

**Wellington City Proposed District Plan
Report 5B
Natural Hazards
Coastal Hazards**

**Appendix 2
Recommended Responses to
Submissions and Further Submissions**

Appendix 2

Recommended Responses to Submissions and Further Submissions

1. Natural Hazards

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.37	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Not specified	Considers that community resilience is an incredibly important factor in terms of natural hazard response.	Seeks that infrastructure facilitates bringing people together.	Reject	No
Tyers Stream Group	221.28	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks stricter management of rules to restrict buildings and infrastructure in areas covered by the Stream Corridor Overlay, the Overland Flow Path Overlay and the Ponding Overlay.	Reject	No
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	FS25.27	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	The submission seeking stricter rules to manage infrastructure in stated hazard areas is too uncertain. Infrastructure may need to be located in these areas such to operational need or functional need. The existing framework in the INF-NH chapter is considered to be satisfactory. Any provision for infrastructure should also be contained in the INF-NH chapter and not the general NH chapter to which the submission relates.	Disallow	Accept	No
Powerco Limited	F561.41	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	The submission seeking stricter rules to manage infrastructure in stated hazard areas is too uncertain. Infrastructure may need to be located in these areas such to operational need or functional need. The existing framework in the INF-NH chapter is considered to be satisfactory. Any provision for infrastructure should also be contained in the INF-NH chapter and not the general NH chapter to which the submission relates.	Disallow	Accept	No
Tyers Stream Group	221.29	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Support	Supports Natural Hazards chapter as it relates to the Tyers stream catchment	Retain Natural Hazards chapter as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject	No
Wellington City Council	266.65	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	Considers there is a need to clarify and add detail in relation to sensitivity rating definitions.	Amend the first sentence of paragraph one of the introduction under 'Hazard Sensitivity' as follows: To assist with determining the consequences associated with natural hazards, buildings and activities have been allocated a sensitivity rating (see Definitions – <u>less hazard sensitive activities</u> , <u>potentially hazard sensitive activities</u> , <u>hazard sensitive activities</u>).	Accept	Yes

Wellington City Council	266.66	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	Considers 'Sheppards Gully' is spelled incorrectly and should instead be 'Shepherds Gully'.	Amend, in the introduction, the Natural Hazard Overlay title as follows: Sheppards Shepherds Gully Fault Overlay Consequential re-naming of 'Sheppards Gully' in the following provisions: INF-NH-R60.1.a.iii NH-R5.1.b SUB-R17 (rule title) SUB-R18 (rule title) SUB- R18.1.1 SUB-R22 (rule title) Planning maps	Accept in part	Yes
Toka Tū Ake EQC	282.5	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	Considers that the provisions for landslide hazard mitigation in the earthworks section of the Proposed Plan are not sufficient, as they rely on individual assessments of sites and could be applied inconsistently. They also allow for developments which do not require earthworks in areas which are at risk of slope failure. Applying a Landslide Hazard overlay (such as the non-regulatory landslide overlay) and restricting development within high-hazard areas will preclude inconsistent application of earthworks rules and prevent subdivision and development on slopes prone to failure. Considers that while there is a restrictive disclaimer on the existing non-regulatory GNS Science SLIDE Geomorphology Map, the uncertainties in a landslide hazard overlay developed from this map can be managed through policy.	Seeks that objectives, policies and rules are developed in the Natural Hazards chapter to restrict hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in high risk land located as a new landslide hazard overlay.	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.127	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Support	Greater Wellington support the submitter's request for additional provisions to control development on land that is at higher risk of slope failure. By identifying and managing this risk, the risk to life, property and well-being of future urban intensification can be appropriately minimised. These changes would have regard to Proposed RPS Plan Change 1, specifically Policy 51.	Allow / Supports the submission in part and seeks additional controls on landslide hazards to manage landslide risk on steep land. Considers that some controls should apply to slopes from ~20- 34". Seeks that the matters of control for these areas include a site-specific geotechnical investigation to ensure slope failure hazards are appropriately managed.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	282.6	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	Considers that the terminology 'Fault Hazard Overlay' should be consistent with the MFE guidelines i.e. Fault Avoidance Zone, and that including the use of confined, unconfined, distributed and uncertain fault areas where appropriate. Considers that the supporting s32 information indicates that the Fault Hazard Overlay are the mapped Fault Avoidance Zones that are mapped in the supporting report; however, this is not explained in the s32. Considers that the description of 'fault hazard' needs to be clarified or amended to reflect how it is shown on the maps i.e., a band, which are at different widths on the map, which we assume reflects the certainty of the fault location.	Seeks that the term "Fault Hazard Overlay" in the Natural Hazards chapter is changed to "Fault Avoidance Zone" and include confined, unconfined, distributed, and uncertain fault areas.	Accept in part	Yes

Aggregate and Quarry Association	303.13	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Not specified	<p>Considers that it is important that the PDP does not shut off access to potential aggregate sources to provide for Wellington's current and future construction needs.</p> <p>As aggregate is expensive to transport, sources of this need to be close to the place of construction.</p>	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan provisions do not rule out quarries along the faultline.	Accept in part	Yes
----------------------------------	--------	--	---------------	---	--	----------------	-----

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.33	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	<p>A number of submission points made by the Aggregate & Quarry Association (please see multiple points in their submission relating to the same theme) argue that "it is important that the PDP does not shut off access to potential aggregate sources to provide for Wellington's current and future construction needs. As aggregate is expensive to transport, sources of this need to be close to the place of construction." Elsewhere, they also say: "... the District Plan must not unreasonably curtail expansion of existing quarries and establishment of new quarries..."</p> <p>WCCERG disagree, on the basis of primary and secondary greenhouse gas emissions from quarrying, which are no longer tenable; and the opportunity to re-use existing materials (instead of sending them to landfill, as is currently the case).</p>	Disallow / Seeks that instead of allowing new mining or quarrying activities and changes of use, WCC requires no expansion of any kind of mining or quarrying activities, and a second policy stating that these activities be phased out by (for example), 2030.	Reject	No
David Karl	309.5	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	<p>Considers that whanau's homes should not be unnecessarily impacted by inaccurate modelling. Further development should also not occur in areas that it should not. There is emotional pain and significant costs linked to Council holding information that is not publicly available and then requiring costly changes to building plans before providing approval.</p>	Seeks that objectives, policies and rules relevant to Hazard zoning be drafted to ensure that the relevant zones (as shown on a map) can most easily be updated to reflect new information.	Reject	No
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.8	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	<p>The Natural Hazards chapter is missing emergency management requirements in the event of major earthquakes or disasters. The population will have a need for water and sewage disposal following a major earthquake, the Proposed District Plan should address this.</p> <p>Mount Cook is especially vulnerable int times of earthquake, as it has several major education facilities that could be cut-off from whānau. Residents that travel between the CBD and Mt Cook may also be cut-off from their home by impassable roads.</p> <p>Finally, the PDP should include provisions to ensure the population's safety in times of natural disaster, as this will focus the attention of Body Corporates on planning for emergency situations.</p>	Seeks that the Natural Hazards chapter include provisions relating to emergency management in times of a major earthquake or natural disaster.	Reject	No
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.9	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	<p>Considers that Wellington City's water storage should be focused around the city to relieve pressure on emergency water supplies. Wellington's water supply could be disrupted for up to 100 days in the aftermath of an earthquake, as the pipes could all break. With up to 400,000 people relying on the network, the city should be making it easy, and in some cases compulsory, for householders to install potable water tanks that will make them self-sufficient for longer. 200 litre tanks are already available, subsidised by Wellington City Council. Kāinga Ora and WREMO both advise that individuals and households be responsible for their own water storage. However, some may not be able to comply and planning rules need to do more to make it easier to store more water privately and in public places.</p>	Seeks that water storage capacity be increased in the City in preparation for a major earthquake.	Reject	No

Property Council New Zealand	338.6	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	Considers that the natural hazard overlays (i.e. flooding, fault rapture, tsunami and coastal) should be included in the Council's LIM reports. Supporting and assessing risks in a way that is more proactive will result in restrictions on building in high-risk areas, with work arounds for the lower-risk areas (taking into account the sensitivity of the proposed activity).	Seeks that natural hazards overlays be included in LIM reports.	Reject	No
Kimberley Vermaey	348.3	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	Considers that areas in the Fault Hazard Overlay are not well defined or understood. The objective, policy and rule frameworks for the fault hazards overlay need to be updated to reflect this differing understanding of the fault hazard overlays. In areas where there is a good understanding of the fault hazard location, there should be more restrictive objectives, policies and rules (similar to what is proposed in the draft plan). where there is a poorer understanding of the fault location, then less restrictive objectives, policies and rules should apply (for example a policy framework that requires the identification of the position of the fault and a corresponding permitted, controlled, or restricted discretionary activity status.	Seeks that where there is poorer understanding of the fault location then less restrictive objectives, policies and rules should apply. The new policy framework would require the identification of the position of the fault and a corresponding permitted, controlled, or restricted discretionary activity status. These provisions need to be drafted and included in the District Plan.	Accept	Yes
Kimberley Vermaey	348.4	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	Considers that rules relating to additions in the Coastal Hazards Overlay do not address alterations to existing buildings. There is the potential for alterations to increase the risk from the conversion of non-habitable buildings. There needs to be consideration as to whether it is appropriate for conversions to existing buildings to be covered. This is to ensure the rule frameworks are consistent with the additions framework.	Seeks that rules relating to additions in the Coastal Inundation Overlay address alterations to existing buildings.	Accept	Yes
Kimberley Vermaey	348.5	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	Considers that rules relating to additions in the Natural Hazards Overlay do not address alterations to existing buildings. There is the potential for alterations to increase the risk from the conversion of non-habitable buildings. There needs to be consideration as to whether it is appropriate for conversions to existing buildings to be covered. This is to ensure the rule frameworks are consistent with the additions framework.	Seeks that provisions relating to additions in the Natural Hazard Overlays address alterations to existing buildings.	Accept	Yes
Kimberley Vermaey	348.6	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	Considers that the current coastal hazard framework does not have any consideration of the inundation depths. As a result, areas with 2m of inundation depth would be treated the same as areas with 0.1m of inundation depth. There may be a need to refine the policy and rule frameworks to recognise different inundation depths and this may have some implications of the hazard classification frameworks. (Option A)	Seeks that classification of inundation depths be reassessed for the Coastal Inundation Overlay.	Accept in part	Yes
Kimberley Vermaey	348.7	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	Considers that the current coastal hazard framework does not have any consideration of the inundation depths. Alternatively, the hazard map overlays may be adjusted to remove inundation depths below a certain level as they will not reach a level that constitutes a hazard that warrants land use planning. Expert advice on this may be required as to what is the most appropriate depth, but it may be 0.15m and less. (Option B)	Seeks that the Coastal Inundation Overlay be adjusted to remove inundation depths below a certain low-hazard level.	Accept in part	Yes
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.31	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Support	Support	Retain NH – Ngā Mōrearea ā-Taiao - Natural Hazards as notified.	Accept in part	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.118	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	Considers that intensification in any flood hazard zone is not in line with regional, national or international direction on hazards or climate change, and would impact Greater Wellington's ability to discharge its flood risk management functions. Increasing densities within Wellington City area may result in an increase in the vulnerability of people and property to flood hazards, and there will also be a need to introduce more sophisticated flood forecasting and warning systems to the region.	Seeks that WCC continues to work with Greater Wellington to discuss the City's flood hazards in relation to the proposed intensification.	Accept in part	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.20	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC support natural hazard provisions based on current and accurate research. Continued collaboration between agencies is important to keep hazard information up to date and consistent across the region.	Allow	Accept in part	No
Jane Szentivanyi and Ben Briggs	369.12	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Not specified	Considers that natural hazard such as flooding and slips are an important qualifying factor in determining future development.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.88	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Support in part	The Natural Hazard chapter is supported for its intent, as it seeks to protect people, property and infrastructure from natural hazards. The chapter's 'risk-based approach' is also supported as it seeks to manage effects from natural hazards by classifying activities and providing separate provisions for these activities depending on their level of hazard sensitivity.	Retain the Natural Hazard chapter, with amendments.	Accept in part	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.55	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Support	The Natural Hazards chapter' Introduction is supported, including the risk framework, the use of both buildings and activities, and the three focus areas of people, property and infrastructure.	Retain the Natural Hazards chapter's Introduction as notified.	Accept in part	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.19	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Support in part	Supports the Introduction to the extent that it takes an adaptation approach to natural hazards. Retreat from the Wellington CBD is unlikely to occur, and therefore it would be more appropriate for the Proposed Plan to anticipate a protection or adaptation approach to climate change hazards. Argosy opposes hazard rankings being attributed to the various natural hazards. For example, the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay being identified as a 'high' risk. This is because the natural hazards overlays apply to all levels of risk either in the same way, or specific to the type of risk. It does not have a practical implication to attribute hazard rankings to the natural hazards and is inappropriate. Notes that the hazard overlays are wide ranging in terms of risk and feasible approaches to mitigate that risk. By including all the hazard overlays together the Proposed Plan applies the same risk and mitigation approach to all hazard overlays. This is inappropriate for some overlays, such as liquefaction and tsunamis (discussed below), where the risk cannot be mitigated and the probability of an event is low	Delete "Natural Hazard Overlay" table in Introduction.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.1	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	High, medium and low risk ranking is important in assessing the level of activity appropriate in areas at risk from natural hazards.	Disallow	Accept	No

Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.63	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	<p>Considers further engagement with Council is appropriate to ensure existing consents can be implemented without future impediment and to ensure the District Plan reflects the aspirations of Taranaki Whānui.</p> <p>Natural Hazard overlays are identified over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford, and Shelly Bay Taikuru.</p>	<p>Seeks that amendments that are most appropriate to address concerns around ensuring that Taranaki Whānui can implement existing consents around Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford, and Shelly Bay Taikuru without future impediment.</p>	Reject	No
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.5	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states as a Submission Point, that “Taranaki Whānui opposes the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford.”</p> <p>It lists the relevant PDP Chapter as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning maps • He Rohe Ahoaho Māori Natural Open Space Zone chapter • Ngā Wāhi Tapu ki te Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter • Ngā Pūnaha Rauropi me te Kanorau Koiora Taketake Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter • Te Ahurei o Ngā Hanga Māori Natural Character chapter • Ngā Hanga Māori me Ngā Nohopae Natural Features and Landscapes chapter • Wawaetanga Subdivision chapter • Taiao Takutai Coastal Environment chapter <p>Opposes in total Submission 389 on these points, which appears to be a wholesale rejection of planning rules in these areas.</p>	Disallow	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.22	Part 2 /Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states: “Taranaki Whānui’s RFR [Right of First Refusal] opportunities in Te Motu Kairangi: Taranaki Whānui have a significant interest in Te Motu Kairangi which includes Mount Crawford and Watts Peninsula, these landholdings hold significant interest - culturally, socially, environmentally and commercially to Taranaki Whānui. These opportunities include the Mount Crawford Prison site as well as the ‘Watts Peninsula’ sites being 75.85 hectares of former Defence Land.”</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays notes that the Submission does not include maps however they (Buy Back the Bays) are very concerned to see that Taranaki Whānui appears to be seeking possible commercial development of 75.85 hectares of former defence land on Watts Peninsula. This appears to be the heart of the long-promised Watts Peninsula park and a major part of the proposed national heritage park.</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays strongly oppose rezoning on Watts Peninsula to facilitate any development there that is incompatible with the park plans. More generally, Buy Back the Bays oppose Submission 389’s attempt to remove the proposed public interest controls from Watts Peninsula and Mount Crawford. Considers that where Submission 389 states “Illustrated on Figure One below, the following zone and overlays are proposed for Taranaki Whānui’s RFR properties in Te Motu Kairangi,” Buy Back the Bays oppose the changes it seeks. This includes opposing Submission 389’s request for “The proposed zoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST [to be] amended from Natural Open Space Zone to: a. Medium Density Residential; and b. Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone.”</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.41	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	<p>Refers to submission 389 states: Taranaki Whānui opposes the extent of the proposed zoning of Shelly Bay Taikuru and the proposed height control limits.” Buy Back the Bays opposes the submission on both points.</p> <p>Specifically, the Submission 389 for Taranaki Whānui seeks that:</p> <p>“1. The Mixed Use Zone is extended across the allotments illustrated in Figure Two below or amended to follow the extent of consented development area outlined in the approved masterplan and engineering drawings.</p> <p>2. The Height Control Area is amended to 27m being the maximum height of development consented under the Shelly Bay Masterplan resource consent.”</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays opposes both parts. Buy Back the Bays note that neither part affects Taranaki Whānui’s commercial or other interests. Considers that both parts only affect the tall apartment buildings planned by and for the exclusive commercial benefit of The Wellington Company, not the</p>	Disallow		

				leasing of lower existing buildings that The Wellington Company has offered to Taranaki Whānui as its stake in the project.		Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.154	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Support in part	The inclusion of rules in relation to flood hazards is partially supported, as well as the risk-based approach to the management of natural hazards. However, an amendment is sought.	Retain the Natural Hazards chapter with amendment.	Accept in part	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.155	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	Considers that rules related to flood hazards should not be linked to static maps.	Amend the Natural Hazards chapter so that rules do not refer to static maps.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.51	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	Accurate and risk-based regulatory hazard maps are an important tool in the WCC Proposed District Plan to limit subdivision and development within areas subject to natural hazard risk. Removing part or all of these regulatory maps opens the possibility that rules controlling development in flood-prone areas will be inconsistently applied, exposing people and their properties to unnecessary flood risk.	Disallow	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.57	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a non-statutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.156	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose in part	<p>The inclusion of flood hazard mapping as part of the District Plan is opposed, despite the risk-based approach to the management of natural hazards being generally supported. Including Flood Hazard overlays in the District Plan ignores the dynamic nature of flood hazards and will create unnecessary additional cost and uncertainty for landowners and land developers. It is considered appropriate to include rules in relation to flood hazards but sought that the rules are not linked to static maps.</p> <p>The Auckland Unitary Plan (“AUP”) adopts a set of non-statutory flood hazard overlay maps which operate as interactive maps on the Council’s ‘Geo Maps’ website – a separate mapping viewer to the statutory maps. The advantage of this approach is the ability to operate a separate set of interactive maps which are continually subject to improvement and updates, outside of and without a reliance on the Schedule 1 process under the RMA.</p> <p>It is noted that there is no formal requirement for flooding overlay maps to be included within a district plan. It is also noted that the National Planning Standards 2016 – Mapping Standard Table 20 includes a number of specific overlay and other symbols, but none relate to flooding. The removal of the mapped flooding Natural Hazard Overlays from within the District Plan is sought. This should instead be included as a non-statutory, information only mapping layer that sits outside the Proposed District Plan and refer to “Natural Hazard Overlays” as “Natural Hazard Areas”.</p> <p>The mapping of other, non-flooding natural hazards to be incorporated into the District Plan maps, such as Liquefaction and Fault Hazards (in addition to Coastal Hazards) are otherwise supported, as these hazards are less subject to change.</p>	Seeks that natural hazard flooding overlays from the District Plan are deleted and that the information be held in non-statutory GIS maps instead.	Reject	No
Thorndon Residents’ Association Inc	FS69.6	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	<p>Thorndon is susceptible to flooding. This must be an urban planning consideration.</p> <p>Recent weather events have caused underground streams to daylight themselves in areas predicted by the planning map. Climate change is anticipated to increase the frequency and impact of deluges on Thorndon’s catchments (Te Ahumairangi Hill and the Pipitea Stream).</p> <p>This is critical information for planning scenarios. It must have impactful (and legal) significance.</p> <p>There is a vulnerability to flooding in Thorndon and this information must be formally woven into the DP to regulate urban development. This must also be assessed alongside, and with equivalent status, to other natural hazard vulnerabilities in Thorndon e.g. seismic, slope erosion, underground geology, etc.</p>	Disallow		

				[Refer to Further submission for included map].		Accept	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.52	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	Accurate and risk-based regulatory hazard maps are an important tool in the WCC Proposed District Plan to limit subdivision and development within areas subject to natural hazard risk. Removing part or all of these regulatory maps opens the possibility that rules controlling development in flood-prone areas will be inconsistently applied, exposing people and their properties to unnecessary flood risk.	Disallow	Accept	No
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.32	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	Considers that mapping flood hazards remains an important priority for residents.	Disallow	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.58	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a non-statutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.157	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose in part	The term "Natural Hazard Overlays" is opposed and should be removed and replaced by a newly defined term "Natural Hazard Areas". Natural Hazard Overlays should instead be included as non-statutory, information-only mapping layer that sits outside the Proposed District Plan.	Delete all references to "Natural Hazard Overlays" and refer to the newly defined term of Natural Hazard Areas instead.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.7	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	<p>Thorndon is susceptible to flooding. This must be an urban planning consideration.</p> <p>Recent weather events have caused underground streams to daylight themselves in areas predicted by the planning map. Climate change is anticipated to increase the frequency and impact of deluges on Thorndon's catchments (Te Ahumairangi Hill and the Pipitea Stream).</p> <p>This is critical information for planning scenarios. It must have impactful (and legal) significance.</p> <p>There is a vulnerability to flooding in Thorndon and this information must be formally woven into the DP to regulate urban development. This must also be assessed alongside, and with equivalent status, to other natural hazard vulnerabilities in Thorndon e.g. seismic, slope erosion, underground geology, etc.</p> <p>[Refer to Further submission for included map].</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.53	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	<p>MfE discussion paper on National Planning Standards: Zones and Overlays supports the use of the term 'overlay' to mean mapped areas which "introduce more restrictive built form controls than apply to the underlying zone". As this is the purpose of the WCC proposed plan's Natural Hazard Overlays, the term should be retained. Regulatory natural hazard overlays, including for flood, are an important tool to limit subdivision and development within areas subject to natural hazard risk.</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Elliott Thornton	399.1	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	<p>Considers that while the PDP regulates the location and siting of buildings to be sufficiently flood-free, it does not address people trying to traverse flood waters, which is one of the primary causes of death or injury from flooding.</p>	<p>Seeks that the permitted depth for access is set at 0.3m, consistent with the Greater Wellington Regional Council's Flood Hazard Modelling Standard, and where not meeting that standard, a risk management approach which could consider matters such as the duration of the flood hazard, velocity, the ability for emergency vehicle access, or ability to provide alternative access during a major flood event.</p>	Reject	No
CentrePort Limited	402.91	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	<p>Considers that there is a structural difficulty with Natural Hazards being included in the Infrastructure section when there is a separate and standalone chapter that specifically references Natural Hazards as well as coastal hazards included in the Coastal Environment. This creates uncertainty. For an infrastructure provider and for ease of plan usage these provisions should be in the Natural Hazards Chapter.</p>	<p>Seeks that Infrastructure Natural Hazards provisions are located within the Natural Hazards Chapter.</p>	Reject	No

CentrePort Limited	402.92	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	Considers that there is a structural difficulty with Natural Hazards being included in the Infrastructure section when there is a separate and standalone chapter that specifically references Natural Hazards as well as coastal hazards included in the Coastal Environment. This creates uncertainty. For an infrastructure provider and for ease of plan usage these provisions should be in the Natural Hazards Chapter.	Seeks that Infrastructure Natural Hazards provisions are located within the Natural Hazards Chapter.	Reject	No
CentrePort Limited	402.93	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	Supports policy INF-NH-P61 but considers that for ease of plan usage it should instead be included in the overarching Natural Hazard Overlays chapter.	Seeks that INF-NH-P61 (Infrastructure and structures in Natural Hazard and Coastal Hazard Overlays) is relocated to the Natural Hazards Chapter.	Reject	No
CentrePort Limited	402.94	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	Opposes structure of dealing with Natural Hazards. Considers that the structure of managing Natural Hazards is confusing. There are Natural Hazards provisions in the infrastructure chapter as well as Natural Hazards chapter, while coastal hazards are in the Coastal Environment Chapter. For CentrePort related matters you potentially have to look at all three. This is considered inefficient and could lead to duplication. Of the hazards listed CentrePort has fault hazard, liquefaction, coastal inundation and tsunami (high) risk.	Seeks that plan is amended so all Natural Hazards requirements are included in one chapter.	Reject	No
CentrePort Limited	402.95	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	Opposes structure of dealing with Natural Hazards. Considers that the structure of managing Natural Hazards is confusing. There are Natural Hazards provisions in the infrastructure chapter as well as Natural Hazards chapter, while coastal hazards are in the Coastal Environment Chapter. For CentrePort related matters you potentially have to look at all three. This is considered inefficient and could lead to duplication. Of the hazards listed CentrePort has fault hazard, liquefaction, coastal inundation and tsunami (high) risk.	Seeks that plan is amended so all Natural Hazards requirements are included in one chapter.	Reject	No
Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	FS25.28	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	Retaining the infrastructure rules related to natural hazards in the INF-NH sub-chapter rather than the general NH Chapter is preferred to keep the INF provisions largely self-contained in one location.	Disallow	Accept	No
Powerco Limited	FS61.42	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	Retaining the infrastructure rules related to natural hazards in the INF-NH sub-chapter rather than the general NH Chapter is preferred to keep the INF provisions largely self-contained in one location.	Disallow	Accept	No
Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?

Oyster Management Limited	404.7	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose in part	Opposes the Proposed Plan in part.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan recognises the benefits of existing investment in the CBD in relation to natural hazards and coastal hazards.	Accept in part	Yes
Oyster Management Limited	404.8	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose in part	Opposes the Proposed Plan in part.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan applies appropriate provisions to reflect the probability and limitations in mitigating risks of liquefaction and tsunamis.	Reject	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.9	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose in part	Opposes the Proposed Plan in part.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan provides consistency in the approach to potentially hazard sensitive activities in the Natural Hazards and Coastal Hazards Overlays.	Reject	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.10	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Support in part	The submitter's properties at 6 Hurring Place and 12 Newlands Road are partly within the Flood Hazard Overlay – Inundation Area and 6 Hurring Place is partly within the Flood Hazard Overlay – Overland Flowpath.	Retain the Natural Hazards Introduction as notified to the extent that it takes an adaptation approach to natural hazards, with amendments. [Refer to original submission for maps of the submitter's properties under the Proposed District Plan].	Accept in part	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.11	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose in part	The submitter's properties at 6 Hurring Place and 12 Newlands Road are partly within the Flood Hazard Overlay – Inundation Area and 6 Hurring Place is partly within the Flood Hazard Overlay – Overland Flowpath.	Not specified. [Refer to original submission for maps of the submitter's properties under the Proposed District Plan].	Not specified.	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.12	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Support	Supports the Introductory text to the extent that it takes an adaptation approach to natural hazards.	Retain NH (Natural Hazards) - Introduction as notified.	Accept in part	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.208	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Support	Supports Natural Hazards chapter introduction. Supports the recognition of Wellington Airport within the introductory text.	Retain Natural Hazards chapter introduction as notified.	Accept in part	No
VictLabour	414.20	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Support in part	Supports restrictions on development in areas at risk of coastal inundation and tsunami with amendment as detailed in other submission point.	Retain coastal inundation and tsunami provisions with amendment.	Accept in part	No
VictLabour	414.21	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Not specified	Considers that the reality of sea level rise means Council must start considering a programme of managed retreat. Considers that Council must lay the groundwork now and begin the difficult conversations with communities about the longevity of their placement within areas susceptible to considerable risk from sea level rise	Seeks that the Council start considering a programme of managed retreat.	Reject	No

Fabric Property Limited	425.9	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose in part	<p>It is important that the Proposed Plan accurately conveys the probabilities of different natural hazards, and does not unduly create an impression of greater risk than is the case.</p> <p>The introduction to the Natural Hazards chapter identifies the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay with a 'High' hazard ranking. However, the provisions associated with the Liquefaction Overlay suggest that these are areas of lower hazard risk. We also note the natural hazards overlays apply to all levels of risk either in the same way, or in relation to the specific type of risk. Accordingly, Fabric seeks amendments to the introduction to remove the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay from the 'High' hazard ranking, to better reflect the risks associated with liquefaction and to achieve better consistency with the associated provisions.</p>	Option 1: Seeks that the introduction to the Natural Hazards chapter is amended to delete the hazard rankings from the table.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.10	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	High, medium and low risk ranking is important in assessing the level of activity appropriate in areas at risk from natural hazards. Deleting the rankings will undermine the risk-based approach that has been taken.	Disallow	Accept	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.10	38	Oppose in part	<p>It is important that the Proposed Plan accurately conveys the probabilities of different natural hazards, and does not unduly create an impression of greater risk than is the case.</p> <p>The introduction to the Natural Hazards chapter identifies the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay with a 'High' hazard ranking. However, the provisions associated with the Liquefaction Overlay suggest that these are areas of lower hazard risk. We also note the natural hazards overlays apply to all levels of risk either in the same way, or in relation to the specific type of risk. Accordingly, Fabric seeks amendments to the introduction to remove the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay from the 'High' hazard ranking, to better reflect the risks associated with liquefaction and to achieve better consistency with the associated provisions.</p>	<p>Option 2: If the hazards ranking table is not deleted from the Natural Hazards chapter introduction:</p> <p>Amend the Natural Hazards chapter introduction to remove the 'High' hazard ranking for the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay.</p>	Accept	Yes
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.11	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	Liquefaction is a hazard associated with earthquakes. Much of central Wellington is built on ground likely to liquefy in an earthquake, and the risk of earthquakes in Wellington is high. Liquefaction is a real risk that has already been experienced in Wellington (e.g. during the 2016 Kaikoura earthquake), and ignoring the liquefaction risk in Christchurch resulted in catastrophic damage and retirement of land. MBIE guidelines for development in areas at risk from liquefaction ³ recommend both land use planning to avoid more vulnerable activities in high risk areas and requiring liquefaction resistant foundations for those buildings which are appropriate to develop in medium and high risk areas.	Disallow	Reject	No
Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?

Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.20	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / New NH	Amend	Considers here should be an additional objective in the Natural Hazards overlays which provides for a range of activities that maintain the vibrancy and vitality of the City Centre zone, while also ensuring that subdivision, development and use in these areas do not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure. This would be consistent with Objective CE-08 in relation to coastal hazards. It is appropriate for a similar approach to be taken to coastal hazards and natural hazards to recognise that here is significant existing investment in the CBD and there are social and economic benefits to enabling development that does not increase risks arising from natural hazards.	Add new objective NH-OX to the Natural Hazards chapter as follows: <u>Provide for a range of activities that maintain the vibrancy and vitality of the City Centre Zone, while also ensuring that subdivision, development and use in these areas do not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure</u>	Reject	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.21	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / New NH	Amend	Considers there should be an additional policy which recognises that development in the natural hazard overlays in the City Centre zone is appropriate in some instances. This would be consistent with Policies CE-921 and CE-P22. As noted above, it is appropriate for a similar approach to be taken to coastal hazards and natural hazards.	Add new policy NH-PX to the Natural Hazards chapter as follows: <u>Enable subdivision, development and use associated within the City Centre Zone and within all of the Natural Hazard Overlays, where they do not involve the construction of new buildings which will be occupied by members of the public or the creation of vacant allotments</u>	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	F570.2	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / New NH	Oppose	Some areas within natural hazard overlays are not appropriate for development and the NH provisions in the plan are reflective of this.	Disallow	Accept	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.22	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / New NH	Amend	Considers there should be an additional policy which recognises that development in the natural hazard overlays in the City Centre zone is appropriate in some instances. This would be consistent with Policies CE-921 and CE-P22. As noted above, it is appropriate for a similar approach to be taken to coastal hazards and natural hazards.	Add new policy NH-PX to the Natural Hazards chapter as follows: <u>Manage subdivision, development and use within the City Centre Zone and within all of the Natural Hazard Overlays, where they involve the construction of new buildings which will be occupied by members of the public or result in the creation of a vacant allotment by ensuring that the activity, building or subdivision incorporates measures that reduce or not increase the risk to people, and property.</u>	Reject	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.11	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / New NH	Amend	Considers that there should be an additional objective in the Natural Hazards overlays which provides for a range of activities that maintain the vibrancy and vitality of the City Centre zone, while also ensuring that subdivision, development and use in these areas do not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure. This would be consistent with Objective CE-08 in relation to coastal hazards. It is appropriate for a similar approach to be taken to coastal hazards and natural hazards to recognise that there is significant existing investment in the CBD and there are social and economic benefits to enabling development that does not increase risks arising from natural hazards.	Add new Objective as follows: NH-05 (City Centre Zone): <u>Provide for a range of activities that maintain the vibrancy and vitality of the City Centre Zone, while also ensuring that subdivision, development and use in these areas do not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure.</u>	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.119	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-01	Amend	Considers it appropriate to amend to have regard to the Proposed RPS Change 1 Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as “as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)” and is in line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as practicable but is a clearer signal than ‘reduce or do not increase’, to actively look to bring down the risk in the design and planning of the development.	Amend NH-01 (Risk from natural hazards) as follows: Subdivision, use and development within the Natural Hazard Overlays minimises reduce or do not increase the risk from natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure.		

						Accept in part	Yes
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.21	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-01	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GWRC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that 'minimise' natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than 'reduce' and 'reduce or do not increase'.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.10	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-01	Oppose	Stride is opposed to amending the wording of the natural hazard policies from "reduce or avoid an increase in risk" to "minimise risk" which would impose an unreasonable and greater burden than the current wording of the Proposed Plan.	Disallow	Reject	No
Investore Property Limited	FS108.10	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-01	Oppose	Investore is opposed to amending the wording of the natural hazard policies from "reduce or avoid an increase in risk" to "minimise risk" which would impose an unreasonable and greater burden than the current wording of the Proposed Plan.	Disallow	Reject	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.23	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-01	Support	Supports the objective as it enables use and development within the Natural Hazard Overlays that do not increase the risk from natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure	Retain NH-01 (Risk from natural hazards) as notified.	Reject	No
Ministry of Education	400.44	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-01	Support	Supports NH-01 to reduce risk to people, property, and infrastructure. The submitter acknowledges there are existing Educational Facilities within the Coastal Hazard Area and that any development of these would be subject to these provisions (if not designated).	Retain NH-01 (Risk from natural hazards) as proposed.	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.50	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-01	Support	Waka Kotahi supports providing for subdivision and development where this does not increase risk to people property and infrastructure.	Allow	Reject	No
CentrePort Limited	402.96	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-01	Support	Support the intent of this Objective.	Retain NH-01 (Risk from natural hazards) as notified.	Reject	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.13	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-01	Support	Supports NH-01 to the extent that it enables use and development within the natural hazard overlays that do not increase the risk from natural hazards to people, property, and infrastructure.	Retain NH-01 (Risks from natural hazards) as notified.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.209	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-01	Oppose	Opposes NH-01. Furthermore, and as set out in Objective SRCC-02, the risks from natural hazards should be avoided where they are intolerable. This concept should be brought into this policy and acknowledges that people, activities, property and infrastructure have varying levels of coastal hazard tolerance. [See paragraph 4.85 to 4.92 in original submission for full reason]	Opposes NH-01 (Risk from natural hazards) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.210	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-01	Amend	Opposes NH-01. Furthermore, and as set out in Objective SRCC-02, the risks from natural hazards should be avoided where they are intolerable. This concept should be brought into this policy and acknowledges that people, activities, property and infrastructure have varying levels of coastal hazard tolerance. [See paragraph 4.85 to 4.92 in original submission for full reason]	Submitter seeks either deletion of NH-01 (Risk from natural hazards) or an amendment to NH-01 (Risk from natural hazards) as follows: Subdivision, use and development in the Natural Hazard Overlays <u>do not create an intolerable level of risk</u> reduces or does not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	F570.91	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-01	Oppose	Toka Tū Ake supports the suggestion that the concept of risk tolerance be included in natural hazard provisions. However, natural hazard risk tolerance is a concept which varies widely between people and communities, and it is impractical to include it in this instance as a comprehensive definition of 'tolerable' risk has not been developed, nor has one been offered. Deletion of this provision is not an appropriate alternative to including risk tolerance, as it is important to limit development in areas at risk from natural hazards.	Disallow	Accept	No
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.93	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-01	Support	Supports the objective to provide for operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities while ensuring these activities do not increase the risk to people, property and infrastructure.	Retain NH-01 (Risk from natural hazards) as notified.	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.120	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-02	Amend	Supports the inclusion of "catchment management" in the objective as notified.	Retain NH-02 (Planned natural hazard mitigation works), subject to amendments.	Accept in part	Yes
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.121	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-02	Amend	Considers it appropriate to amend to have regard to the Proposed RPS Change 1 Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as "as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)" and is in line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as practicable but is a clearer signal than 'reduced', to actively look to bring down the risk in the design and planning of the development.	Amend NH-02 (Planned natural hazard mitigation works) as follows: There is reduced The risk to people, property and infrastructure from flood hazards through planned mitigation works and catchment management <u>is minimised</u> .	Accept in part	Yes

Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.22	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O2	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GWRC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that 'minimise' natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than 'reduce' and 'reduce or do not increase'.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
CentrePort Limited	402.97	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O2	Support	Support the intent of this Objective.	Retain NH-O2 (Planned natural hazard mitigation works) as notified.	Accept	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.60	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O3	Support	Supports the policy 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 could include fire breaks which can comprise a natural physical barrier against the spread of fire from or into any area of continuous flammable material.	Retain NH-O3 (Natural systems and features) as notified.	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.122	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O3	Support	Considers the wording of this objective is generally consistent with the expectations of Greater Wellington in respect of natural features and RPS direction.	Retain NH-O3 (Natural systems and features) as notified.	Accept	No
CentrePort Limited	402.98	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O3	Support	Support the intent of this Objective.	Retain NH-O3 (Natural systems and features) as notified.	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.123	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O4	Support	Considers this approach is appropriate	Retain NH-O4 (Operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.	Reject	No
CentrePort Limited	402.99	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O4	Support	Support specific objective for Port Activities.	Retain NH-O4 (Operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.211	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O4	Oppose in part	Opposes NH-O4. The activities listed have operational and functional constraints which ultimately govern the location of these activities, including within areas exposed to natural hazard risk. This objective needs to appropriately recognise this, and consistent with the directive contained within SRCC-O2, avoid areas where the risks are intolerable, taking into consideration operational and functional constraints associated with identified activities.	Opposes NH-O4 (Operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.212	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O4	Amend	<p>Opposes NH-O4.</p> <p>The activities listed have operational and functional constraints which ultimately govern the location of these activities, including within areas exposed to natural hazard risk. This objective needs to appropriately recognise this, and consistent with the directive contained within SRCC-O2, avoid areas where the risks are intolerable, taking into consideration operational and functional constraints associated with identified activities.</p>	<p>Submitter seeks either deletion of NH-O4 (Operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) or an amendment to NH-O4 (Operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as follows:</p> <p>NH-O4 Airport, Operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities</p> <p>Airport, Operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities are provided for, while also ensuring that subdivision, development and use of land occupied by operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities do not <u>create an intolerable level of increase</u> the risk to people, property, and infrastructure.</p>	Accept in part	Yes
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.124	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P1	Support	<p>Supports a risk-based approach to manage subdivision use and development within the identified areas, specifically sensitivity to impacts and the hazard posed to lives and wellbeing. This aligns with RPS direction on natural hazards. Considers that Changes requested to the policies may necessitate amendments to the rules to have regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>	Retain NH-P1 (Identification of natural hazards) as notified.	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.51	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P1	Support	<p>Waka Kotahi supports a risk-based approach in providing for subdivision and development based on the likelihood and consequence to people property and infrastructure.</p>	Allow	Reject	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.24	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P1	Support	<p>Supports the policy in that the risk-based approach needs to consider the impact, likelihood and consequences of different natural hazard events.</p>	Retain NH-P1 (Identification of natural hazards) as notified.	Reject	No
Ministry of Education	400.45	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P1	Support in part	<p>Support NH-P1 in part.</p>	Retain NH-P1 (Identification of natural hazards) with amendment.	Accept in part	Yes
Ministry of Education	400.46	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P1	Amend	<p>Seeks that NH-P1 be amended. The submitter acknowledges the risk that natural hazards pose to hazard sensitive activities.</p> <p>However the submitter seeks that this policy be amended so that an operational need for the Ministry to locate educational facilities in natural hazard areas to serve existing communities can be considered when managing development in natural hazard areas.</p>	<p>Amend NH-P1 (Identification of natural hazards) as follows:</p> <p>Identify natural hazards within the District Plan and take a risk-based approach to the management of subdivision, use and development based on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The sensitivity of the activities to the impacts of natural hazards; and 2. The hazard posed to people's lives and wellbeing, property and infrastructure, by considering the likelihood and consequences of natural hazard events; and 3. The operational need for some activities to locate in natural hazard areas. 	Accept in part	Yes

Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.78	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P1	Support	WIAL supports the intent of this relief to the extent that it is consistent with the outcomes sought from its primary submission.	Allow / Seeks that part of submission to be allowed.	Accept in part	Yes
Oyster Management Limited	404.14	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P1	Support	Supports NH-P1 to the extent that the risk-based approach needs to consider the impact, likelihood, or consequences of different natural hazard events.	Retain NH-P1 (Identification of natural hazards) as notified.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.213	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P1	Oppose	Opposes NH-P1. The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraph 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes NH-P1 (Identification of natural hazards) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.214	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P1	Amend	Opposes NH-P1. The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraph 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that NH-P1 (Identification of natural hazards) is amended to introduce the concept of tolerability.	Reject	No
Horokivi Quarries Ltd	271.18	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Support	Supports the risk-based approach within the policy.	Retain NH-P2 (Levels of risk) as notified.	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.61	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Support	Supports the policy as the policy makes an allowance for buildings or activities in the low, medium and high hazard areas where mitigation measures are incorporated to address the impacts from the relevant natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure. A number of established fire stations are located in either the low, medium or high hazard areas and it is supported that an opportunity exists for future additions or site layout amendments.	Retain NH-P2 (Levels of risk) as notified.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.125	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Amend	Considers it appropriate to amend to have regard to the Proposed RPS Change 1 Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as “as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)” and is in line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as practicable but is a clearer signal than ‘reduce or do not increase’, to actively look to bring down the risk in the design and planning of the development. Considers that Changes requested to the policies may necessitate amendments to the rules to have regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Amend NH-P2 (Levels of risk) as follows: Subdivision, use and development minimises reduce or do not increase the risk to people, property and infrastructure by:...	Accept in part	Yes
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.23	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GWRC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that ‘minimise’ natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than ‘reduce’ and ‘reduce or do not increase’.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.11	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Oppose	Stride is opposed to amending the wording of the natural hazard policies from “reduce or avoid an increase in risk” to “minimise risk” which would impose an unreasonable and greater burden than the current wording of the Proposed Plan.	Disallow	Reject	No
Investore Property Limited	FS108.11	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Oppose	Investore is opposed to amending the wording of the natural hazard policies from “reduce or avoid an increase in risk” to “minimise risk” which would impose an unreasonable and greater burden than the current wording of the Proposed Plan.	Disallow	Reject	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.25	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Oppose in part	Consider NH-P2.1 is restrictive to allow only low occupancy or low replacement value development within the Natural Hazard Overlays. The Liquefaction Hazard Overlay applies to approximately half of the CBD. It is considered that this policy does not appropriately recognise this context and existing built environment. Considers NH-P2.2 is unrealistic to provide that mitigation can address the impacts from natural hazards. This will not always be possible or practical. Further, Policy NH-P.2 should apply in all hazard areas. Considers NH-P2.3 is similarly restrictive and equally fails to recognise that a significant portion of the CBD is subject to high hazard areas under the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay. Policy NH-P2.3 should apply to the Fault Hazard Overlay only, and also recognise functional need in this location. Notes that all activities except emergency service facilities are permitted within the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay. The policy should be consistent with the level of risk reflected in the rules	Amend NH-P2 (Levels of risk) as follows: Subdivision, use and development reduce or do not increase the risk to people, property and infrastructure by: 1-Allowing for those buildings and activities that have either low occupancy or low replacement value within the low, medium and high hazard areas of the Natural Hazard Overlays; 2. Requiring buildings and activities to reduce or not increase mitigate the impacts from natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure in the low hazard, and medium and high hazard areas within the Natural Hazard Overlays; and 3. Avoiding buildings and activities in the high hazard areas of the Natural Fault Hazard Overlays unless there is a functional or exceptional reason for the building or activity to be located in this area and the activity mitigates the impacts from natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure.	Reject	No

Ministry of Education	400.47	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Support in part	Support NH-P2 in part.	Retain NH-P2 (Levels of risk) with amendment.	Accept in part	Yes
Ministry of Education	400.48	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Amend	<p>Seeks that NH-P2 be amended. The submitter acknowledges the risk that natural hazards pose to hazard sensitive activities.</p> <p>However the submitter considers that, at times, there is an operational need for the submitter to locate educational facilities in these areas to serve existing communities. The submitter seeks an amendment so that this need can be considered when managing development in natural hazard areas, whilst also requiring natural hazard risk to be mitigated through any new development.</p>	<p>Amend NH-P2 (Levels of risk) as follows:</p> <p>Subdivision, use and development reduce or do not increase the risk to people, property and infrastructure by:</p> <p>...</p> <p>3. Avoiding buildings and activities in the high hazard areas of the Natural Hazard Overlays unless there is an exceptional reason or <u>operational need</u> for the building or activity to be located in this area and the activity mitigates the impacts from natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure.</p>	Accept in part	Yes
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.52	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Support	Waka Kotahi supports a risk-based approach in providing for subdivision and development, and only in circumstances where there is an operational need provide for activities to be undertaken in the high hazard area.	Allow	Accept in part	No
CentrePort Limited	402.100	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Support in part	Considers that the area within the Special Purpose Port Zone has a number of hazard risks including those categorised as high. However this policy seeks to only allow buildings and activities in exceptional circumstances rather than recognising there may be a functional need or operational requirement for the building or activity.	Retain NH-P2 (Levels of risk), with amendment.	Accept in part	Yes
CentrePort Limited	402.101	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Amend	Considers that the area within the Special Purpose Port Zone has a number of hazard risks including those categorised as high. However this policy seeks to only allow buildings and activities in exceptional circumstances rather than recognising there may be a functional need or operational requirement for the building or activity.	<p>Amend NH-P2 (Levels of risk) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>3. Avoiding buildings and activities in the high hazard areas of the Natural Hazard Overlays unless there is an there <u>is a functional need or operational requirement or other</u> exceptional reason for the building or activity to be located in this area, and the activity mitigates the impacts from natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure.</p>	Accept in part	Yes
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.79	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Support	WIAL supports the intent of this relief to the extent that it is consistent with the outcomes sought from its primary submission.	Allow / Seeks that part of submission to be allowed.	Accept in part	Yes

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.215	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Oppose	<p>Opposes NH-P2.</p> <p>The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards.</p> <p>[See paragraph 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]</p>	Opposes NH-P2 (Levels of risk) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.216	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Amend	<p>Opposes NH-P2.</p> <p>The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards.</p> <p>[See paragraph 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that NH-P2 (Levels of risk) is either deleted or amended to introduce the concept of tolerability.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.92	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Oppose	<p>Toka Tū Ake supports the suggestion that the concept of risk tolerance be included in natural hazard provisions. However, natural hazard risk tolerance is a concept which varies widely between people and communities, and it is impractical to include it in this instance as a comprehensive definition of 'tolerable' risk has not been developed nor has one been offered. Deletion of this provision is not an appropriate alternative to including risk tolerance, as it is important to limit development in areas at risk from natural hazards.</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.12	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that NH-P2.1 is very restrictive to allow only low occupancy or low replacement value development within the Natural Hazard Overlays. The Liquefaction Hazard Overlay applies to approximately half of the CBD. This policy does not appropriately recognise this context and exacerbates the undue representation of risk.</p> <p>Considers that NH-P2.2 is unrealistic to provide that mitigation can address the impacts from natural hazards because mitigation will not always be possible or practical. Further, Policy NH-P.2 should apply in all hazard areas.</p> <p>Considers that NH-P2.3 is similarly restrictive and equally fails to recognise that a significant portion of the CBD is subject to high hazard areas under the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay. Policy NHP2.3 should apply to the Fault Hazard Overlay only, and also recognise functional need in this location.</p> <p>Notes that all activities except emergency service facilities are permitted within the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay. The policy should be consistent with the level of risk reflected in the rules.</p>	Opposes NH-P2 (Levels of risk) in part.		

							Reject	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.13	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Amend	<p>Considers that NH-P2.1 is very restrictive to allow only low occupancy or low replacement value development within the Natural Hazard Overlays. The Liquefaction Hazard Overlay applies to approximately half of the CBD. This policy does not appropriately recognise this context and exacerbates the undue representation of risk.</p> <p>Considers that NH-P2.2 is unrealistic to provide that mitigation can address the impacts from natural hazards because mitigation will not always be possible or practical. Further, Policy NH-P.2 should apply in all hazard areas.</p> <p>Considers that NH-P2.3 is similarly restrictive and equally fails to recognise that a significant portion of the CBD is subject to high hazard areas under the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay. Policy NHP2.3 should apply to the Fault Hazard Overlay only, and also recognise functional need in this location.</p> <p>Notes that all activities except emergency service facilities are permitted within the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay. The policy should be consistent with the level of risk reflected in the rules.</p>	<p>Amend NH-P2 (Levels of risk) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>1. Allowing for those buildings and activities that have either low occupancy or low replacement value within the low, medium and high hazard areas of the Natural Hazard Overlays;</p> <p><u>1. 2. Requiring buildings and activities to reduce or not increase mitigate the impacts from natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure in the low, and medium and high hazard areas within the Natural Hazard Overlays;</u></p> <p><u>2. 3. Avoiding buildings and activities in the high hazard areas of the Natural-Fault Hazard Overlays unless there is a functional or operational an exceptional reason for the building or activity to be located in this area and the activity mitigates the impacts from natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure.</u></p>		Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.12	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Oppose	<p>The WCC proposed district plan liquefaction hazard overlay is based on the high and very high liquefaction zones shown in the GWRC liquefaction hazard maps, and it is appropriate to require low occupancy development and mitigation of the impact of natural hazards in this area and within all other Natural Hazard Overlays. Liquefaction is a real risk that has already been experienced in Wellington (e.g. during the 2016 Kaikoura earthquake), and ignoring the liquefaction risk in Christchurch resulted in catastrophic damage and retirement of land. MBIE guidelines for development in areas at risk from liquefaction recommend both land use planning to avoid more vulnerable activities in high risk areas, and requiring liquefaction resistant foundations for those buildings which are appropriate to develop in medium and high risk areas.</p>	Disallow		Accept	No

Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.19	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH- P3	Support	Supports the risk-based approach within the policy NH-P3 (Less hazard sensitive activities).	Retain NH-P3 (Less hazard sensitive activities) as notified.	Accept in part – noting that amendments are recommended in response to other submission points	No
-----------------------	--------	--	---------	--	--	--	----

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.126	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P3	Support	Supports for allowing for less hazard sensitive activities within certain areas is considered appropriate, where the risks are acceptable and flowpaths and stream corridors will be managed in accordance with this policy. Considers that Changes requested to the policies may necessitate amendments to the rules to have regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Retain NH-P3 (Less hazard sensitive activities) as notified.	Accept in part – noting that amendments are recommended in response to other submission points	No
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.5	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P4	Support	Supports NH-P4 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities in an identified inundation area of the flood hazard overlay) to the extent that it "provides for" additions to buildings that accommodate existing potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities in an identified inundation area.	Retain NH-P4 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities in an identified inundation area of the flood hazard overlay) as notified.	Accept in part – noting that amendments are recommended in response to other submission points	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.62	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P4	Support in part	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies form relevant matters of discretion where related rules are infringed. Submitter considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in identified hazardous areas.	Supports NH-P4 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities in an identified inundation area of the flood hazard overlay) with amendment.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.63	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P4	Amend	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies form relevant matters of discretion where related rules are infringed. Submitter considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in identified hazardous areas.	Amend NH-P4 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities in an identified inundation area of the flood hazard overlay) as follows: ... <u>The activity, excluding additions to existing building, has an operational and/or functional need to locate within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay and locating outside of these Overlays is not a practicable option.</u>	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.127	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P4	Support	Supports where buildings containing hazard sensitive activities are located within the inundation flood hazard overlay, it is appropriate to allow additions to these buildings in certain circumstances and where the risks are acceptable. Considers that Changes requested to the policies may necessitate amendments to the rules to have regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Retain NH-P4 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities in an identified inundation area of the flood hazard overlay) as notified.	Accept in part – noting that amendments are recommended in response to other submission points	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.26	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P4	Support	Supports this policy to the extent that enables additions to buildings that accommodate potentially hazard sensitive activities.	Retain NH-P4 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities in an identified inundation area of the flood hazard overlay) as notified.	Accept in part – noting that amendments are recommended in response to other submission points	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.15	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P4	Support	Supports NH-P4 to the extent that it enables additions to buildings that accommodate potentially hazard sensitive activities.	Retain NH-P4 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities in an identified inundation area of the flood hazard overlay) as notified.	Accept in part – noting that amendments are recommended in response to other submission points	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.64	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P5	Support in part	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies form relevant matters of discretion where related rules are infringed. Submitter considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in identified hazardous areas.	Support NH-P5 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the overland flow paths and stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlays) with amendment.	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.65	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P5	Amend	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies form relevant matters of discretion where related rules are infringed. Submitter considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in identified hazardous areas.	Amend NH-P5 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the overland flow paths and stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as follows: ... <u>The activity, excluding additions to existing building, has an operational and/or functional need to locate within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay and locating outside of these</u>		

					Overlays is not a practicable option.	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.128	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P5	Support	Supports this approach.	Retain NH-P5 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths and stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as notified.	Reject	No
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.28	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P5	Oppose in part	Opposes in part to Policy NH-P5.3 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths and stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlays). Policy NH-P5.3 only allows additions to buildings that accommodate existing potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within overland flowpaths and stream corridors where overland flowpaths and stream corridors are “unimpeded, and unobstructed to allow for the conveyancing of flood waters”.	Opposes Policy NH-P5 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths and stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlays) in its current form and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.29	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P5	Amend	Seeks to amend Policy NH-P5.3 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths and stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlays). Considers that the intention is that additions to buildings will allow for the conveyancing of flood waters, but the current wording of the policy is impractical. Considers that the terms “unimpeded, and unobstructed” may be restrictive that no additions would be allowed within overland flowpaths and stream corridors under this policy (with the effect that it could become a de facto avoidance policy). where an addition to a building is proposed to be constructed in an overland flowpath, the overland flowpath is likely to be obstructed to some extent. Seeks for this policy to be amended to allow for additions to buildings in overland flowpaths and stream corridors that allow for the conveyance of flood waters.	Amend Policy NH-P5.3 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths and stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as follows: Only Allow additions to buildings that accommodate existing potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths and stream corridors, where it can be demonstrated that: 1. The risk from the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability flood event is low due to either the: a. Proposed mitigation measures; b. Size of the addition; or c. Nature of the activities undertaken within the addition; and 2. The risk to people and property is reduced or not increased from the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability flood; and 3. Overland flowpaths and stream corridors or other mechanisms are unimpeded, and unobstructed to allow for the conveyancing of flood waters.	Reject	No
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.6	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-	Oppose	Supports NH-P6 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the identified inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as it provides for potentially hazard	Retain NH-P6 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the identified inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as notified.		

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
		P6		sensitive activities within the inundation area.		Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.66	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P6	Support in part	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies form relevant matters of discretion where related rules are infringed. Submitter considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in identified hazardous areas.	Support NH-P6 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the identified inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays) with amendment.	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.67	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P6	Amend	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies form relevant matters of discretion where related rules are infringed. Submitter considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in identified hazardous areas.	Amend NH-P6 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the identified inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as follows: ... <u>The activity, excluding additions to existing building, has an operational and/or functional need to locate within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay and locating outside of these Overlays is not a practicable option.</u>	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.129	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P6	Amend	Considers it appropriate to amend to have regard to the Proposed RPS Change 1 Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as "as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)" and is in line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as practicable but is a clearer signal than 'reduce or do not increase', to actively look to bring down the risk in the design and planning of the development. Considers that Changes requested to the policies may necessitate amendments to the rules to have regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Amend NH-P6 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the identified inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as follows: Provide subdivision development and use for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the inundation area provided that mitigation measures are incorporated to ensure the risk to people and property both on the site and on adjacent properties is <u>minimised not increased or is reduced.</u>	Accept	Yes
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.24	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P6	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GWRC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that 'minimise' natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than 'reduce' and 'reduce or do not increase'.	Allow	Accept	Yes
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.12	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P6	Oppose	Stride is opposed to amending the wording of the natural hazard policies from "reduce or avoid an increase in risk" to "minimise risk" which would impose an unreasonable and greater burden than the current wording of the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		

						Reject	No
Investore Property Limited	FS108.12	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P6	Oppose	Investore is opposed to amending the wording of the natural hazard policies from “reduce or avoid an increase in risk” to “minimise risk” which would impose an unreasonable and greater burden than the current wording of the Proposed Plan.	Disallow	Reject	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.27	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P6	Support	Supports this policy to the extent that it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities within the identified inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays.	Retain NH-P6 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the identified inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as notified.	Reject	No
Ministry of Education	400.49	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P6	Support	Supports NH-P6 and its requirement for mitigation measures to be incorporated into the development of hazard sensitive activities in inundation areas of flood hazard overlays.	Retain NH-P6 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the identified inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as notified.	Reject	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.16	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P6	Support in part	Supports NH-P6 to the extent it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities within the inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays.	Retain NH-P6 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the identified inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays) with amendments.	Reject	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.17	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P6	Oppose in part	Supports NH-P6 to the extent it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities within the inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays. Seeks to amend the policy so that it only applies when significant risk is posed to people and property.	Amend NH-P6 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the identified inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays) to: Provide for subdivision, development and use for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the inundation area provided that mitigation measures are incorporated to ensure the <u>that significant</u> risk to people and property both on the site and on adjacent properties is not increased or is reduced.	Reject	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.18	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P6	Amend	Supports NH-P6 to the extent it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities within the inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays. Seeks to amend the policy so that it only applies when significant risk is posed to people and property.	Amend NH-P6 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the identified inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays) to: Provide for subdivision, development and use for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the inundation area provided that mitigation measures are incorporated to ensure the <u>that significant</u> risk to people and property both on the site and on adjacent properties is not increased or is reduced.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.66	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P6	Oppose	The submission does not make it clear what constitutes a “significant risk”, and the level of risk deemed significant may vary between communities. While the level of risk may vary within the flood inundation overlay, it is appropriate to require mitigation measures for hazard sensitive and potentially hazard sensitive activities throughout the zone. Any risk (not just significant risk) to people and property on the site and adjacent properties should be reduced or not increased.	Disallow	Accept	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.68	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P7	Support in part	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies form relevant matters of discretion where related rules are infringed. Submitter considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in identified hazardous areas.	Supports NH-P7 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the overland flow paths of the Flood Hazard Overlays) with amendment.		

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.69	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P7	Amend	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies form relevant matters of discretion where related rules are infringed. Submitter considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in identified hazardous areas.	Amend NH-P7 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the overland flow paths of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as follows: ... <u>The activity, excluding additions to existing building, has an operational and/or functional need to locate within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay and locating outside of these Overlays is not a practicable option.</u>	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.130	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P7	Amend	Considers it appropriate to amend to have regard to the Proposed RPS Change 1 Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as "as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)" and is in line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as practicable but is a clearer signal than 'reduce or do not increase', to actively look to bring down the risk in the design and planning of the development. Considers that Changes requested to the policies may necessitate amendments to the rules to have regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Amend NH-P7 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as follows: Manage subdivision, development and use associated with potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths by: 1. Incorporating mitigation measures that <u>minimise the reduce or avoid an increase</u> in risk to people and property from the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability flood; ...	Accept	Yes
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.25	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P7	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GWRC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that 'minimise' natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than 'reduce' and 'reduce or do not increase'.	Allow	Accept	Yes
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.13	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P7	Oppose	Stride is opposed to amending the wording of the natural hazard policies from "reduce or avoid an increase in risk" to "minimise risk" which would impose an unreasonable and greater burden than the current wording of the Proposed Plan.	Disallow	Reject	No
Investore Property Limited	FS108.13	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P7	Oppose	Investore is opposed to amending the wording of the natural hazard policies from "reduce or avoid an increase in risk" to "minimise risk" which would impose an unreasonable and greater burden than the current wording of the Proposed Plan.	Disallow	Reject	No
Ministry of Education	400.50	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P7	Support	Supports NH-P7 and the management of development in overland flow paths of the flood hazard overlays as proposed, in order to reduce the impacts of natural hazards on hazard sensitive activities.	Retain NH-P7 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as notified.	Reject	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.19	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P7	Support in part	Supports NH-P7 to the extent it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities within the inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays.	Retain NH-P7 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlays) with amendments.		

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Oyster Management Limited	404.2	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P7	Oppose in part	Supports NH-P7 to the extent it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities within the inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays. Seeks to amend the policy so that it only applies when significant risk is posed to people and property.	Amend NH-P7 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as follows: Incorporating mitigation measures that reduce or avoid an increase in <u>significant</u> risk to people and property from the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability flood;	Reject	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.21	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P7	Amend	Supports NH-P7 to the extent it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities within the inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays. Seeks to amend the policy so that it only applies when significant risk is posed to people and property.	Amend NH-P7 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as follows: Incorporating mitigation measures that reduce or avoid an increase in <u>significant</u> risk to people and property from the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability flood;	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.67	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P7	Oppose	The submission does not make it clear what constitutes a “significant risk”, and the level of risk deemed significant may vary between communities. Unimpeded overland flowpaths are important in allowing floodwater to escape and recede, and development within them should be restricted. Any risk (not just significant risk) to people and property on the site and adjacent properties should be reduced or not increased.	Disallow	Accept	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.70	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P8	Support in part	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies form relevant matters of discretion where related rules are infringed. Submitter considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in identified hazardous areas.	Supports NH-P8 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlay) with amendment.	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.71	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P8	Amend	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies form relevant matters of discretion where related rules are infringed. Submitter considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in identified hazardous areas.	Amend NH-P8 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows: ... The activity, excluding additions to existing building, has an operational and/or functional need to locate within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay and locating outside of these Overlays is not a practicable option.	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.61	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P8	Oppose in part	Considers that the use of both ‘avoid’ and ‘unless it can be demonstrated’ in NH-P8 is contradictory, and that the policy should be amended to be enabling when standards are met, rather than restrictive when standards are not met.	Opposes NH-P8 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlay) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No

Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.62	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P8	Amend	Considers that the use of both 'avoid' and 'unless it can be demonstrated' in NH-P8 is contradictory, and that the policy should be amended to be enabling when standards are met, rather than restrictive when standards are not met.	Amend NH-P8 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows: <u>Avoid</u> <u>Enable</u> subdivision development and use associated with potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridors, <u>unless where</u> it can be demonstrated that: ...	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.131	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P8	Amend	Considers it appropriate to amend to have regard to the Proposed RPS Change 1 Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as "as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)" and is in line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as practicable but is a clearer signal than 'reduce or do not increase', to actively look to bring down the risk in the design and planning of the development. Considers that Changes requested to the policies may necessitate amendments to the rules to have regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Amend NH-P8 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows: Avoid subdivision development and use associated with potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridors, unless it can be demonstrated that: ... 2. Mitigation measures are incorporated that <u>minimise the reduce or avoid an increase in risk</u> to people and property from the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability Flood; ...	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.26	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P8	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GWRC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that 'minimise' natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than 'reduce' and 'reduce or do not increase'.	Allow	Reject	No
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.14	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P8	Oppose	Stride is opposed to amending the wording of the natural hazard policies from "reduce or avoid an increase in risk" to "minimise risk" which would impose an unreasonable and greater burden than the current wording of the Proposed Plan.	Disallow	Accept	No
Investore Property Limited	FS108.14	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P8	Oppose	Investore is opposed to amending the wording of the natural hazard policies from "reduce or avoid an increase in risk" to "minimise risk" which would impose an unreasonable and greater burden than the current wording of the Proposed Plan.	Disallow	Accept	No
Ministry of Education	400.51	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P8	Support	Supports NH-P8 as the submitter acknowledges the risk which flood hazards can pose to people and property. However the submitter considers, at times, there is an operational need for the submitter to locate educational facilities in flood hazard overlays to provide for existing communities. The submitter therefore supports the provision as proposed.	Retain NH-P8 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.72	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P9	Support	Supports the policy insofar as it seeks to avoid the development of new emergency facilities within the liquefaction overlay, unless it can be demonstrated that the facility will be able to maintain functionality following an earthquake and emergency vehicles will be able to service the impacted community.	Supports NH-P9 (Emergency facilities in the Liquefaction Overlay).	Accept in part	No

Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.73	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH- P9	Support in part	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies form relevant matters of discretion where related rules are infringed. Submitter considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in identified hazardous areas.	Supports NH-P9 (Emergency facilities in the Liquefaction Overlay) with amendment.	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.74	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH- P9	Amend	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies form relevant matters of discretion where related rules are infringed. Submitter considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in identified hazardous areas.	Amend NH-P9 (Emergency facilities in the Liquefaction Overlay) as follows: ... <u>The activity, excluding additions to existing building, has an operational and/or functional need to locate within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay and locating outside of these Overlays is not a practicable option.</u>	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.132	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH- P9	Amend	Considers there is a risk here from allowing critical infrastructure in liquefaction prone areas. It is important to specify that the foundations are designed to the highest standard to minimise the risk that the building will be able to operate after an event. Good geotechnical design is able to achieve this and the clause would not add an unreasonable burden to the development design and makes it clear what is required. Considers that Changes requested to the policies may necessitate amendments to the rules to have regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Amend NH-P9 (Emergency facilities in the Liquefaction Overlay) to add a clause to say that the foundation designs must be designed and certified by qualified Geotech engineer in order to prevent liquefaction induced deformation of the building and in doing so maintains its post event functionality.	Accept in part	Yes
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.27	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P9	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC support requiring a qualified geotechnical engineer to certify foundation designs for emergency facilities within the liquefaction hazard overlay, to increase resilience of the building and maintain post-event functionality.	Allow	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
CentrePort Limited	402.102	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P9	Amend	The equivalent definition is Emergency Service Facilities which should be used here as Emergency Facility may be subject to interpretation.	Amend NH-P9 (Emergency facilities in the Liquefaction Overlay) as follows: Only allow new emergency <u>service</u> facilities within the Liquefaction Overlay where it can be demonstrated that: 1. IIIThe emergency <u>service</u> facility will be able to maintain post disaster functionality following an earthquake; and 2. III....	Accept	Yes
CentrePort Limited	402.103	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P9	Support in part	The equivalent definition is Emergency Service Facilities which should be used here as Emergency Facility may be subject to interpretation.	Support NH-P9 (Emergency facilities in the Liquefaction Overlay), with amendment.	Accept	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.67	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P10	Amend	Considers policy needs to be amended for clarity and consistency.	Amend NH-P10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay)as follows: Manage subdivision, development or use associated with potentially hazard sensitive activities, including additions to existing buildings within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay by ensuring that: 1. The activity is located more than 20m <u>from of</u> the Wellington Faultline or Ohariu Faultline; and ...	Accept in part	Yes
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.75	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P10	Support in part	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies form relevant matters of discretion where related rules are infringed. Submitter considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in identified hazardous areas.	Supports NH-P10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay) with amendment:	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.76	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P10	Amend	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies form relevant matters of discretion where related rules are infringed. Submitter considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in identified hazardous areas.	Amend NH-P10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay) as follows: ... <u>The activity, excluding additions to existing building, has an operational and/or functional need to locate within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay and locating outside of these</u>		

					Overlays is not a practicable option.	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.133	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P10	Amend	<p>Considers it appropriate to amend to have regard to the Proposed RPS Change 1 Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as “as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)” and is in line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as practicable</p> <p>but is a clearer signal than ‘reduce or do not increase’, to actively look to bring down the risk in the design and planning of the development. Considers that Changes requested to the policies may necessitate amendments to the rules to have regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>	<p>Amend NH-P10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay) as follows:</p> <p>Manage subdivision, development or use associated with potentially hazard sensitive activities, including additions to existing buildings within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay by ensuring that:</p> <p>...</p> <p>3. The activity incorporates mitigation measures that ensure the risk from fault rupture to people, property and infrastructure is <u>minimised-reduced or not increased</u>; or</p> <p>...</p>	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	F570.28	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P10	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GWRC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that ‘minimise’ natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than ‘reduce’ and ‘reduce or do not increase’.	Allow	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.56	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P10	Amend	Considers that NH-P10 should be clarified, namely the 20 meter rule. It is assumed 20m is meant to be a buffer and amended wording is proposed to reflect this.	<p>Amend NH-P10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay) as follows:</p> <p>Manage subdivision, development or use associated with potentially hazard sensitive activities, including additions to existing buildings within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay by ensuring that:</p> <p>1. The activity is located more than 20m <u>ef from</u> the Wellington Faultline or Ohariu Faultline; and</p> <p>2. The activity incorporates mitigation measures that ensure the risk from fault rupture to people, property and infrastructure is reduced or not increased.</p>	Accept in part	Yes
Ministry of Education	400.52	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P10	Support	Supports NH-P10 and the management of development in the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay as proposed.	Retain NH-P10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay) as notified.	Reject	No
CentrePort Limited	402.104	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P10	Support	Support the intent of this policy.	Retain NH-P10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay) as notified.	Reject	No
Submitter Name	Sub No /	Sub-part / Chapter	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?

					minimised reduced or not increased.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.29	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P11	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GWRC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that 'minimise' natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than 'reduce' and 'reduce or do not increase'.	Allow	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.57	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P11	Amend	Considers that NH-P11 should be amended, as it appears to allow for single residential buildings to be constructed on existing sites. Such as for a replacement dwelling or possibly in accordance with new rules allowing for infill housing on a single site. It may be prudent to not allow any new housing even on existing sites so that over time the fault lines are de-populated, reducing the risk of loss of life, reducing future insurance burdens and ultimately providing for more green corridors within the city.	Amend NH-P11 (Hazard sensitive activities, excluding a single residential dwelling on an existing site, within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay) as follows: Hazard sensitive activities, excluding a single <u>existing</u> residential dwelling on an existing site, within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay Avoid subdivision, development or use associated with hazard sensitive activities, excluding a single existing residential dwelling on an <u>existing</u> site, within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay.	Accept in part	Yes
Ministry of Education	400.53	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P11	Support	Supports NH-P11 as the submitter acknowledges the risk that natural hazards can pose to people and property. However the submitter considers that, at times, there is an operational need for the submitter to locate educational facilities in fault overlays to provide for existing communities. The Ministry therefore supports the provision as proposed.	Retain NH-P11 (Hazard sensitive activities, excluding a single residential dwelling on an existing site, within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay) as notified.	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.78	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P12	Support in part	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies form relevant matters of discretion where related rules are infringed. Submitter considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in identified hazardous areas.	Retain NH-P12 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the Sheppard's Fault Overlay and Terawhiti Fault Overlay) with amendment.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.79	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P12	Amend	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies form relevant matters of discretion where related rules are infringed. Submitter considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in identified hazardous areas.	Amend NH-P12 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the Sheppard’s Fault Overlay and Terawhiti Fault Overlay) as follows: ... <u>The activity, excluding additions to existing building, has an operational and/or functional need to locate within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay and locating outside of these Overlays is not a practicable option.</u>	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.135	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P12	Amend	Considers it appropriate to amend to have regard to the Proposed RPS Change 1 Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as “as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)” and is in line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as practicable but is a clearer signal than ‘reduce or do not increase’, to actively look to bring down the risk in the design and planning of the development. Considers that Changes requested to the policies may necessitate amendments to the rules to have regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Amend NH-P12 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the Sheppard’s Fault Overlay and Terawhiti Fault Overlay) as follows: Allow for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the Sheppard’s Fault Overlay and Terawhiti Fault Overlay with the exception of educational facilities, health care facilities and emergency facilities, where it can be demonstrated that the activity is more than 20m from either the Sheppard’s Fault or Terawhiti Fault and the development incorporates mitigation measures that ensure the risk from fault rupture to people and property is minimised reduced or not increased .	Accept in part	Yes
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.30	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P12	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GWRC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that ‘minimise’ natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than ‘reduce’ and ‘reduce or do not increase’.	Allow	Accept	No
Ministry of Education	400.54	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P12	Support in part	Supports NH-P12 in part.	Retain NH-P12 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the Sheppard’s Fault Overlay and Terawhiti Fault Overlay) with amendment.	Accept in part	Yes
Ministry of Education	400.55	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P12	Amend	Seeks that NH-P12 be amended. The submitter acknowledges the risk that natural hazards can pose to people and property. However, at times, there is an operational need for the submitter to locate educational facilities in fault overlays to provide for existing communities. The submitter therefore requests an amendment to this policy to provide for development in fault overlays where there is an operational need to locate there. The submitter notes that this would still require resource consent as a Discretionary Activity, which is considered appropriate and is supported.	Amend NH-P12 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the Sheppard’s Fault Overlay and Terawhiti Fault Overlay) as follows: Allow for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the Sheppard’s Fault Overlay and Terawhiti Fault Overlay with the exception of educational facilities, health care facilities and emergency facilities (<u>unless it can be demonstrated that these facilities have an operational need to be located in these areas</u>), where it can be demonstrated that the activity is more than 20m from either the Sheppard’s Fault or Terawhiti Fault and the development incorporates mitigation measures that ensure the risk from fault rupture to people and property is reduced or not increased.	Accept in part	Yes

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	FS14.5	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P12	Support	Fire and Emergency may have an operational and functional need to locate in the Sheppard's Fault Overlay and Terawhiti Fault Overlay to ensure Fire and Emergency can maintain efficient and effective emergency response times to growing / changing communities.	Allow	Accept	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	282.8	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P13	Amend	Considers that the plan does not adequately manage the risks of fault rupture, with single residential dwellings able to be located within the Wellington and Ohariu Fault Overlays. MfE guidelines for planning around an active fault advise that Buildings Importance Category (BIC) 2 (residential) structures are not developed within the fault avoidance zones (within 20 m of the fault race) of Recurrence Interval Class (RIC) I (≤2000 years) faults on brownfield sites and RIC I and II (2000 – 3500 years) on greenfield sites. The Wellington Fault is RIC I and the Ohariu Fault is RIC II. Considers that any residential development within the Fault Overlays should be avoided within 20 m of the Wellington Fault, even on an existing site.	Amend NH-P13 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Wellington Fault Overlay.) as follows: Provide for subdivision, development and use associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities, within the Wellington Fault Overlay, where the subdivision, development and use does not involve the construction of new buildings which will be occupied by more than 10 employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities or any members of the public, <u>and where it can be demonstrated that the activity is located more than 20 m from the Wellington Fault.</u>	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.136	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P13	Support	Considers this provision is appropriate.	Retain NH-P13 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Wellington Fault Overlay) as notified.	Reject	No
CentrePort Limited	402.105	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P13	Oppose	Opposes NH-P13 as it is considered unnecessary. Large parts of the Port Operations including the Kaiwharawhara ferry terminal location are included within the fault overlay. A policy limitation to 10 passengers or 10 employees would therefore render large parts of the Special Purpose Port Zone unusable for these activities.	Delete NH-P13 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Wellington Fault Overlay) in its entirety.	Reject	No
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.94	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P13	Support	Supports policy that provides for and manages subdivision, development and use associated within the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Wellington Fault Overlay.	Retain NH-P13 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Wellington Fault Overlay) as notified.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	282.9	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P14	Amend	Considers that the plan does not adequately manage the risks of fault rupture, with single residential dwellings able to be located within the Wellington and Ohariu Fault Overlays. MfE guidelines for planning around an active fault advise that Buildings Importance Category (BIC) 2 (residential) structures are not developed within the fault avoidance zones (within 20 m of the fault race) of Recurrence Interval Class (RIC) I (≤2000 years) faults on brownfield sites and RIC I and II (2000 – 3500 years) on greenfield sites. The Wellington Fault is RIC I and the Ohariu Fault is RIC II. Considers that any residential development within the Fault Overlays should be avoided within 20 m of the Wellington Fault, even on an existing site.	Amend NH-P14 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Wellington Fault Overlay) as follows: Manage subdivision, development and use associated within the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Wellington Fault Overlay where the subdivision, development and use involves the construction of new buildings which will be occupied by members of the public, or more than 10 employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities by ensuring that: 1. Mitigation measures are incorporated that avoid an increase in risk to people, property and infrastructure from the fault rupture of the Wellington Fault. <u>and</u> 2. <u>Where it can be demonstrated that the activity is located more than 20 m from the Wellington Fault.</u>	Accept in part	Yes

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.137	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P14	Amend	<p>Considers it appropriate to amend to have regard to the Proposed RPS Change 1 Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as "as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)" and is in line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as practicable</p> <p>but is a clearer signal than 'reduce or do not increase', to actively look to bring down the risk in the design and planning of the development. Considers that Changes requested to the policies may necessitate amendments to the rules to have regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>	<p>Amend NH-P14 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Wellington Fault Overlay) as follows:</p> <p>Manage subdivision, development and use associated within the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Wellington Fault Overlay where the subdivision, development and use involves the construction of new buildings which will be occupied by members of the public, or more than 10 employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities by ensuring that:</p> <p>1. Mitigation measures are incorporated that <u>minimises the</u> avoid an increase in risk to people, property and infrastructure from the fault rupture of the Wellington Fault.</p>	Accept in part	Yes
Toka Tū Ake EQC	F570.31	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P14	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GWRC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that 'minimise' natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than 'reduce' and 'reduce or do not increase'.	Allow	Accept	No
CentrePort Limited	402.106	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P14	Oppose	Opposes NH-P14 as it is considered unnecessary. Large parts of the Port Operations including the Kaiwharawhara ferry terminal location are included within the fault overlay. A policy limitation to 10 passengers or 10 employees would therefore render large parts of the Special Purpose Port Zone unusable for these activities.	Opposes NH-P14 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Wellington Fault Overlay) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
CentrePort Limited	402.107	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P14	Amend	Opposes NH-P14 as it is considered unnecessary. Large parts of the Port Operations including the Kaiwharawhara ferry terminal location are included within the fault overlay. A policy limitation to 10 passengers or 10 employees would therefore render large parts of the Special Purpose Port Zone unusable for these activities.	<p>Amend NH-P14 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Wellington Fault Overlay) as follows:</p> <p>Manage subdivision, development and use associated within the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Wellington Fault Overlay where the subdivision, development and use involves the construction of new buildings which will be occupied by members of the public, or more than 10 employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities by ensuring that:</p> <p>1. Mitigation measures are incorporated that avoid an increase in risk to people, property and infrastructure from the fault rupture of the Wellington Fault.</p>	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.95	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P14	Support	Supports policy that provides for and manages subdivision, development and use associated within the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Wellington Fault Overlay.	Retain NH-P14 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Wellington Fault Overlay) as notified.	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.138	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P15	Support	Considers it is essential to provide for the maintenance and enhancement of natural systems and features where these features reduce the risk of the hazard. This aligns with operative RPS direction (Policies 51 and 52). Considers that Changes requested to the policies may necessitate amendments to the rules to have regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Retain NH-P15 (Natural systems and features) as notified.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.58	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P15	Support	NH-P15 is supported, as natural systems and features have multiple benefits including for carbon sequestration, amenity value, attractiveness, cost-effectiveness and supporting biodiversity and ecosystems	Retain NH-P15 (Natural systems and features) as notified.	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.139	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P16	Amend	Considers that NH-P16 as notified implies that the mitigation works will be hard-engineering based. This may not be the case, but it would be good to clarify in the policy that the mitigation works could consist of a range of options as outlined in NH-P17 and Policy 52 in Proposed RPS Change 1. Considers that Changes requested to the policies may necessitate amendments to the rules to have regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Amend NH-P16 (Natural hazard mitigation works) as follows: Enable natural hazard mitigation or stream and river management works undertaken by a statutory agency or their nominated contractors or agents within Natural Hazard Overlays where <u>there is no other practicable option and</u> these will significantly decrease the existing risk to people's lives and wellbeing, property and infrastructure.	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.53	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P16	Support	Waka Kotahi supports enabling hazard mitigation or stream and river management works within the Natural Hazard Overlay where this will decrease the risk to people's lives and wellbeing, property and infrastructure.	Allow	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.140	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P17	Amend	Considers it appropriate to amend for consistency with Policy 52 in Proposed RPS Change 1. Green infrastructure has been defined in the WCC PDP with a strong focus on engineering systems that mimic natural systems, however there are other natural hazard mitigation measures that the Proposed RPS Change directs consideration of, which aren't captured by green infrastructure. We therefore seek for this policy to be broadened. Considers that Changes requested to the policies may necessitate amendments to the rules to have regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Amend NH-P17 (Green infrastructure) as follows: Encourage the use of green infrastructure, non-structural, soft engineering or Mātauranga Māori approaches when undertaking natural hazard mitigation or stream and river management works by a statutory agency or their nominated contractors or agents within Natural Hazard Overlays.	Accept in part	Yes
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.59	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P17	Amend	Considers that NH-P17 should be amended so that Green Infrastructure is the default choice for undertaking natural hazard mitigation, with other options considered in circumstances where green infrastructure solutions do not exist, are not suitable, or are prohibitively expensive.	Amend NH-P17 (Green Infrastructure) as follows: <u>Encourage Require</u> the use of green infrastructure when undertaking natural hazard mitigation or stream and river management works by a statutory agency or their nominated contractors or agents within Natural Hazard Overlays <u>unless green infrastructure solutions do not exist, are not suitable or are prohibitively expensive.</u>	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington City Council	266.68	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R1	Amend	Considers amendment needed for clarity and consistency.	Amend NH-R1 (Less hazard sensitive activities within all hazard areas) as follows: Less hazard sensitive activities within all hazard areas <u>Natural Hazard Overlays</u>	Accept	Yes
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.103	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R1	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this submission as it is not consistent with the Kāinga Ora’s primary submission.	Disallow	Reject	No
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.20	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R1	Support	Supports the provision of a permitted rule for activities within hazard areas.	Retain NH-R1 (Less hazard sensitive activities within all hazard areas) as notified.	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.141	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R3	Amend	Considers there appears to be a numbering error in respect of the discretionary activity rule for green infrastructure.	Seeks to amend numbering to state ‘2’, not ‘1’ as notified.	Accept	Yes
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.7	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R4	Support	Supports NH-R4 (Additions to all buildings in the inundation area, overland flow paths or the stream corridor) and in particular supports the Permitted activity status, and the Restricted Discretionary activity status for additions to buildings in the inundation area and overland flow paths where the permitted activity status is not achieved.	Retain NH-R4 (Additions to all buildings in the inundation area, overland flow paths or the stream corridor) as notified.	Reject	No
Wellington City Council	266.69	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R4	Amend	Considers amendment needed for clarity and consistency.	Amend NH-R4 (Additions to all buildings in the inundation area, overland flow paths or the stream corridor) as follows: Additions to all buildings in the inundation area, overland flow paths or the stream corridor within the Flood Hazard Overlay	Accept in part	Yes
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.104	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R1	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this submission as it is not consistent with the Kāinga Ora’s primary submission.	Disallow	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.80	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R4	Support in part	Subject to the relief sought for NH-P4 (which forms a matter of discretion where permitted conditions are infringed, is supportive of this rule which seeks to provide for additions to buildings in the Ponding Area and Overland Flow path as permitted, restricted discretionary or discretionary activities. Notes that additions within a Stream Corridor would amount to a non-complying activity. The submitter has an existing fire station within a Stream Corridor which may need to be extended in the future and therefore seeks a discretionary activity status under such circumstances	Supports NH-R4 (Additions to all buildings in the inundation area, overland flow paths or the stream corridor) with amendment.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.81	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R4	Amend	Subject to the relief sought for NH-P4 (which forms a matter of discretion where permitted conditions are infringed, is supportive of this rule which seeks to provide for additions to buildings in the Ponding Area and Overland Flow path as permitted, restricted discretionary or discretionary activities. Notes that additions within a Stream Corridor would amount to a non-complying activity. The submitter has an existing fire station within a Stream Corridor which may need to be extended in the future and therefore seeks a discretionary activity status under such circumstances	Amend NH-R4.3 (Additions to all buildings in the inundation area, overland flow paths or the stream corridor) as follows: 3. Activity status: Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of NH-R4.1.a cannot be achieved. b. <u>Compliance with the requirements of NH-R4.1.c cannot be achieved but there is a functional and operational need for such an infringement.</u>	Reject	No
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.20	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R4	Amend	Considers that NH-R4 should be amended to clarify its wording. The wording used here conflicts with itself. Finished floor level cannot be at "the bottom of the floor joists or the base of the concrete floor slab". There should also be some provision to allow small additions to be built at the existing floor level. It may be impractical and very likely serve no purpose to have the addition built at a higher level if the entire ground floor of the dwelling is subject to inundation as the result of extreme rain events.	Amend NH-R4 (Additions to all buildings in the inundation area, overland flowpaths or the stream corridor) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. When located within an inundation area, the finished floor levels of the addition for hazard sensitive and potentially hazard sensitive activities are demonstrated to be above the <u>level of 1% Flood Annual Exceedance Probability level plus the height of including an allowance for freeboard,</u> where the finished floor level is to the bottom of the floor joists or the base of the concrete floor slab and an allowance for freeboard; b. The additions are not located within an overland flowpaths; or c. The additions are not located within a stream corridor <u>or where the floor area of the extension is no more than 30m2.</u>	Accept in part	Yes
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.89	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R4	Support	NH-R4 is supported as it permits additions to all buildings in the Inundation Area of the Flood Hazard Overlay where the finished floor levels of the addition for Hazard Sensitive and Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities are located above the 1% Flood Annual Exceedance Probability Level. This rule is supported as it would enable minor upgrading and maintenance works where those works will have minimal effect on the flood bearing capacity of the land.	Retain NH-R4 (Additions to all buildings in the inundation area, overland flowpaths or the stream corridor) as notified.	Reject	No
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.30	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R4	Support in part	Supports additions to buildings in an inundation area to be permitted where they comply with NH-R4.1a and restricted discretionary if they do not comply. Considers that these are appropriate controls.	Retain rule NH-R4.1a (Construction of new buildings and structures) as notified.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.31	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R4	Oppose in part	<p>Seeks that the provisions for NH-R4.2 are amended to be restricted discretionary. Considers that it is inappropriate for additions to existing buildings to trigger a discretionary process, where the existing building is already subject to an overland flowpath.</p> <p>Considers it would be more appropriate for additions to buildings within an overland flowpath to be a restricted discretionary activity, which would still give a consent authority appropriate discretion to consider natural hazard risks.</p>	Opposes Policy NH-R4.2 (Additions to all buildings in the inundation area or overland flowpaths) in its current form and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.32	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R4	Amend	<p>Seeks that the provisions for NH-R4.2 are amended to be restricted discretionary. Considers that it is inappropriate for additions to existing buildings to trigger a discretionary process, where the existing building is already subject to an overland flowpath.</p> <p>Considers it would be more appropriate for additions to buildings within an overland flowpath to be a restricted discretionary activity, which would still give a consent authority appropriate discretion to consider natural hazard risks.</p> <p>The amendments sought by Southern Cross would apply a consistent approach to inundation areas and overland flowpaths. These features can intersect, and do in this case, and it would be practical to take the same approach (which still allows for appropriate risk assessment by the Council).</p>	<p>Amend NH-R4.2 (Additions to all buildings in the inundation area, overland flowpaths or the stream corridor) as follows:</p> <p>.....</p> <p>2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance with the requirements of NH-R4.1.a and <u>NH-R4.1.b</u> cannot be achieved.</p> <p>.....</p>	Reject	No
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.33	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R4	Oppose	<p>Considers that it is inappropriate for additions to existing buildings to trigger a discretionary process, where the existing building is already subject to an overland flowpath.</p> <p>Considers it would be more appropriate for additions to buildings within an overland flowpath to be a restricted discretionary activity, which would still give a consent authority appropriate discretion to consider natural hazard risks.</p> <p>The amendments sought by Southern Cross would apply a consistent approach to inundation areas and overland flowpaths. These features can intersect, and do in this case, and it would be practical to take the same approach (which still allows for appropriate risk assessment by the Council).</p>	<p>Amend NH-R4 (Additions to all buildings in the inundation area, overland flowpaths or the stream corridor) as follows:</p> <p>....</p> <p>3. Activity status: Discretionary</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance with the requirements of NH-R4.1.b cannot be achieved</p> <p>...</p>	Reject	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.28	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R4	Support	Supports the direction of this rule to enable additions to buildings within a Flood Hazard Overlay - Inundation Area as a permitted activity or restricted discretionary activity.	Retain NH-R4 (Additions to all buildings in the inundation area, the overland flowpaths, or the stream corridor) as notified.	Reject	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.22	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R4	Support	Supports the direction of this rule to enable additions to buildings within a Flood Hazard Overlay - Inundation Area as a permitted activity where compliance with NH-R4.1 cannot be achieved.	Retain NH-R4 (Additions to all buildings in the inundation area, overland flowpaths or the stream corridor) as notified.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fabric Property Limited	425.14	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R4	Support	Supports NH-R4 and in particular supports the Restricted Discretionary activity status for additions to buildings in the Inundation Area where the permitted activity status is not achieved.	Retain NH-R4 (Additions to all buildings in the inundation area, overland flowpaths or the stream corridor) as notified.	Reject	No
Wellington City Council	266.70	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R5	Amend	Considers it necessary to fix a drafting error where both matters of discretion in NH-R5 (Additions to a building for a hazard-sensitive activity within a Fault Overlay) refer to potentially hazard sensitive activities.	Amend NH-R5.2 (Additions to a building for a hazard-sensitive activity within a Fault Overlay) as follows: (...) Matters of discretion are: 1. For additions to potentially hazard sensitive activities - the matters in NH-P11; and 2. For additions to potentially hazard sensitive activities - the matters in NH-P10.	Accept	Yes
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.82	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R5	Support in part	Supports this rule as it seeks to provide for additions to buildings for hazard-sensitive activities within a Fault Overlay as permitted or restricted discretionary activity. Notes that emergency service facilities are considered a hazard-sensitive activity and, as such, seeks the addition of a permitted activity standard which allows additions to buildings within a Fault Overlay when there is a functional and operational need to do so.	Supports NH-R5 (Additions to a building for a hazard-sensitive activity within a Fault Overlay) with amendment.	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.83	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R5	Amend	Supports this rule as it seeks to provide for additions to buildings for hazard-sensitive activities within a Fault Overlay as permitted or restricted discretionary activity. Notes that emergency service facilities are considered a hazard-sensitive activity and, as such, seeks the addition of a permitted activity standard which allows additions to buildings within a Fault Overlay when there is a functional and operational need to do so.	Amend NH-R5 (Additions to a building for a hazard-sensitive activity within a Fault Overlay) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: ... d. The additions do not increase the Gross Floor Area of a Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activity in Wellington Fault Overlay or the Ohariu Fault Overlay by more than 30m ² ; <u>or</u> e. <u>There is a functional and operational need for the activity in the Fault Overlay.</u>	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Toka Tū Ake EQC	282.10	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R6	Amend	Considers that the plan does not adequately manage the risks of fault rupture, with single residential dwellings able to be located within the Wellington and Ohariu Fault Overlays. MFE guidelines for planning around an active fault advise that Buildings Importance Category (BIC) 2 (residential) structures are not developed within the fault avoidance zones (within 20 m of the fault trace) of Recurrence Interval Class (RIC) I (≤2000 years) faults on brownfield sites and RIC I and II (2000 – 3500 years) on greenfield sites. The Wellington Fault is RIC I and the Ohariu Fault is RIC II. Considers that any residential development within the Fault Overlays should be avoided within 20 m of the Wellington Fault, even on an existing site.	Amend NH-R6-1 (Construction of a residential unit or conversion of any non-residential building into a residential unit in the Wellington Fault and Ohariu Fault Overlays) as follows: 1. Activity Status: Permitted Where: a. The development involves the construction of no more than one additional residential unit on a site; and b. The total number of residential units on a site is no more than two; <u>and</u> c. It can be demonstrated that the unit is more than 20 m away from the Wellington or Ohariu Faults.	Reject	No
Kimberley Vermaey	348.8	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R6	Amend	Considers that due to the hazard and potential impacts presented by the Wellington fault, the maximum number of permitted dwellings should be limited to 1 instead of the proposed 2 dwellings. Any proposals involving more than 1 dwelling should be a non-complying activity within the fault hazard overlay.	Amend NH-R6 (Construction of a residential unit or conversion of any non-residential building into a residential unit in the Wellington Fault and Ohariu Fault Overlays) to allow only 1 residential unit per site. More than one dwelling per site should be assessed as a non-complying activity .	Accept	Yes
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.84	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R7	Support in part	Considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in Sheppard Fault and Terawhiti Fault Overlays. As such, FENZ seeks to remove the exclusion of emergency service facilities from the permitted activity rule in order to ensure efficient and effective emergency response times.	Supports NH-R7 (Hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities in the Sheppard Fault and Terawhiti Fault Overlays) with amendment.	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.85	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R7	Amend	Considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in Sheppard Fault and Terawhiti Fault Overlays. As such, FENZ seeks to remove the exclusion of emergency service facilities from the permitted activity rule in order to ensure efficient and effective emergency response times.	Amend NH-R7 (Hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities in the Sheppard Fault and Terawhiti Fault Overlays) as follows: 3. Activity Status: Permitted Where: a. The development does not involve the establishment of either: i. Educational facilities; ii. Health care facilities; or iii. Emergency service facilities.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Toka Tū Ake EQC	282.11	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R7	Amend	Considers that hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities should be located 20m away from the Sheppard or Terawhiti Faults. References the MFE guidelines for planning around active faults which indicate to avoid hazardous facilities and major hazardous facilities within 20 m of RIC III faults. Considers that no hazardous activities should be permitted within 20 m of either fault trace given Shepherd's Gully Fault is RIC III (3500 – 5000 years), and the Terawhiti fault has not yet had its recurrence interval calculated, no hazardous activities should be permitted within 20 m of either fault trace.	Amend NH-R7-1 (Hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities in the Sheppard Fault and Terawhiti Fault Overlays) as follows: 1. Activity Status: Permitted Where: <u>a. It can be demonstrated that the activity is more than 20 m away from the Shepherd's Gully or Terawhiti Fault; and</u> b. The development does not involve the establishment of either: i. Educational facilities; ii. Health care facilities; <u>or</u> iii. Emergency service facilities.; <u>or</u> iv. <u>Hazardous facilities and Major Hazardous Facilities.</u>	Accept in part	Yes
Ministry of Education	400.56	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R7	Support in part	Support NH-R7 in part. In particular, the submitter supports the Discretionary Activity status for educational facilities and considers it to be appropriate.	Retain NH-R7 (Hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities in the Sheppard Fault and Terawhiti Fault Overlays) with amendments.	Reject	No
Ministry of Education	400.57	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R7	Amend	Seeks that NH-R7 be amended. The submitter seeks changes to this rule to more accurately reflect the policy direction outlined in NH-P12.	Amend NH-R7 (Hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities in the Sheppard Fault and Terawhiti Fault Overlays) as follows: 1. Activity Status: Permitted Where: a. The development does not involve the establishment of either: iv. Educational facilities; v. Health care facilities; <u>or</u> vi. Emergency service facilities.; <u>and</u> <u>b. The activity is located more than 20 m away from either the Sheppard's Fault or Terawhiti Fault; and</u> <u>c. The development incorporates mitigation measures that ensure the risk from fault rupture to people and property is reduced or not increased.</u> 2. Activity status: Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of NH-R7.1.a, <u>b or c</u> cannot be achieved.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
CentrePort Limited	402.108	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R8	Support in part	Support subject to submission points on NH-P13 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Wellington Fault Overlay) and NH-P14 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Wellington Fault Overlay). Large parts of the Port are subject to Natural Hazards.	Retain NH-R8 (Operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified, subject to amendments sought relating to NH-P13 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Wellington Fault Overlay) and NH-P14 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Wellington Fault Overlay).	Reject	No
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.96	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R8	Support	Supports the ability to undertake operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities as a permitted activity.	Retain NH-R8 (Operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.	Reject	No
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.8	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R9	Support	Supports NH-R9 (Activities in the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay) as it provides for all activities except emergency service facilities in the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay to occur as a permitted activity.	Retain NH-R9 (Activities in the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay) as notified.	Accept – noting minor amendments are recommended	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.86	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R9	Support in part	Considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay. As such, FENZ seeks to remove the exclusion of emergency service facilities from the permitted activity rule in order to ensure efficient and effective emergency response times.	Supports NH-R9 (Activities in the liquefaction hazard overlay) with amendment.	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.87	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R9	Amend	Considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay. As such, FENZ seeks to remove the exclusion of emergency service facilities from the permitted activity rule in order to ensure efficient and effective emergency response times.	Amend NH-R9 (Activities in the liquefaction hazard overlay) as follows: 1. Activity Status: Permitted Where: a. It involves a less hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activity, or b. it involves a hazard sensitive activity that is not an emergency service facility.	Reject	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.29	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R9	Support	Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being permitted in the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay.	Retain NH-R9 (Activities in the liquefaction hazard overlay) as notified.	Accept – noting minor amendments are recommended	No
Ministry of Education	400.58	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R9	Support	Supports NH-R9, in particular the permitted activity status for the establishment of educational facilities in the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay.	Retain NH-R9 (Activities in the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay) as notified.	Accept – noting minor amendments are recommended	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.15	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R9	Support	Supports NH-R9 as it provides for all activities except emergency service facilities in the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay to occur as a permitted activity. This is appropriate and proportionate to the risk level and ability to mitigate that risk.	Retain NH-R9 (Activities in the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay) as notified.	Accept – noting minor amendments are recommended	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.9	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R10	Support in part	Supports NH-R10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay), as it provides for Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities in the Inundation Area of the Flood Hazard Overlay as a Permitted activity where conditions around floor levels are met.	Retain NH-R10.1 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.	Reject	No
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.10	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R10	Support in part	Supports the Restricted Discretionary status for Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities that do not comply with the conditions of NH-R10.1.	Retain NH-R10.2 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.	Reject	No
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.21	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R10	Amend	Considers that NH-R10 should be amended to clarify its wording. The wording used here conflicts with itself. Finished floor level cannot be at "the bottom of the floor joists or the base of the concrete floor slab".	Amend NH-R10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows: 1. Activity Status: Permitted Where: a. When located within an Inundation Area of the Flood Hazard Overlay, the finished floor levels of the building for the potentially hazard sensitive activity is located above the 1% Flood Annual Exceedance Probability level, <u>plus the height of including an allowance for freeboard, where the finished floor level is to the bottom of the floor joists or the base of the concrete floor slab and an allowance for freeboard.</u> ...	Accept in part	Yes
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.90	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R10	Support	NH-R10 is supported as it enables Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities in the Inundation Area of the Flood Hazard Overlay as a permitted activity where the finished floor levels of the building for the Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activity is located above the 1% Flood Annual Exceedance Probability Level. This approach is supported in principle, which (in accordance with Policy NH-P6) seeks that measures be incorporated to ensure the risk to people, property and infrastructure both on the site and on adjacent properties is not significantly increased by Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities.	Retain NH-R10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.	Reject	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.30	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R10	Support	Supports the direction of this rule to enable potentially hazard sensitive activities within a Flood Hazard Overlay - Inundation Area as a permitted activity, or restricted discretionary activity if NH-R10.1 cannot be achieved.	Retain NH-R10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the flood hazard overlay) as notified.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Oyster Management Limited	404.23	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R10	Support	Supports direction of this rule to enable potentially hazard sensitive activities within a Flood Hazard Overlay - Inundation Area as a permitted activity, or restricted discretionary activity if NH-R10.1 cannot be achieved.	Retain NH-R10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.	Reject	No
Investore Property Limited	405.31	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R10	Support	Supports the provisions setting permitted and restricted discretionary activity status. Considers that this provides for an appropriate balance of risk management while retaining appropriate discretion to address natural hazard risks. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Retain NH-R10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.	Reject	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.16	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R10	Support in part	Supports NH-R10, as it provides for Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities in the Inundation Area of the Flood Hazard Overlay as a Permitted activity where conditions around floor levels are met. The commercial activities carried out at Fabric's properties are potentially hazard sensitive activities.	Retain NH-R10.1 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.	Reject	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.17	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R10	Support in part	Supports the Restricted Discretionary activity status for Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities that do not comply with the conditions of NH-R10.1. The restricted discretionary activity status provides for an appropriate balance of risk management while retaining appropriate discretion to address natural hazards.	Retain NH-R10.2 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.	Accept	No
Reading Wellington Properties Limited	441.1	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R10	Support	Supports permitting potentially sensitive activities in the Flood Inundation overlay with mitigation (as outlined in NH-R10).	Retain NH-R10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.	Reject	No
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.15	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R10	Support	Supports the Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities in the Inundation Area of the Flood Hazard Overlay being a Permitted Activity, as the commercial activities at the Johnsonville Town Centre are potentially hazard sensitive activities.	Retain NH-R10.1 (potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.	Reject	No
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.16	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R10	Support	Supports the Restricted Discretionary Activity status for activities not complying with the conditions of NH-R10.1. (potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay)	Retain NH-R10.2 (potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.	Accept – noting minor changes are recommended	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.88	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Support in part	Considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in the Flood Hazard Overlay. As such, FENZ seeks to remove the exclusion of emergency service facilities from the permitted activity rule in order to ensure efficient and effective emergency response times.	Supports NH-R11 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) with amendment.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.89	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Amend	Considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in the Flood Hazard Overlay. As such, FENZ seeks to remove the exclusion of emergency service facilities from the permitted activity rule in order to ensure efficient and effective emergency response times.	Amend NH-R11 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows: Matters of discretion are: 1. The impact from the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability flood is low due to either the: a. Implementation mitigation measures; b. The shallow depth of the flood waters within the building; or c. Type of activity undertaken within the building; and 2. The risk to people and property is reduced or not increased ; <u>and</u> <u>3. There is a functional and operational need for the activity in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard overlay</u>	Reject	No
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.22	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Amend	Considers that NH-R11 should be amended to clarify its wording. The wording used here conflicts with itself. Finished floor level cannot be at “the bottom of the floor joists or the base of the concrete floor slab”.	Amend NH-R11 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows: 1. Activity Status: Permitted Where: a. When located within an Inundation Area of the Flood Hazard Overlay, the finished floor levels of the building for the hazard sensitive activity is located above the 1% Flood Annual Exceedance Probability level, <u>plus the height of including an allowance for freeboard, where the finished floor level is to the bottom of the floor joists or the base of the concrete floor slab and an allowance for freeboard.</u>	Accept in part	Yes
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.91	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Support	NH-R11 is supported, as it enables Hazard Sensitive Activities in the Inundation Area of the Flood Hazard Overlay as a restricted discretionary activity where the finished floor levels of the building for the Hazard Sensitive Activity is located above the 1% Flood Annual Exceedance Probability Level. This rule is supported for the same reason as NH-R10.	Retain NH-R11 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.	Reject	No
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.34	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Support in part	Supports hazard sensitive activities in inundation areas being restricted discretionary where the finished floor levels of the building are located above the 1% Flood Annual Exceedance Probability level (including an allowance for freeboard, where the finished floor level is to the bottom of the floor joists or the base of the concrete floor slab.)	Retain rule NH-R11.1 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.35	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Oppose in part	<p>Seeks for the activity status for hazard sensitive activities in an inundation area that do not comply with Rule NH-R11.1 be discretionary.</p> <p>The activity status of non-complying may overstate the risk of locating such activities in an inundation area. It is appropriate for a consent authority to use its full discretion to undertake an assessment of the activity with the benefit of a consent application, and an assessment under s 104D of the Resource Management Act 1991 is not required.</p>	Opposes Policy NH-R11.2 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) in its current form and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.36	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Amend	<p>Seeks for the activity status for hazard sensitive activities in an inundation area that do not comply with Rule NH-R11.1 be discretionary.</p> <p>The activity status of non-complying may overstate the risk of locating such activities in an inundation area. It is appropriate for a consent authority to use its full discretion to undertake an assessment of the activity with the benefit of a consent application, and an assessment under s 104D of the Resource Management Act 1991 is not required.</p>	<p>Amend NH-R11.2 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows:</p> <p>2. Activity Status: <u>Discretionary Non-Complying</u> Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of NHR11.1. a cannot be achieved.</p>	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.158	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Oppose in part	NH-R11 is opposed, as identified flooding inundation areas carry the lowest risk of natural hazard potential and are more than capable of being mitigated.	Retain NH-R11 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) with amendment.	Reject	No
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	F569.8	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	<p>Thorndon is susceptible to flooding. This must be an urban planning consideration.</p> <p>Recent weather events have caused underground streams to daylight themselves in areas predicted by the planning map. Climate change is anticipated to increase the frequency and impact of deluges on Thorndon's catchments (Te Ahumairangi Hill and the Pipitea Stream).</p> <p>This is critical information for planning scenarios. It must have impactful (and legal) significance.</p> <p>There is a vulnerability to flooding in Thorndon and this information must be formally woven into the DP to regulate urban development. This must also be assessed alongside, and with equivalent status, to other natural hazard vulnerabilities in Thorndon e.g. seismic, slope erosion, underground geology, etc.</p> <p>[Refer to Further submission for included map].</p>	Disallow	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.159	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Amend	Considers that NH-R12 should be amended to have a permitted activity pathway. Identified flooding inundation areas carry the lowest risk of natural hazard potential and are more than capable of being mitigated. Therefore it is considered that a permitted activity pathway should be available for development that achieves the 1% Flood Annual Exceedance Probability level, including allowance for freeboard.	Amend NH-R11.1 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) and its title as follows: Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard <u>Overlay Area</u> 1. Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary Permitted Where: a. When located within an Inundation Area of the Flood Hazard <u>Overlay Area</u> , the finished floor levels of the building for the hazard sensitive activity is located above the 1% Flood Annual Exceedance Probability level, including an allowance for freeboard, where the finished floor level is to the bottom of the floor joists or the base of the concrete floor slab. Matters of discretion are: 1. The impact from the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability flood is low due to either the: a. Implementation mitigation measures; b. The shallow depth of the flood waters within the building; or c. Type of activity undertaken within the building; and 2. The risk to people and property is reduced or not increased.	Reject	No
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.9	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	Thorndon is susceptible to flooding. This must be an urban planning consideration. Recent weather events have caused underground streams to daylight themselves in areas predicted by the planning map. Climate change is anticipated to increase the frequency and impact of deluges on Thorndon's catchments (Te Ahumairangi Hill and the Pipitea Stream). This is critical information for planning scenarios. It must have impactful (and legal) significance. There is a vulnerability to flooding in Thorndon and this information must be formally woven into the DP to regulate urban development. This must also be assessed alongside, and with equivalent status, to other natural hazard vulnerabilities in Thorndon e.g. seismic, slope erosion, underground geology, etc. [Refer to Further submission for included map].	Disallow	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.54	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Oppose	It is not appropriate for hazard sensitive activities, which include emergency facilities, hospitals, major hazardous facilities and childcare, within the flood inundation hazard overlay to have permitted status. Flooding is the most common natural hazard faced in Aotearoa, and repeated flooding events can have severe effects on properties and the wellbeing of residents. As the depth of expected flood inundation and thus risk varies within the overlay, restricted discretionary status allows for restriction of development within higher risk areas of the overlay. As discussed elsewhere, regulatory hazard overlays for flooding should remain in the district plan.	Disallow	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.78	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose a permitted activity for hazard sensitive activities in the Flood Hazard Overlay as it does not allow sufficient oversight of development in natural hazard areas.	Disallow / Seeks that NH-R11 is retained as notified.	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.160	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Amend	Considers that NH-R12 should be amended to have a permitted activity pathway. Identified flooding inundation areas carry the lowest risk of natural hazard potential and are more than capable of being mitigated. Therefore it is considered that a permitted activity pathway should be available for development that achieves the 1% Flood Annual Exceedance Probability level, including allowance for freeboard.	Amend NH-R11.2 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows: Activity Status: Non-Complying <u>Restricted Discretionary</u> Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of NH-R11.1.a cannot be achieved. <u>Matters of discretion are:</u> <u>1. The degree to which the impact from the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability flood is low due to either the:</u> <u>a) Implementation of mitigation measures</u> <u>b) The shallow depth of the flood waters within the building; or</u> <u>c) Type of activity undertaken within the building</u> <u>2. The extent to which the risk to people and property is reduced or not increased.</u>	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.10	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	<p>Thorndon is susceptible to flooding. This must be an urban planning consideration.</p> <p>Recent weather events have caused underground streams to daylight themselves in areas predicted by the planning map. Climate change is anticipated to increase the frequency and impact of deluges on Thorndon's catchments (Te Ahumairangi Hill and the Pipitea Stream).</p> <p>This is critical information for planning scenarios. It must have impactful (and legal) significance.</p> <p>There is a vulnerability to flooding in Thorndon and this information must be formally woven into the DP to regulate urban development. This must also be assessed alongside, and with equivalent status, to other natural hazard vulnerabilities in Thorndon e.g. seismic, slope erosion, underground geology, etc.</p> <p>[Refer to Further submission for included map].</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.55	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Oppose	Hazard sensitive activities, which include emergency facilities, hospitals, major hazardous facilities and childcare, within the inundation area of the flood hazard zone should remain non-compliant when the floor level required for restricted discretionary status is not met. Amending this to discretionary provides a path for development which puts more people at risk from flood hazard.	Disallow	Accept	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.24	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Support	Supports the direction of this rule that hazard sensitive activities (e.g. emergency service facilities) are a RD activity within the Flood Hazard Overlay - Inundation Area	Retain NH-R11 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.	Reject	No
Investore Property Limited	405.32	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Support in part	<p>Supports in part, as it provides for Hazard Sensitive Activities in the Inundation Area as a Restricted Discretionary activity where conditions around floor levels are met.</p> <p>Considers that the non-complying status where the restricted discretionary rule cannot be met is too onerous. Considers that a discretionary activity status is more appropriate and would be consistent with the approach taken to Hazard Sensitive Activities within the Overland Flowpaths (as provided in rule NH-R13).</p>	Retain NH-R11.2 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Investore Property Limited	405.33	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Amend	Considers that the non-complying status where the restricted discretionary rule cannot be met is too onerous. Considers that a discretionary activity status is more appropriate and would be consistent with the approach taken to Hazard Sensitive Activities within the Overland Flowpaths (as provided in rule NH-R13).	<p>Amend NH-R11.2 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows:</p> <p>2. Activity Status: Non-Complying Discretionary</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance with the requirements of NH-R11.1.a cannot be achieved.</p>	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Toka Tū Ake EQC	F570.41	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Oppose	Hazard sensitive activities, which include emergency facilities, hospitals, major hazardous facilities and childcare, within the inundation area of the flood hazard zone should remain non-compliant when the floor level required for restricted discretionary status is not met. Amending this to discretionary provides a path for development which puts more people and property at risk from flood hazard.	Disallow	Accept	No
Investore Property Limited	405.34	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Support in part	Supports in part, as it provides for Hazard Sensitive Activities in the Inundation Area as a Restricted Discretionary activity where conditions around floor levels are met. Considers that the non-complying status where the restricted discretionary rule cannot be met is too onerous. Considers that a discretionary activity status is more appropriate and would be consistent with the approach taken to Hazard Sensitive Activities within the Overland Flowpaths (as provided in rule NH-R13).	Retain NH-R11.2 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Investore Property Limited	405.35	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Amend	Considers that the non-complying status where the restricted discretionary rule cannot be met is too onerous. Considers that a discretionary activity status is more appropriate and would be consistent with the approach taken to Hazard Sensitive Activities within the Overland Flowpaths (as provided in rule NH-R13).	Amend NH-R11.2 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows: 2. Activity Status: <u>Non-Complying Discretionary</u> Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of NH-R12.1.a cannot be achieved.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	F570.42	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R12	Oppose	Potentially hazard sensitive activities, which include commercial activities, offices, and retail activities, within the inundation area of the flood hazard zone should remain non-compliant when the floor level required for restricted discretionary status is not met. Amending this to discretionary provides a path for development which puts more people and property at risk from flood hazard.	Disallow	Accept	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.18	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Support in part	Supports NH-R11.1 in part, as it provides for Hazard Sensitive Activities in the Inundation Area as a Restricted Discretionary activity where conditions around floor levels are met.	Supports NH-R11.1 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay), with amendment.	Reject	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.19	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Amend	Seeks amendments to NH-R11.2 to make the default activity status Discretionary within the Inundation Area for Hazard Sensitive Activities that do not comply with NHR11.1, rather than Non-Complying. Considers this would be consistent with the approach taken to Hazard Sensitive Activities within the Overland Flowpaths (as provided in rule NH-R13).	Amend NH-R11.2 as follows: 1. Activity Status: <u>Non-Complying Discretionary</u> Where: Compliance with the requirements of NH-R11.1.a cannot be achieved.	Reject	No
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.17	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Support in part	Supports in part NH-R11 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay), as it provides for Hazard Sensitive Activities in the Inundation Area as a Restricted Discretionary.	Retain NH-R11 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified, with amendments.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.18	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Amend	<p>Seeks amendments to NH-R11.2 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) to make the default activity status Discretionary within the Inundation Area for Hazard Sensitive Activities that do not comply with NH-R11.1, rather than Non-Complying.</p> <p>Considers that this would be consistent with the approach taken to Hazard Sensitive Activities within the Overland Flowpaths (as provided in rule NH-R13).</p>	<p>Amend NH-R11.2 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity Status: Non-Complying Discretionary</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance with the requirements of NH-R11.1.a cannot be achieved</p>	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.81	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Oppose	<p>Hazard sensitive activities, which include emergency facilities, hospitals, major hazardous facilities and childcare, within the inundation area of the flood hazard zone should remain non-compliant when the floor level required for restricted discretionary status is not met. Amending this to discretionary provides a path for development which puts more people at risk from flood hazard.</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.11	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R12	Support in part	<p>Supports NH-R12 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the overland flow path of the Flood Hazard Overlay) in part, as it provides for Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities in the overland flow path overlay as a Restricted Discretionary activity where conditions around floor levels are met.</p>	Not specified.	No relief specified.	No
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.12	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R12	Amend	<p>Seeks amendments to NH-R12.2 to make the default activity status Discretionary within the overland flow path for Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities that do not comply with NH-R12.1, rather than Non-Complying. This would be consistent with the approach taken to Hazard Sensitive Activities within the overland flow path overlay (as provided in rule NH-R13 (Hazard sensitive activities within the overland flow paths of the Flood Hazard Overlay)).</p>	<p>Amend NH-R12.2 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the overland flowpath of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity Status: Non-Complying Discretionary</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>Compliance with the requirements of NH-R12.1.a cannot be achieved.</p>	Accept	Yes
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.23	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R12	Amend	<p>Considers that NH-R12 should be amended to clarify its wording. The wording used here conflicts with itself. Finished floor level cannot be at "the bottom of the floor joists or the base of the concrete floor slab".</p>	<p>Amend NH-R12 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the overland flowpath of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity Status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. When located within an overland flowpath of the Flood Hazard Overlay, the finished floor levels of the building for the potentially hazard sensitive activity is located above the 1% Flood Annual Exceedance Probability level, plus the height of including an allowance for freeboard, where the finished floor levels to the bottom of the floor joists or the base of the concrete floor slab and an allowance for freeboard.</p>	Accept in part	Yes

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.161	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R12	Support in part	NH-R12 is supported for its general approach that impacts on hazard sensitive activities should be mitigated in medium risk areas in accordance with NH-P2. On this basis rule NH-R12.2 needs to be amended as overland flowpaths are identified as a medium risk area in the chapter introduction.	Retain NH-R12 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the overland flowpath of the Flood Hazard Overlay) with amendment.	Accept	Yes
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.162	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R12	Amend	Considers that NH-R12 should be amended to have a discretionary activity status. Overland flowpaths are identified as a medium risk area in the chapter introduction. Consequently, it is sought that the consent status of NH-R12 be made discretionary rather than non-complying as non-complying status is generally utilised for avoidance rather than mitigation.	Amend NH-R12.2 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the overland flowpath of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows: Activity Status: Non-Complying <u>Discretionary</u> Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of NH-R12.1.a cannot be achieved	Accept	Yes
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.56	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R12	Oppose	Hazard sensitive activities, which include emergency facilities, hospitals, major hazardous facilities and childcare, within the overland flowpath area of the flood hazard overlay should remain non-compliant when freeboard levels are not met. Unimpeded overland flowpaths are important in allowing floodwater to escape and recede. Amending this to discretionary provides a path for development which puts more people at risk from flood hazard and may worsen the effects of flooding in the surrounding area.	Disallow	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.79	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R12	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose the discretionary pathway suggested by the submitter as this undermines the risk-based approach adopted in the Proposed District Plan.	Disallow / Seeks that NH-R12 is retained as notified.	Reject	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.25	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R12	Oppose in part	Supports restricted discretionary activity status for NH-R12.1, but considers that if RD status is not achieved, the activity status should become Discretionary rather than NC.	Amend NH-R12 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the overland flowpath of the Flood Hazard Overlay) to: 2. Activity status: Non-complying <u>Discretionary</u> Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of NH-R12.1.a cannot be achieved	Accept	Yes
Oyster Management Limited	404.26	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R12	Support in part	Supports restricted discretionary activity status for NH-R12.1, but considers that if RD status is not achieved, the activity status should become Discretionary rather than NC.	Retain NH-R12.1 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the overland flowpath of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.	Accept in part – noting amendments are recommended in response to other submissions	Yes
Oyster Management Limited	404.27	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R12	Amend	Supports restricted discretionary activity status for NH-R12.1, but considers that if RD status is not achieved, the activity status should become Discretionary rather than NC.	Amend NH-R12 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the overland flowpath of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows: 2. Activity status: Non-complying <u>Discretionary</u> Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of NH-R12.1.a cannot be achieved		

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.68	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R12	Oppose	Potentially hazard sensitive activities, which include commercial activities, offices, and retail activities, within the overland flowpath area of the flood hazard overlay should remain non-compliant when freeboard levels are not met. Unimpeded overland flowpaths are important in allowing floodwater to escape and recede. Impeded overland flowpaths may also lead to larger effects on the environment, such as contaminated flood water from commercial activities affecting water quality and human and environmental health. Amending this to discretionary provides a path for development which puts more people at risk from flood hazard and may worsen the effects of flooding in the surrounding area.	Disallow	Reject	No
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.19	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R12	Support in part	Supports in part NH-R12 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the overland flowpath of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as it provides for Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities in the Overland Flowpath of the Flood Hazard Overlay as a Restricted Discretionary activity where conditions around floor levels are met.	Retain NH-R12 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the overland flowpath of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified, with amendments.	Accept	Yes
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.20	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R12	Amend	Seeks amendments to make the default activity status Discretionary within the Overland Flowpath overlay for Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities that do not comply with NH-R12.1, rather than Non Complying. Considers that the risks from activities within an overland flowpath overlay can be appropriately assessed as a Discretionary Activity. Considers that a Discretionary status would also be consistent with the activity status for Hazard Sensitive Activities in the Overland Flowpath as set out in NH-R13.	Amend NH-R12.2 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the overland flowpath of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows: 2. Activity Status: Non-Complying <u>Discretionary</u> Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of NHRR12.1.a cannot be achieved	Accept	Yes
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.82	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R12	Oppose	Potentially hazard sensitive activities, which include commercial activities, offices, and retail activities, within the inundation area of the flood hazard zone should remain non-compliant when the floor level required for restricted discretionary status is not met. Amending this to discretionary provides a path for development which puts more people at risk from flood hazard.	Disallow	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.37	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R13	Oppose in part	<p>Seeks that hazard sensitive activities within an overland flowpath are a restricted discretionary activity. This would be more consistent with Policy NH-P1 to take a risk-based approach to subdivision, use and development based on the hazards posed.</p> <p>It would be more appropriate for the Proposed Plan to take a consistent approach to assessing hazard sensitive activities in overland flowpaths and inundation areas.</p> <p>While we appreciate that the Council has identified overland flowpaths and inundation areas as having different hazard rankings, the level of risk arising from the hazard will depend on the actual activity. This rule relates to the risk to people involved in hazard sensitive activities, and the risks are similar to people involved in hazard sensitive activities in an inundation area to hazard sensitive activities in an overland flowpath.</p>	Opposes NH-R13 (Hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlay) in its current form and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.38	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R13	Amend	<p>Seeks that hazard sensitive activities within an overland flowpath are a restricted discretionary activity. This would be more consistent with Policy NH-P1 to take a risk-based approach to subdivision, use and development based on the hazards posed.</p> <p>It would be more appropriate for the Proposed Plan to take a consistent approach to assessing hazard sensitive activities in overland flowpaths and inundation areas.</p> <p>While we appreciate that the Council has identified overland flowpaths and inundation areas as having different hazard rankings, the level of risk arising from the hazard will depend on the actual activity. This rule relates to the risk to people involved in hazard sensitive activities, and the risks are similar to people involved in hazard sensitive activities in an inundation area to hazard sensitive activities in an overland flowpath.</p>	<p>Amend NH-R13 (Hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity Status: <u>Restricted</u> Discretionary</p>	Reject	No
Ministry of Education	400.59	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R13	Support	Supports NH-R13 as it enables the establishment of educational facilities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlay as a Discretionary Activity. The submitter considers this to be appropriate.	Retain NH-R13 (Hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Oyster Management Limited	404.28	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R13	Amend	Considers that this rule should provide a tiered approach to activity status, specifically where compliance with the floor level (as per NH-12.1.a)) is a RD activity.	Amend NH-R13 (Hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows: <u>1. Activity status: Restricted discretionary</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>a. Compliance with NH-R13.1.a is achieved.</u> 2. Activity status: Discretionary <u>Where:</u> <u>a. Compliance with NH-R13.1.a is not achieved.</u> [Inferred decision requested].	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.69	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R13	Oppose	Hazard sensitive activities, which include emergency facilities, hospitals, major hazardous facilities and childcare, within the overland flowpath area of the flood hazard overlay should remain discretionary. Unimpeded overland flowpaths are important in allowing floodwater to escape and recede. Impeded overland flowpaths may also lead to larger effects on the environment, such as contaminated flood water from commercial activities affecting water quality and human and environmental health. Amending this to restricted discretionary provides a path for development which puts more people at risk from flood hazard and may worsen the effects of flooding in the surrounding area.	Disallow	Accept	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.29	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R13	Oppose in part	Considers that this rule should provide a tiered approach to activity status, specifically where compliance with the floor level (as per NH-12.1.a)) is a RD activity.	Amend NH-R13 (Hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows: <u>1. Activity status: Restricted discretionary</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>a. Compliance with NH-R13.1.a is achieved.</u> 2. Activity status: Discretionary <u>Where:</u> <u>a. Compliance with NH-R13.1.a is not achieved.</u> [Inferred decision requested].	Reject	No
Investore Property Limited	405.36	Hazards and Risks /Natural Hazards / NH-R13	Support	Supports the Discretionary activity status for Hazard Sensitive Activities.	Retain NH-R13 (Hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.21	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R13	Support	Supports NH-R13 (Hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlay).	Retain NH-R13 (Hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.	Reject	No
Ministry of Education	400.60	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R15	Support	Supports NH-R15 as the submitter considers that the non-complying activity status for hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlay is appropriate.	Retain NH-R15 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	282.12	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R16	Amend	Considers that residential units should be included as hazard sensitive activities within the Wellington and Ohariu Fault Overlays. References the MFE guidelines for planning around an active fault that advise that Buildings Importance Category (BIC) 2 (residential) structures are not developed within the fault avoidance zones (within 20 m of the fault race) of Recurrence Interval Class (RIC) I (≤2000 years) faults on brownfield sites and RIC II (2000 – 3500 years) on greenfield sites. The Wellington Fault is RIC I and the Ohariu Fault is RIC II. Considers that any residential development within the Fault Overlays should be avoided within 20 m of the Wellington Fault, even on an existing site.	Amend NH-R16-1 (Hazard sensitive activities (excluding a single residential unit) within the Wellington Fault and Ohariu Fault Overlay) as follows: Hazard sensitive activities (excluding a single residential unit) within the Wellington Fault and Ohariu Fault Overlay 1. Activity status: Non-Complying	Accept in part	Yes
Ministry of Education	400.61	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R16	Support	Supports NH-R16 as the submitter considers that non-complying activity status for hazard sensitive activities within the Wellington Fault and Ohariu Fault Overlay is appropriate.	Retain NH-R16 (Hazard sensitive activities (excluding a single residential unit) within the Wellington Fault and Ohariu Fault Overlay) as notified.	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.36	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers the term 'hard engineering' is defined in both the RPS and regional plan. Including a definition for hard engineering natural hazard mitigation works would align with the use of a specific definition of soft engineering hazard mitigation works.	Add a new definition for 'Hard Engineering Natural Hazards Mitigation Works' to align with operative RPS and regional plan as follows: <u>Engineering works that use structural materials such as concrete, steel, timber or rock armour to provide a hard, inflexible edge between the land-water interface along rivers, shorelines or lake edges. Typical structures include groynes, seawalls, revetments or bulkheads that are designed to prevent erosion of the land.</u>	Accept in part	Yes
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.11	Part 1/ Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Support	WIAL supports the inclusion of this definition, as derived from the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and Regional Plan. WIAL would be comfortable for any relief that seeks to address the concerns raised in its primary submission with respect to the seawall located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point to adopt this language.	Allow	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.31	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that references to "Natural Hazard Overlays" should be removed and replaced by a newly defined term "Natural Hazard Areas". Natural Hazard Overlays should instead be included as non-statutory, information-only mapping layer that sits outside the Proposed District Plan.	Seeks to add new definitions to identify flood hazards in the Plan, including a definition for "Natural Hazard Areas".	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.14	Part 1/ Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Support	WIAL supports the use of natural hazard overlays as a non-statutory mapping tool, particularly with respect to the coastal hazard overlays that apply within the already built up area around Wellington International Airport.	Allow	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part Chapter/Provision /	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.47	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Oppose	MFE discussion paper on National Planning Standards: Zones and Overlays supports the use of the term 'overlay' to mean mapped areas which "introduce more restrictive built form controls than apply to the underlying zone". As this is the purpose of the WCC proposed plan's Natural Hazard Overlays, the term should be retained. Regulatory natural hazard overlays, including for flood, are an important tool to limit subdivision and development within areas subject to natural hazard risk.	Disallow	Accept	No
CentrePort Limited	402.4	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that there should be an explanation of what is meant by community scale to accompany the definition of 'Community Scale Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures'.	Seeks that a definition of 'community scale' is provided.	Accept in part	Yes
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.37	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COMMUNITY SCALE NATURAL HAZARD MITIGATION STRUCTURES	Support	Considers that it is appropriate to define hazard mitigation structures within the District Plan, including Greater Wellington facilities such as the Seton Nossiter flood detention area and the Stebbings Valley Flood detention Dam. It is important to include in the definition those entities responsible for construction and maintain these structures, including Greater Wellington.	Retain the Definition of 'Community Scale Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures' as notified.	Reject	No
CentrePort Limited	402.10	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COMMUNITY SCALE NATURAL HAZARD MITIGATION STRUCTURES	Support in part	Supports 'Community Scale Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures' definition in part.	Retain the definition of 'Community Scale Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures' with amendments.	Accept in part	Yes
CentrePort Limited	402.11	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COMMUNITY SCALE NATURAL HAZARD MITIGATION STRUCTURES	Amend	Considers that some community scale natural hazard mitigation works may be required particularly where there is public access, as CentrePort holds considerable land adjoining the Coastal Marine Area. The agencies listed do not include CentrePort as being appropriate to carry out such works.	Amend definition of 'Community Scale Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures' as follows: means natural hazard mitigation works that serve multiple properties and are constructed and administered by the Crown, the Greater Wellington Regional Council, Wellington City Council, <u>CentrePort</u> , or their nominated contractor or agent.	Accept in part	Yes
CentrePort Limited	402.12	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COMMUNITY SCALE NATURAL HAZARD MITIGATION STRUCTURES	Amend	Considers that there is uncertainty as to the relationship between matters covered in the definition of Natural Hazard Mitigation Works and what is covered in the definition of Community Scale Natural Hazard Mitigation.	Clarify the relationship between matters covered in the definition of 'Natural Hazard Mitigation Works' and 'Community Scale Natural Hazard Mitigation', in particular what is meant by community scale and what activities are excluded from this.	Accept in part	Yes

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.39	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE	Amend	Considers that an example would assist plan users. Proposed RPS Change 1 includes several examples in the definition for nature-based solutions. One of these examples may be suitable to include	Seeks to amend the Definition of 'Green Infrastructure' to include an example, such as a constructed wetland.	Reject	No
New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	314.4	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HAZARD SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	Oppose	Considers that the definition of 'Hazard Sensitive Activity' should be clarified to outline the criteria which define why and how an un-named activity may be sensitive. The definition only provide a list of uses or activities. This approach is inconsistent with the effects-based approach required to be taken in Part 2 of the Resource Management Act.	Clarify the definition of 'Hazard Sensitive Activity' to provide a set of criteria defining why and how an un-named activity may be sensitive.	Reject	No
New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	314.5	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HAZARD SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	Oppose in part	Considers that the definition of hazard sensitive activity should not include 'visitor accommodation'. A subcategory that excludes campgrounds from sensitive and hazard sensitive activities should be added to the definition. Reason being, camping grounds are transitory in nature and provide for accommodation on a temporary basis. People enjoy camping in areas with natural scenery and landscapes as well as in areas close to the central business centres. The effects can be moderated easily through more specific site management efforts as many of the activities are not permanently attached to the land. People can be moved easily and forewarned in the event of a potential risk or natural hazard. The New Zealand Motor Caravan Association operates over 47 parks across New Zealand, most of which are not categorised as a sensitive activity or hazard sensitive activity.	Amend the definition of 'Hazard Sensitive Activity' to remove the mention of visitor accommodation.	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.2	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HAZARD SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	Support	Supports the inclusion of retirement villages as a hazard sensitive activity.	Retain the definition of HAZARD SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES as notified.	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.40	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HAZARD SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	Amend	Considers it is appropriate to define this term in the PDP, to assist users in applying Plan provisions.	Amend the Definition of 'Hazard Sensitive Activities' to align with the definition in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Reject	No
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.11	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HAZARD SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	Support in part	The definition of Hazard Sensitive Activities is supported as it specifically includes Hazardous Facilities and MHF which recognises the risk associated with the manufacture, use, storage, transportation and disposal of hazardous substances and the potential of human and environmental harm from natural hazards. It is however considered that Hazardous Facilities are not defined in the PDP and clarification is sought on this matter.	Retain the Definition of 'Hazard Sensitive Activities' as notified.	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Ministry of Education	400.7	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HAZARD SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	Support	Supports the inclusion of educational facilities in the definition of 'hazard sensitive activities' as it aims to protect educational facilities.	Retain the definition of [Hazard Sensitive Activities] as notified.	Accept	No
CentrePort Limited	402.15	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HIGH COASTAL HAZARD AREA	Support	Support the intent of this definition.	Retain the definition of 'High Coastal Hazard Area' as notified.	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.41	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / LESS HAZARD SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	Support	Considers it is appropriate to define this term in the PDP, to assist users in applying Plan provisions.	Retain the Definition of 'Less Hazard Sensitive Activities' as notified.	Reject	No
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.14	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / LESS HAZARD SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	Support in part	Considers that the definition of Less Hazard Sensitive Activities includes accessory buildings used for non-habitable purposes. It is unclear whether such accessory buildings can be related to a Hazardous Facility, which is not currently defined, or an MHF, and clarification is sought on this matter.	Retain the Definition of 'Less Hazard Sensitive Activities', with amendment.	Reject	No
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.15	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / LESS HAZARD SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	Amend	Considers that the definition of Less Hazard Sensitive Activities should be clarified, as it is unclear whether accessory buildings can be related to a Hazardous Facility, which is not currently defined, or an MHF, and clarification is sought on this matter.	Amend the Definition of 'Less Hazard Sensitive Activities' to clarify whether accessory buildings can be related to a Hazardous Facility.	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.11	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NATURAL HAZARD	Support	Supports the definition of "natural hazard" as it is consistent with S2 RMA	Retain the definition of "natural hazard" as notified.	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.42	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NATURAL HAZARD MITIGATION WORKS	Support	Considers it is appropriate to define this term in the PDP, to assist users in applying Plan provisions.	Retain the Definition of 'Natural Hazard Mitigation Works' as notified.	Accept	No
CentrePort Limited	402.17	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NATURAL HAZARD MITIGATION WORKS	Support in part	Supports 'Natural Hazard Mitigation Works' in part. Considers that there is uncertainty as to the relationship between matters covered in the definition of Natural Hazard Mitigation Works and what is covered in the definition of Community Scale Natural Hazard Mitigation.	Retain the definition of 'Natural Hazard Mitigation Works' with amendments.	Reject	No
CentrePort Limited	402.18	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NATURAL HAZARD MITIGATION WORKS	Amend	Considers that there is uncertainty as to the relationship between matters covered in the definition of Natural Hazard Mitigation Works and what is covered in the definition of Community Scale Natural Hazard Mitigation.	Clarify the relationship between matters covered in the definition of 'Natural Hazard Mitigation Works' and 'Community Scale Natural Hazard Mitigation', Considers that there is uncertainty as to the relationship between matters covered in the definition of Natural Hazard Mitigation Works and what is covered in the definition of Community Scale Natural Hazard Mitigation.	Accept in part	Yes

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.43	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NATURAL HAZARD OVERLAYS	Support	Considers it is appropriate to define this term in the PDP, identifying the areas of the particular hazard, including flooding, to assist users in applying the relevant Plan provisions.	Retain the Definition of 'Natural Hazard Overlays' as notified.	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.36	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NATURAL HAZARD OVERLAYS	Oppose in part	The inclusion of flood hazard mapping as part of the District Plan is opposed, despite the overall support for the risk-based approach to the management of natural hazards.	Opposes the definition of 'Natural Hazard Overlays' as it stands and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.19	Part 1/Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NATURAL HAZARD OVERLAY	Oppose	WIAL supports the further refinement of the natural hazard overlay and mapping in the Proposed Plan. WIAL however opposes the submission to the extent that this definition only deals with a selection of hazards, not coastal hazards such as tsunami risk. This creates ambiguity in the subsequent application of the natural hazard provisions of the Proposed Plan.	Disallow / Seeks that part of the submission be disallowed.	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.54	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NATURAL HAZARD OVERLAYS	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a non-statutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.37	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NATURAL HAZARD OVERLAYS	Amend	Considers that the definition of 'Natural Hazards Overlays' should be amended.	Amend the definition of 'Natural Hazard Overlays' as follows: NATURAL HAZARD OVERLAYS <u>AREA</u> means the combined mapped extent within the District Plan of the following natural hazards: a. Flood Hazards b a. Liquefaction Hazards c b. Fault Hazards <u>And the Council's publicly available information showing the modelled extent of flooding affecting specific properties in its GIS viewer. The maps are non-statutory and can be reviewed to take account of any property-specific information.</u>	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.20	Part 1/Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NATURAL HAZARD OVERLAY	Oppose	WIAL supports the further refinement of the natural hazard overlay and mapping in the Proposed Plan. WIAL however opposes the submission to the extent that this definition only deals with a selection of hazards, not coastal hazards such as tsunami risk. This creates ambiguity in the subsequent application of the natural hazard provisions of the Proposed Plan.	Disallow / Seeks that part of the submission be disallowed.	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.48	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NATURAL HAZARD OVERLAYS	Oppose	MfE discussion paper on National Planning Standards: Zones and Overlays supports the use of the term 'overlay' to mean mapped areas which "introduce more restrictive built form controls than apply to the underlying zone". As this is the purpose of the WCC proposed plan's Natural Hazard Overlays, the term should be retained. Regulatory natural hazard overlays, including for flood, are an important tool to limit subdivision and development within areas subject to natural hazard risk.	Disallow	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.55	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NATURAL HAZARD OVERLAYS	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a non-statutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.44	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / POTENTIALLY HAZARD SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	Support	Considers it is appropriate to define this term in the PDP, to assist users in applying Plan provisions.	Retain the Definition of 'Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities' as notified.	Reject	No
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.18	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / POTENTIALLY HAZARD SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	Support	The definition of Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities is supported, as it includes commercial activities and retail activities (which includes Yard-Based Retail Activities and, therefore, service stations).	Retain the Definition of 'Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities' as notified.	Reject	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.4	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / POTENTIALLY HAZARD SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	Support	Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities including offices and retail activities. This is appropriate and consistent with the other potentially hazard sensitive activities, which are activities which include employees but are not particularly sensitive (in comparison to, for example, childcare activities)	Retain the definition of "Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities" as notified.	Reject	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.98	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / POTENTIALLY HAZARD SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	Support	Supports the definition of "potentially hazard sensitive activities". Considers this is appropriate and consistent with the other potentially hazard sensitive activities, which are activities which include employees but are not particularly sensitive (compared to sensitive activities such as childcare activities).	Retain the definition of 'potentially sensitive activity' as notified.	Reject	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.1	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / Potentially hazard sensitive activities	Support	Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities including offices and retail activities. This is appropriate and consistent with the other potentially hazard sensitive activities, which are activities which include employees but are not particularly sensitive (in comparison to, for example, childcare activities).	Retain definition of 'Potentially hazard sensitive activities' as notified.	Reject	No
Meridian Energy Limited	228.12	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SENSITIVE ACTIVITY	Support	Considers the definition accurately identifies land use activities that are sensitive to adverse amenity effects including noise.	Retain the definition of 'Sensitive Activity' as notified.	Not addressed in this report	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.48	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SOFT ENGINEERING NATURAL HAZARD MITIGATION WORKS	Support	Considers it is appropriate to define this term as it improves ease of use of the Plan and guides the Plan user and the examples included are useful.	Retain the Definition of 'Soft Engineering Natural Hazard Mitigation Works' as notified.	Accept	No
Rod Halliday	25.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the flood ponding and overland flow path zone at 28 Westchester Drive is inaccurate. The presence of the Stebbings Dam upstream and concrete retaining wall structures holding up the road will prevent this hazard. [refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]	Seeks that the flood ponding and overland flow path zone at 28 Westchester Drive be deleted and re assessed.	Reject	No
Glenside Progressive Association (GPA)	FS4.10	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Not specified	Submitter contends that ephemeral streams in the proposed development area have been incorrectly mapped. GPA are not in a position to comment on the veracity of this statement but if any development is to take place, it is important that the lie of the land including gullies is accurately mapped, that these are not filled in during earthworks and that roads are planned to avoid them. Considers that if any development is to take place, it is important that the lie of the land including gullies is accurately mapped, that these are not filled in during earthworks and that roads are planned to avoid them. [Inferred reference to submission 25.3]	Not specified / Seeks that any development in this area takes place with a minimum of earthworks and that natural gullies are not filled in.	Reject	No
Heidi Snelson	FS24.4	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	The submitter seeks to reduce / remove / question previous flood ponding, flow path zone assessments stating existing retention dam and retaining wall structures will mitigate against future risk. The detention dam is upstream of recent flooding and flow path damage across Westchester Drive and on Reedy Block road - to become new access way to development. Upstream mitigation does not protect the area which is being inundated by development activities and significant rainfall, downstream. Flooding and slippage and the resultant damage has already been in evidence in this area. (2020, 2021, 2022)	Disallow / Seeks that the submission is disallowed to uphold flood ponding and overflow path zone at 28 Westchester Drive and require appropriate and effective mitigation works from the developer to : 1. Protect the Porirua Stream from continued pollution from the development site. 2. Protect the Churton Park Community and the key roading infrastructure of Westchester Drive from the continuing flooding hazards.	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Toka Tū Ake EQC	282.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that the provisions for landslide hazard mitigation in the earthworks section of the PDP are not sufficient, as</p> <p>they rely on individual assessments of sites and could be applied inconsistently. They also allow for developments which do not require earthworks in areas which are at risk of slope failure. Applying a Landslide Hazard overlay (such as the nonregulatory landslide overlay) and restricting development</p> <p>within high-hazard areas will preclude inconsistent application of earthworks rules and prevent subdivision and development on slopes prone to failure. Considers that while there is a restrictive disclaimer on the existing non-regulatory GNS Science</p> <p>SLIDE Geomorphology Map, the uncertainties in a landslide hazard overlay developed from this map can be managed through policy.</p>	Seeks that a landslide hazard overlay is included into planning maps. This overlay would be linked to provisions that restrict development (through sensitive activities) implemented in high-risk areas.	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.126	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Greater Wellington support the submitter's request for additional provisions to control development on land that is at higher risk of slope failure. By identifying and managing this risk, the risk to life, property and well-being of future urban intensification can be appropriately minimised. These changes would have regard to Proposed RPS Plan Change 1, specifically Policy 51.	Allow / Supports the submission in part and seeks additional controls on landslide hazards to manage landslide risk on steep land. Considers that some controls should apply to slopes from ~20-34°. Seeks that the matters of control for these areas include a site-specific geotechnical investigation to ensure slope failure hazards are appropriately managed.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	282.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that the terminology 'Fault Hazard Overlay' should be consistent with the MFE guidelines i.e. Fault Avoidance Zone, and that including the use of confined, unconfined, distributed and uncertain fault areas where appropriate. Considers that the supporting s32 information indicates that the Fault Hazard Overlay are the mapped Fault Avoidance Zones that are mapped in the supporting report; however, this is not explained in the s32. Considers that the description of 'fault hazard' needs to be clarified or amended to reflect how it is shown on the maps i.e., a band, which are at different widths on the map, which we assume reflects the certainty of the fault location.</p>	Seeks that mapping of any "Fault Hazard Overlay" is changed to "Fault Avoidance Zone" and that mapping includes confined, unconfined, distributed, and uncertain fault areas.	Accept in part	Yes
David Karl	309.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that Council required ground levels be raised by around a metre during the construction of a house on Trent Street. While not easy to check, it appears the current ground level of the house is not reflected in the hazard zones.</p>	Seek hazard zones be amended to reflect latest ground levels (including to meet resource consent conditions that have been complied with).	Accept	Yes
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.27	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Overlays shown in the PDP have been sourced from Wellington Water and do not provide a complete picture of the flooding risks across the City. Additional discussion is required to complete the flood hazard information available to users of the Plan.</p>	Seeks that WCC continues to work with Greater Wellington to discuss the City's flood hazards in relation to the proposed intensification.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.17	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC support natural hazard overlays based on current and accurate research. Continued collaboration between agencies is important to keep hazard information up to date and consistent across the region.	Allow	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.28	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Overlays shown in the PDP have been sourced from Wellington Water and do not provide a complete picture of the flooding risks across the City. Additional discussion is required to complete the flood hazard information available to users of the Plan.	Seeks that WCC continues to work with Greater Wellington to discuss the City's flood hazards in relation to the proposed intensification.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.18	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC support natural hazard overlays based on current and accurate research. Continued collaboration between agencies is important to keep hazard information up to date and consistent across the region.	Allow	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.29	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose in part	Considers it is important to identify areas subject to flooding hazard in the Rural area, as well as in the Residential and other zones. Currently the PDP does not provide any information on flooding hazards across the whole Rural zone. These areas will be subject to flooding and this should be shown on the Plan.	Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.30	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers it is important to identify areas subject to flooding hazard in the Rural area, as well as in the Residential and other zones. Currently the PDP does not provide any information on flooding hazards across the whole Rural zone. These areas will be subject to flooding and this should be shown on the Plan.	Seeks to Include identified overlays in the Rural Zone, based on the regional flood hazard mapping provided: Regional Exposure Assessment 1% AEP RCP8.5 2101-2120 (arcgis.com) [Refer to original submission]	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.19	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Natural hazard overlays are important in rural areas as well as urban and residential zones. Rural communities can be severely affected by flooding and this information is important for land use planning and public information.	Allow	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.19	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose in part	The inclusion of flood hazard mapping as part of the District Plan is opposed. Including Flood Hazard overlays in the District Plan ignores the dynamic nature of flood hazards and will create unnecessary additional cost and uncertainty for landowners and land developers.	Remove the Flood Hazard overlay from planning maps.	Reject	No
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.5	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	The Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct is based on the heritage of the suburb's development and it is also essential to the identity of the city	Disallow	Accept	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.44	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Accurate and risk-based regulatory hazard maps are an important tool in the WCC Proposed District Plan to limit subdivision and development within areas subject to natural hazard risk. Removing part or all of these regulatory maps opens the possibility that rules controlling development in flood-prone areas will be inconsistently applied, exposing people and their properties to unnecessary flood risk.	Disallow	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.51	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a non-statutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Metlifecare Limited	FS87.2	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports the removal of the Flood Hazard overlay from planning maps on the basis that they create unnecessary additional cost and uncertainty for landowners and land developers. The overlay should be identified on a non-statutory map that is publicly available to provide flexibility to ensure that these maps are continually updated.	Allow	Reject	No
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.38	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Stride supports deleting the Flood Hazard Overlays from the Proposed Plan for the reasons provided by the primary submitter, and to ensure a practical approach is taken to flood risk management.	Allow	Reject	No
Investore Property Limited	FS108.38	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Investore supports deleting the Flood Hazard Overlays from the Proposed Plan for the reasons provided by the primary submitter, and to ensure a practical approach is taken to flood risk management.	Allow	Reject	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.74	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	The submitter opposes flood hazard overlays and seeks for flood hazard overlays to be removed from the plan. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose the removal of flood hazard overlays because these overlays provide certainty around what areas could be affected by hazards and how to plan for natural hazards – what land uses are appropriate to allow and disallow for.	Disallow	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.20	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that the Flood Hazard Overlay should not be included in the District Plan maps and should instead be included in non-statutory GIS maps that are publicly available. The Auckland Unitary Plan (“AUP”) adopts a set of non-statutory flood hazard overlay maps which operate as interactive maps on the Council’s ‘Geo Maps’ website – a separate mapping viewer to the statutory maps. This approach is different to that of the traditional means of displaying hazard overlays on district plan maps and reflects that these maps do not have regulatory effect.</p> <p>The advantage of this approach is the ability to operate a separate set of interactive maps which are continually subject to improvement and updates, outside of and without a reliance on the Schedule 1 process under the RMA. This separate set of interactive maps are therefore able to be relied upon in a legal sense.</p>	Seeks that data from the Flood Hazard overlay is included in non-statutory GIS maps that are publicly available.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.45	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Removing the regulatory nature of flood hazard maps reduces the ability of the plan to spatially limit inappropriate development in areas at risk from flood hazard, and allows for inconsistent application of rules to minimize flood hazard risk.	Disallow	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.52	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a non-statutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.75	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	The submitter opposes flood hazard overlays and seeks for flood hazard overlays to be removed from the plan. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose the removal of flood hazard overlays because these overlays provide certainty around what areas could be affected by hazards and how to plan for natural hazards – what land uses are appropriate to allow and disallow for.	Disallow	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.21	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support in part	The mapping of other, non-flooding natural hazards to be incorporated into the District Plan is supported, such as Liquefaction and Fault Hazards, as these hazards are less subject to change.	Retain Natural Hazard mapping of risks unrelated to flooding.	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.19	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Opposes Liquefaction Hazard Overlay to the extent that they cover the Airport Zone. Considers that the engineering and design requirements of airport infrastructure, including the requirements under the CDEM to remain operational following a natural hazard event, mean that liquefaction and flood hazard inundation cannot occur on site for operational reasons.	Amend the extent of the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay to remove it from the extent of the Airport Zone. [Inferred Decision Requested]	Reject	No
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.181	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers that parts of Wellington airport are made up of 1950s reclaimed land from sea therefore should be part of the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay.	Disallow / Retain the airport zone in the liquefaction hazard overlay.	Accept	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.83	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	The liquefaction hazard overlay in the Proposed District plan is based on the High and Very High liquefaction susceptibility areas in Griffin et al (2020)6. These zones are based on cone penetrometer tests, and analysis of geomorphology, hydrology and site conditions, and do not take into account likely post-event remediation of liquefaction effects. The part of the Airport within the liquefaction overlay is an area of anthropogenic fill, which is in all cases highly susceptible to liquefaction. If geotechnical engineering has been done to mitigate liquefaction risk, the risk may be lessened, but the submission does not provide examples of this.	Disallow	Accept	No
David Karl	309.2	Mapping / All Overlays / Overlays General	Amend	Considers that whanau's homes should not be unnecessarily impacted by inaccurate modelling. Further development should also not occur in areas that it should not. There is emotional pain and significant costs linked to Council holding information that is not publicly available and then requiring costly changes to building plans before providing approval.	Seeks that hazard zoning be based on the best information available.	Accept	Yes
Oliver Sangster	112.6	Mapping / All Overlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Opposes flood hazard - inundation overlay applying to 22B Glenside road. Considers the mapping inaccurate as it does not reflect the new (higher) ground level as was raised through the subdivision completion and presently includes area that was raised through earthworks and retaining wall construction.	Remove the Flood Hazard - Inundation overlay from 22B Glenside Road.	Accept	Yes
Singvest Group Limited	129.1	Mapping / All Overlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Opposes 154 Victoria Street being included in the Flood Hazard (Inundation) overlay	Remove 154 Victoria from the Flood Hazard (Inundation) overlay	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Michael Thomas	219.1	Mapping / All Overlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Amend	<p>Considers that 18 Campbell Street is significantly higher than the adjoining property 16A Campbell Street and any water would flow there.</p> <p>18 Campbell Street has a retaining wall along its western fence that would provide a barrier to flooding.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including pictures]</p>	Amend the extent of the flood hazard inundation overlay to exclude 18 Campbell Street.	Reject	No
Kimberley Vermaey	348.1	Mapping / All Overlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Amend	<p>Considers that buildings in the Flood Hazard Overlay with water depths less than 0.5m should not require resource consents, subject to minimum floor levels. For buildings with floodwater depths 0.5m or greater, resource consent should be needed as proposed, with displacement effects considered.</p>	Seeks that buildings with flood water depth of less than 0.5m in the Flood Hazard Overlay not require resource consents.	Reject	No
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.10	Mapping / All Overlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	<p>Opposes the flood hazard overlay - inundation mapping for 82 Hanson Street.</p> <p>Considers that the overland flowpath and inundation areas shown in the maps run over the existing Southern Cross Hospital building. It is expected that these features are around the existing building or site. Requests that the Council undertakes further mapping to more accurately apply the overlays on the land in and around the existing buildings.</p>	<p>a) Remove the flood hazard overlay - inundation mapping for 82 Hanson Street.</p> <p>b) Seeks that further investigation is undertaken for the application of the flood hazard (inundation) overlay around existing buildings. [Inferred decision requested].</p>	Reject	No
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.11	Mapping / All Overlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	<p>Opposes the flood hazard overlay - overland flow path mapping for 82 Hanson Street.</p>	<p>a) Remove the flood hazard overlay - overland flow path mapping for 82 Hanson Street.</p> <p>b) Seeks that further investigation is undertaken for the application of the overland flow path overlay around existing buildings. [Inferred decision requested].</p>	Reject	No
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.12	Mapping / All Overlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	<p>Opposes the flood hazard overlay - inundation mapping for 84 Hanson Street.</p> <p>Considers that the overland flowpath and inundation areas shown in the maps run over the existing Southern Cross Hospital building. It is expected that these features are around the existing building or site. Requests that the Council undertakes further mapping to more accurately apply the overlays on the land in and around the existing buildings.</p>	<p>a) Remove the flood hazard overlay - inundation mapping for 84 Hanson Street.</p> <p>b) Seeks that further investigation is undertaken for the application of the flood hazard (inundation) overlay around existing buildings. [Inferred decision requested].</p>	Reject	No
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.13	Mapping / All Overlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	<p>Opposes the flood hazard overlay - overland flow path mapping for 84 Hanson Street.</p>	<p>a) Remove the flood hazard overlay - overland flow path mapping for 84 Hanson Street.</p> <p>b) Seeks that further investigation is undertaken for the application of the overland flow path overlay around existing buildings. [Inferred decision requested].</p>	Reject	No
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.14	Mapping / All Overlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	<p>Opposes the flood hazard overlay - inundation mapping for 86 Hanson Street.</p> <p>Considers that the overland flowpath and inundation areas shown in the maps run over the existing Southern Cross Hospital building. It is expected that these features are around the existing building or site. Requests that the Council undertakes further mapping to more accurately apply the overlays on the land in and around the existing buildings.</p>	<p>a) Remove the flood hazard overlay - inundation mapping for 86 Hanson Street.</p> <p>b) Seeks that further investigation is undertaken for the application of the flood hazard (inundation) overlay around existing buildings. [Inferred decision requested].</p>	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.15	Mapping / All Overlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Opposes the flood hazard overlay - overland flow path mapping for 86 Hanson Street.	a) Remove the flood hazard overlay - overland flow path mapping for 86 Hanson Street. b) Seeks that further investigation is undertaken for the application of the overland flow path overlay around existing buildings. [Inferred decision requested].	Reject	No
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.16	Mapping / All Overlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Opposes the flood hazard overlay - inundation mapping for 88 Hanson Street. Considers that the overland flowpath and inundation areas shown in the maps run over the existing Southern Cross Hospital building. It is expected that these features are around the existing building or site. Requests that the Council undertakes further mapping to more accurately apply the overlays on the land in and around the existing buildings.	a) Remove the flood hazard overlay - inundation mapping for 88 Hanson Street. b) Seeks that further investigation is undertaken for the application of the flood hazard (inundation) overlay around existing buildings. [Inferred decision requested].	Reject	No
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.17	Mapping / All Overlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Opposes the flood hazard overlay - overland flow path mapping for 88 Hanson Street.	a) Remove the flood hazard overlay - overland flow path mapping for 88 Hanson Street. b) Seeks that further investigation is undertaken for the application of the overland flow path overlay around existing buildings. [Inferred decision requested].	Reject	No
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.18	Mapping / All Overlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Opposes the flood hazard overlay - inundation mapping for 90 Hanson Street. Considers that the overland flowpath and inundation areas shown in the maps run over the existing Southern Cross Hospital building. It is expected that these features are around the existing building or site. Requests that the Council undertakes further mapping to more accurately apply the overlays on the land in and around the existing buildings.	a) Remove the flood hazard overlay - inundation mapping for 90 Hanson Street. b) Seeks that further investigation is undertaken for the application of the flood hazard (inundation) overlay around existing buildings. [Inferred decision requested].	Reject	No
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.19	Mapping / All Overlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Opposes the flood hazard overlay - overland flow path mapping for 90 Hanson Street.	a) Remove the flood hazard overlay - overland flow path mapping for 90 Hanson Street. b) Seeks that further investigation is undertaken for the application of the overland flow path overlay around existing buildings. [Inferred decision requested].	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.30	Mapping / All Overlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	The inclusion of flood hazard mapping as part of the District Plan is opposed, despite the risk-based approach to the management of natural hazards being generally supported. Including Flood Hazard overlays in the District Plan ignores the dynamic nature of flood hazards and will create unnecessary additional cost and uncertainty for landowners and land developers.	Delete the Natural Hazard Overlay from the District Plan and instead hold this information in non-statutory GIS maps.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.46	General / Mapping / All Overlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Accurate and risk-based regulatory hazard maps are an important tool in the WCC Proposed District Plan to limit subdivision and development within areas subject to natural hazard risk. Removing part or all of these regulatory maps opens the possibility that rules controlling development in flood-prone areas will be inconsistently applied, exposing people and their properties to unnecessary flood risk.	Disallow	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.53	General / Mapping / All Overlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a non-statutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan	Accept	No
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.39	General / Mapping / All Overlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Support	Stride supports deleting the Flood Hazard Overlays from the Proposed Plan for the reasons provided by the primary submitter, and to ensure a practical approach is taken to flood risk management.	Allow	Reject	No
Investore Property Limited	FS108.39	General / Mapping / All Overlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Support	Investore supports deleting the Flood Hazard Overlays from the Proposed Plan for the reasons provided by the primary submitter, and to ensure a practical approach is taken to flood risk management.	Allow	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.25	Mapping / All Overlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	<p>Submitter is required to manage and drain surface water ponding to avoid giving rise to adverse effects on aeronautical safety.</p> <p>Accordingly, Submitter manages surface water on site to ensure ponding does not arise.</p> <p>Opposes the mapping of 'inundation areas' mapped within the Airport Zone as ponding, such as that depicted on the District Planning maps, does not occur within its landholdings.</p>	Delete all Flood Hazard Overlays from the Airport Zone.	Reject	No
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.184	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers that a vast catchment of Strathmore feeds through Wellington Airport and it should be part of the Flood Hazard overlay	Disallow / Retain the airport zone in the flood hazard overlay.	Accept	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.85	General / Mapping / All Overlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	The flood inundation overlay is based on probability maps by Wellington Water of likely ponding areas in the event of a flood. It does not take into account likely post event remediation of flooding effects. If geotechnical engineering has been done to mitigate flood inundation risk, the risk may be lessened, but the submission does not provide examples of this.	Disallow	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.74	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Noise / NOISE-P4	Oppose	<p>Opposes the deletion of policy direction requiring acoustic treatment and mechanical ventilation for noise sensitive activities.</p> <p>Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.</p>	Disallow		This point will be addressed in Hearing Stream 7
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.26	Mapping / All Overlays / Liquefaction Hazard Overlay	Oppose in part	<p>Submitter is required to manage liquefaction risk to ensure the Airport can continue to operate following as seismic event.</p> <p>Opposes the mapping of 'liquefaction hazard overlay' mapped within the Airport Zone.</p> <p>[See paragraph 4.86 for full reason]</p>	Delete all Liquefaction Hazard Overlays from the Airport Zone.	Reject	No
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.182	General / Mapping / All Overlays / Liquefaction Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Considers that parts of Wellington airport are made up of 1950s reclaimed land from sea therefore should be part of the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay.	Disallow / Retain the airport zone in the liquefaction hazard overlay.	Accept	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.86	General / Mapping / All Overlays / Liquefaction Hazard Overlay	Oppose	The liquefaction hazard overlay in the Proposed District Plan is based on the High and Very High liquefaction susceptibility areas in Griffin et al (2020). These zones are based on cone penetrometer tests, and analysis of geomorphology, hydrology and site conditions, and do not take into account likely post-event remediation of liquefaction effects. The part of the Airport within the liquefaction overlay is an area of anthropogenic fill, which is in all cases highly susceptible to liquefaction. If geotechnical engineering has been done to mitigate liquefaction risk, the risk may be lessened, but the submission does not provide examples of this.	Disallow	Accept	No
Mary-Anne O'Rourke	195.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that there is a valid risk in the future from ratepayers, who are unable to attain house insurances for council consented houses that have been built in known flood and tsunami prone areas, taking future class actions against the Council.	Not specified.	No decision sought	No
Avryl Bramley	202.2	Other / Other / Other	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks a whole of city and a suburb by suburb earthquake and Tsunami risk assessment around existing and proposed buildings to ensure that sufficient resources are likely to be available in the event of a major earthquake.	Reject	No

Appendix 2

Recommended Responses to Submissions and Further Submissions

2. Coastal Hazards

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Grant Birkinshaw	52.4	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Oppose	Opposes the Coastal Hazard overlay based on Tsunami occurrences. The Tsunami baseline is for CD evacuation procedures and as such is not appropriate in a legal document.	Not specified.	Reject	No
Melissa Harward	65.3	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Support	Supports green infrastructure and planning coastal hazard mitigation works.	Retain Coastal Environment chapter as notified.	Accept in part	No
Yvonne Weeber	340.20	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Amend	Considers that the Introduction to the Coastal Environment chapter should be amended to include coastal hazards of storm surges and storm events. It is not only sea level rise that is causing coastal inundation but storm surges and storm events that are increasing due to climate change.	Amend the Introduction to the Coastal Environment chapter as follows: Coastal Hazards Wellington City's coastal environment is susceptible to a range of coastal hazards, which are mapped as Coastal Hazard Overlays. These include: 1. Tsunami; 2. Coastal inundation including sea level rise, storm surges and storm events.	Accept	Yes
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.74	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Support in part	Notes there is significant existing investment in the Wellington CBD which is subject to the coastal hazards overlays and this is not recognised in the Introduction. Argosy supports the Introduction to the extent that it takes an adaptation approach to coastal hazards. Retreat from the Wellington CBD is unlikely to occur, and therefore it would be more appropriate for the Proposed Plan to anticipate a protection or adaptation approach to climate change hazards. Amendment is required to help reconcile these provisions with the strategic direction and City Centre zone provisions above. The Introduction also includes a proposed Coastal Hazard Overlay Hazard Ranking table. This table includes tsunami with a 1:100 year scenario inundation extent as High. The High risk Coastal Hazard Tsunami Overlay covers a large part of the CBD, and the Medium and Low risk areas extend marginally further than the High risk area. Due to the nature of a tsunami, with high impact but low probability, it is considered that the greatest risk rating should be Medium	Amend the Introduction to the Coastal Environment as follows: Amend the Introduction to recognise that there is significant existing investment in the Wellington CBD and an adaptation and protection approach is needed to manage coastal hazards in this area. Argosy seeks for the Coastal Hazard Overlay Hazard Ranking table to be retained as notified subject to the following change: Tsunami – 1:100 year scenario inundation extent = <u>High Medium</u>	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	F570.3	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Oppose	The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunamis are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate. Land use planning options must be considered, particularly when combined with other hazards along the coast (e.g. sea level rise, storm surge, liquefaction). It is not appropriate to reduce the hazard ranking to medium.	Disallow	Accept	No
CentrePort Limited	402.111	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Oppose	Opposes structure of dealing with Natural Hazards. Considers that the structure of managing Natural Hazards is confusing. There are Natural Hazards provisions in the infrastructure chapter as well as Natural Hazards chapter, while coastal hazards are in the Coastal Environment Chapter. For CentrePort related matters you potentially have to look at all three. This is considered inefficient and could lead to duplication. Of the hazards listed CentrePort has fault hazard, liquefaction, coastal inundation and tsunami (high) risk.	Seeks that plan is amended so all Natural Hazards requirements are included in one chapter.	Reject	No
CentrePort Limited	402.112	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Amend	Opposes structure of dealing with Natural Hazards. Considers that the structure of managing Natural Hazards is confusing. There are Natural Hazards provisions in the infrastructure chapter as well as Natural Hazards chapter, while coastal hazards are in the Coastal Environment Chapter. For CentrePort related matters you potentially have to look at all three. This is considered inefficient and could lead to duplication. Of the hazards listed CentrePort has fault hazard, liquefaction, coastal inundation and tsunami (high) risk.	Seeks that plan is amended so all Natural Hazards requirements are included in one chapter.	Reject	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.30	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Oppose in part	Opposes the Proposed Plan in part.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan recognises the benefits of existing investment in the CBD in relation to natural hazards and coastal hazards.	Reject	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.31	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Oppose in part	Opposes the Proposed Plan in part.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan provides consistency in the approach to potentially hazard sensitive activities in the Natural Hazards and Coastal Hazards Overlays.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Oyster Management Limited	404.32	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Support in part	Supports the Introduction to the extent that it takes an adaptation approach to coastal hazards. [Refer to original submission for full reason] .	Retain CE (Coastal Environment) introduction with amendments.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Oyster Management Limited	404.33	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Oppose in part	<p>Considers there is significant existing investment in Wellington CBD that is subject to coastal hazard overlays, which is not recognised in the Introduction.</p> <p>Supports the Introduction to the extent it takes an adaption approach to coastal hazards, as retreat from Wellington CBD is unlikely, it would therefore be more appropriate to anticipate protection or adaption approaches to climate change hazards.</p> <p>Considers that amendment is required to align these provisions with the strategic direction and City Centre Zone provisions. Amendment is required to help reconcile these provisions with the strategic direction and City Centre zone provisions.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	Amend CE (Coastal Environment) - Introduction to recognise the significant existing investment in Wellington CBD and an adaption and protection approach is required to manage coastal hazards in the area.	Reject	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.34	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Amend	<p>Considers there is significant existing investment in Wellington CBD that is subject to coastal hazard overlays, which is not recognised in the Introduction.</p> <p>Supports the Introduction to the extent it takes an adaption approach to coastal hazards, as retreat from Wellington CBD is unlikely, it would therefore be more appropriate to anticipate protection or adaption approaches to climate change hazards.</p> <p>Considers that amendment is required to align these provisions with the strategic direction and City Centre Zone provisions. Amendment is required to help reconcile these provisions with the strategic direction and City Centre zone provisions.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	Amend CE (Coastal Environment) - Introduction to recognise the significant existing investment in Wellington CBD and an adaption and protection approach is required to manage coastal hazards in the area.	Reject	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.35	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Amend	<p>Considers that the hazard ratings for the tsunami risk events in the Coastal Hazard Overlay table in CE - Introduction should be amended due to the high impact, low probability nature of tsunami hazards. Considers the greatest risk rating for a tsunami event should be Medium.</p> <p>Considers that the hazard overlays are wide ranging in terms of risk and feasible approaches to mitigate that risk.</p> <p>By including all the Inundation and Tsunami overlays together, the Proposed Plan applies the same risk and mitigation approach to Inundation and Tsunami. This is inappropriate because the risk of tsunami cannot be mitigated and the probability of tsunami is low compared to Coastal Inundation.</p>	<p>Amend Coastal Hazard Overlay table in CE - Introduction as follows:</p> <p>Tsunami - 1:100 year scenario inundation extent: High <u>Medium</u></p> <p>...</p> <p>Tsunami - 1:500 year scenario inundation extent: Medium <u>Low</u></p> <p>...</p> <p>Tsunami - 1:1000 year scenario inundation extent: Low</p>	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.70	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Oppose	The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunamis are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate ¹ . It is not appropriate to reduce the hazard ranking to medium. Land use planning options must be considered, particularly when combined with other hazards along the coast (e.g. sea level rise, storm surge, liquefaction). It is not appropriate to reduce the hazard ranking for all tsunamis given the high consequence of a tsunami occurring.	Disallow	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.291	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Amend	<p>Considers that tsunami hazard response within existing urban areas requires a broader management response that is best managed collectively by emergency management groups such as Civil Defence.</p> <p>The PDP's approach to tsunami management is cumbersome, particularly for large lifeline utilities like WIAL who have extensive emergency management plans and procedures in place, as well as CDEM requirements to remain operational during a civil defence emergency. The relevant coastal hazard policies and methods that apply to the site therefore have limited utility and will generate unnecessary resource consent requirements for matters that are otherwise already considered by WIAL during the design and development phase of activities within the zone.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that coastal hazard overlays are amended to focus only on coastal inundation hazards.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	F570.93	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Oppose	While the trigger of a tsunami cannot be mitigated, the consequences can be reduced through good design, evacuation planning and communication of the risk, and the tsunami hazard overlay should not be deleted from the policy. The current probability of a rupture of the Hikurangi subduction zone is calculated as 25% in the next 50 years. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes. Land use planning and emergency management options need to be complementary.	Disallow	Accept	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	F570.94	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Oppose	The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunamis are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate. Land use planning options must be considered, particularly when combined with other hazards along the coast (e.g. sea level rise, storm surge, liquefaction). Intensification and further development of brownfield sites as well as development of greenfield sites should be restricted within tsunami hazard overlays (refer to GNS guidance on land use planning which incorporates tsunami modelling).	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.292	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Amend	<p>Considers that tsunami hazard response within existing urban areas requires a broader management response that is best managed collectively by emergency management groups such as Civil Defence.</p> <p>The PDP's approach to tsunami management is cumbersome, particularly for large lifeline utilities like WIAL who have extensive emergency management plans and procedures in place, as well as CDEM requirements to remain operational during a civil defence emergency. The relevant coastal hazard policies and methods that apply to the site therefore have limited utility and will generate unnecessary resource consent requirements for matters that are otherwise already considered by WIAL during the design and development phase of activities within the zone.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Amend the Coastal Environment Chapter to apply coastal tsunami hazard provisions only to new Greenfield developments.	Reject	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.32	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Oppose in part	<p>There is significant existing investment in the Wellington CBD which is subject to the coastal hazards overlays, and it is important that the risks from coastal hazards are appropriately addressed.</p> <p>supports the Introduction to the extent that it takes an adaptation approach to coastal hazards. Retreat from the Wellington CBD is unlikely to occur, and therefore it would be more appropriate for the Proposed Plan to anticipate a protection or adaptation approach to climate change hazards.</p> <p>Amendment is required to help reconcile these provisions with the strategic direction and City Centre zone provisions above.</p> <p>The Introduction also includes a proposed Coastal Hazard Overlay Hazard Ranking table. This table includes tsunami with a 1:100 year scenario inundation extent as High. The High risk Coastal Hazard Tsunami Overlay covers a large part of the CBD, and the Medium and Low risk areas extend marginally further than the High risk area. Due to the nature of a Tsunami, with high impact but low probability, it is considered that the greatest risk rating should be Medium.</p>	<p>Seeks that the introduction to the Coastal Environment introduction is amended to recognise that there is significant existing investment in the Wellington CBD and an adaptation and protection approach is needed to manage coastal hazards in this area.</p> <p>Amend the Coastal Hazard Overlay Hazard Ranking table as follows: Tsunami – 1:100 year scenario inundation extent = <u>High-Medium</u></p>	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.13	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Oppose	The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunamis are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate. It is not appropriate to reduce the hazard ranking to medium. Land use planning options must be considered, particularly when combined with other hazards along the coast (e.g. sea level rise, storm surge, liquefaction).	Disallow	Accept	No
Guardians of the Bays	452.18	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Support	Supports the Coastal Environment Chapter.	Retain the Coastal Environment Chapter with amendment.	Accept	Yes
Guardians of the Bays	452.19	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Amend	Considers an amendment to the introduction to include coastal hazards of storm surges and storm events. It is not only sea level rise that is causing coastal inundation but storm surges and storm events that are increasing due to climate change.	Amend introduction to the Coastal Environment chapter as follows: Coastal Hazards- Wellington City's coastal environment is susceptible to a range of coastal hazards, which are mapped as Coastal Hazard Overlays. These include: 1. Tsunami; 2. Coastal inundation including sea level rise, storm surges and storm events.	Accept	Yes
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.293	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / New CE	Amend	Opposes this rule insofar as it relates to the existing seawall located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point. Considers that the rule should only be applicable to new hard engineering structures. The ongoing upgrade, maintenance and repair of existing hard engineering structures that protect existing regionally significant infrastructure should be permitted, as WIAL has provided for in the underlying Natural Open Space Zone. [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Add new rule in Coastal Environment chapter as follows: <u>CE – R24A Hard engineering measures in the high coastal hazard area for regionally significant infrastructure</u> <u>1. Activity Status: Permitted</u>	Reject	No
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.67	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / New CE	Oppose	Considers that Natural Open Space Zone between Lyall Bay and Moa Point should be retained within the Airport Zone. All amended changes are not required. The airport is a natural coastal environment. It is a complex environment which requires the NZCPS and Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement for land below MHWs.	Disallow	Accept	Yes
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.57	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / New CE	Amend	Considers that the Coastal Environment chapter could specifically recognise and protect significant cultural infrastructure, such as coastal marae, and the impacts that marae communities may face.	Add new objective in the Coastal Environment chapter as follows: <u>Reduce the susceptibility of significant cultural property, infrastructure and associated communities from damage by coastal hazards.</u>	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.132	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O5	Support	Supports this objective to reduce risk to people, property, and infrastructure. FENZ acknowledges there are existing fire stations located within the Coastal Hazard Areas and that any development of these would be subject to provisions within this chapter.	Retain CE-O5 (Risk from coastal hazards) as notified.	Reject	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.298	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O5	Support in part	Considers this objective should not only refer to increased risk to people, property and infrastructure and should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected.	Amend CE-O5 (Risk from coastal hazards): Subdivision, use and development in the Coastal Hazard Overlays reduces or does not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure, natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.90	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O5	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.201	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-05	Amend	Considers amendments appropriate to bring the policy in line with the Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies 51 and 52 in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Seeks to amend wording of CE-05 (Risk from coastal hazards): Subdivision, use and development in the Coastal Hazard Overlays minimises reduces or does not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure.	Accept in part	Yes
Toka Tū Ake EQC	F570.34	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-05	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GWRC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that 'minimise' natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than 'reduce' and 'reduce or do not increase'.	Allow	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.225	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-05	Support	Supports as the objective will benefit the coastal environment.	Retain CE-05 (Risk from coastal hazards) as notified.	Reject	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.75	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-05	Support	Supports the objective in that it enables subdivision, use and development in Coastal Hazard overlays that does not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure	Retain CE-05 (Risk from coastal hazards) as notified.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.246	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-05	Support in part	Objective CE-05 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Supports Objective CE-05 (Risk from coastal hazards) with amendment.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.247	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-05	Amend	Considers that CE-05 should be amended to better identify the effects of new subdivision, use and development may have on the existing environment. It is sought the word "new" is added to this objective to recognise the additional impact that only new subdivision, use and development has on the existing environment.	Amend Objective CE-05 (Risk from coastal hazards) as follows: New 5-subdivision, use and development in the Coastal Hazard Overlays reduces or does not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure.	Reject	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.36	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-05	Support	Supports this objective to the extent that it enables subdivision, use, and development in the Coastal Hazard overlays that does not increase the risk to people, property, or infrastructure.	Retain CE-05 (Risks from coastal hazards) as notified.	Reject	No
Investore Property Limited	405.41	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-05	Support	Supports the objective.	Retain CE-05 (Risk from coastal hazards) as notified.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.300	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-05	Oppose	Opposes CE-05. Considers that the risks from natural hazards should be avoided where they are intolerable. This concept should be brought into this policy and acknowledges that people, activities, property and infrastructure have varying levels of coastal hazard tolerance. [See paragraph 4.46 to 4.49 and 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes CE-05 (Risk from coastal hazards) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Airways Corporation of New Zealand Limited	FS105.2	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / AIRPORT PURPOSES	Support	This submission point is consistent with Airways' operations and its core functions.	Allow	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.301	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-05	Oppose	Opposes CE-05. Considers that the risks from natural hazards should be avoided where they are intolerable. This concept should be brought into this policy and acknowledges that people, activities, property and infrastructure have varying levels of coastal hazard tolerance. [See paragraph 4.46 to 4.49 and 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Amend CE-05 (Risk from coastal hazards) as follows: CE-05 Risk from coastal hazards Subdivision, use and development in the Coastal Hazard Overlays <u>do not create an intolerable level of</u> reduces or does not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fabric Property Limited	425.33	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-05	Support	Supports CE-05 as notified.	Retain CE-05 (Risk from coastal hazards) as notified.	Reject	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.62	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-05	Support in part	Supports the chapter as it has good provisions which incorporate the protection of the coastal environment and protection from Coastal Hazards.	Retain CE-05 (Risk from coastal hazards) as notified, subject to amendments in subsequent submission points	Reject	No
Grant Birkinshaw	52.5	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-06	Oppose	Opposes the Coastal Hazard overlay based on Tsunami occurrences. The Tsunami baseline is for CD evacuation procedures and as such is not appropriate in a legal document.	Not specified.	No relief specified	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.299	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-06	Support in part	Considers this objective should not only refer to increased risk to people, property and infrastructure and should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected.	Amend CE-06 (Natural systems and features): Natural systems and features that reduce the susceptibility of people, property, and infrastructure, <u>natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values</u> from damage by coastal hazards are created, maintained or enhanced.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.91	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-06	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.202	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-06	Support	Considers this approach is appropriate.	Retain CE-06 (Natural systems and features) as notified.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.226	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-06	Support	Supports as the objective will benefit the coastal environment.	Retain CE-06 (Natural systems and features) as notified.	Reject	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.63	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-06	Support in part	Supports the chapter as it has good provisions which incorporate the protection of the coastal environment and protection from Coastal Hazards.	Retain CE-06 (Natural systems and features) as notified, subject to amendments in subsequent submission points	Reject	No
Yvonne Weeber	340.23	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-07	Support	CE-07 is supported, as airport operations should not increase the risk to people, property and infrastructure.	Retain Objective CE-07 (Airport, operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.	Reject	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.300	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-07	Support in part	Considers this objective should not only refer to increased risk to people, property and infrastructure and should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected.	Amend CE-07 (Airport, operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities): Airport, operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities are provided for, while also ensuring that subdivision, development and use of land occupied by Airport, operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities do not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure, <u>natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.</u>	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.92	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-07	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.227	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-07	Support	Supports as the objective will benefit the coastal environment.	Retain CE-07 (Airport, operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.	Reject	No
CentrePort Limited	402.115	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-07	Support in part	Supports objective, but opposes the structure of the plan managing Natural Hazards as it is confusing. There are Natural Hazards provisions in the infrastructure chapter, the Natural Hazards Chapter as well as this chapter dealing with coastal hazards in the Coastal Environment. For CentrePort related matters you potentially have to look at all three. This is considered inefficient and could lead to duplication. Of the hazards listed CentrePort has fault hazard, liquefaction, coastal inundation and tsunami (high) risk.	Seeks that all Natural Hazards provisions are consolidated in the same place or stronger cross-referencing is provided.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.302	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-07	Oppose	Considers that the activities listed have operational and functional constraints which ultimately govern the location of these activities, including within areas exposed to natural hazard risk. This objective needs to appropriately recognise this, and consistent with the directive contained within SRCC-O2, avoid areas where the risks are intolerable, taking into consideration operational and functional constraints associated with identified activities.	Opposes CE-07 (Airport, operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.303	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-07	Amend	Considers that the activities listed have operational and functional constraints which ultimately govern the location of these activities, including within areas exposed to natural hazard risk. This objective needs to appropriately recognise this, and consistent with the directive contained within SRCC-O2, avoid areas where the risks are intolerable, taking into consideration operational and functional constraints associated with identified activities.	Amend CE-07 (Airport, operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as follows: Airport, operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities are provided for, while also ensuring that subdivision, development and use of land occupied by Airport, operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities do not <u>create an intolerable level of increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure.</u>	Reject	No
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.99	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-07	Support	Supports the objective to provide for operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities while ensuring these activities do not increase the risk to people, property and infrastructure.	Retain CE-07 (Airport, operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.	Reject	No
Guardians of the Bays	452.20	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-07	Support	Supports this objective. Considers that Airport operations should not increase the risk to people, property and infrastructure.	Retain CE-07 (Airport, operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.	Reject	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.64	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-07	Support in part	Supports the chapter as it has good provisions which incorporate the protection of the coastal environment and protection from Coastal Hazards.	Retain CE-07 (Airport, operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified, subject to amendments in subsequent submission points	Reject	No
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.19	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08	Support in part	Supports CE-08 (City centre zone) to the extent that it is enabling of development in the city centre.	Retain CE-08 (City Centre Zone) as notified.	Reject	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.301	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08	Support in part	Considers this objective should not only refer to increased risk to people, property and infrastructure and should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected.	Amend CE-08 (City Centre Zone): Provide for a range of activities that maintain the vibrancy and vitality of the City Centre Zone, while also ensuring that subdivision, development and use in these areas do not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure, <u>natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.</u>	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.93	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08	Oppose	<p>WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure; 	Disallow	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.228	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08	Support	Supports as the objective will benefit the coastal environment.	Retain CE-08 (City Centre Zone) as notified.	Reject	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.76	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08	Support	<p>Supports the direction of this objective to provide for a range of activities that maintain the vibrancy and vitality of the City Centre zone, while also ensuring that subdivision, development and use in these areas do not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure.</p> <p>This is because this objective recognises the economic and social benefits of the significant existing investment in the Wellington CBD. The social and economic benefits that the existing Wellington CBD has and its position in the city is fixed. As we respond and adapt to climate change and other hazard risks, decisions will be made on where retreat occurs and what is protected, but it is anticipated that retreat from the Wellington CBD is unlikely to occur</p>	Retain CE-08 (City Centre Zone) as notified.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.248	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08	Support in part	Objective CE-08 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Supports Objective CE-08 (City Centre Zone) with amendment.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.249	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08	Amend	Considers that CE-05 should be amended to better identify the effects of new subdivision, use and development may have on the existing environment. It is sought the word "new" is added to this objective recognise the additional impact that only new subdivision, use and development has on the existing environment.	<p>Amend Objective CE-08 (City Centre Zone) as follows:</p> <p>Provide for a range of activities that maintain the vibrancy and vitality of the City Centre Zone, while also ensuring that <u>new</u> subdivision, development and use in these areas do not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure.</p>	Reject	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.37	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08	Support	<p>Supports the direction of this objective to provide for a range of activities that maintain the vibrancy and vitality of the City Centre zone, while also ensuring that subdivision, development and use in these areas do not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure.</p> <p>Considers this is because this objective recognises the economic and social benefits of the significant existing investment in the Wellington CBD. The social and economic benefits that the existing Wellington CBD has and its position in the city is fixed. As we respond and adapt to climate change and other hazard risks, decisions will be made on where retreat occurs and what is protected, but it is anticipated that retreat from the Wellington CBD is unlikely to occur.</p>	Retain CE-08 (City Centre Zone) as notified.	Reject	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.34	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08	Support in part	<p>Fabric supports CE-08 to the extent that it is enabling of development in the city centre. This reflects that the Wellington City Centre is intended to be the primary commercial centre for the wider Wellington region and retreat is not practical or likely.</p>	Retain CE-08 (City Centre Zone) as notified.	Reject	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.65	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08	Support in part	Supports the chapter as it has good provisions which incorporate the protection of the coastal environment and protection from Coastal Hazards.	Retain CE-08 (City centre zone) as notified, subject to amendments in subsequent submission points	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Yvonne Weeber	340.24	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-09	Support	CE-09 is supported as it enables green infrastructure as the primary method being used to reduce damage from sea level rise and coastal erosion. However, the policies and rules need to reflect that areas of the coastal environment should not be developed in the manner that has occurred in the past.	Retain Objective CE-09 (Measures to reduce damage from sea level rise and coastal erosion) as notified.	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.203	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-09	Amend	Considers that for consistency with Policy 52 in Proposed RPS Change 1. Green infrastructure has been defined in the WCC PDP with a strong focus on engineering systems that mimic natural systems, however there are other natural hazard mitigation measures that the change to the RPS directs consideration of, which are not captured by green infrastructure.	Amend CE-09 (Measures to reduce damage from sea level rise and coastal erosion) to include non-structural, soft engineering or mātauranga Māori approaches.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.229	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-09	Support	Supports as the objective will benefit the coastal environment.	Retain CE-09 (Measures to reduce damage from sea level rise and coastal erosion) as notified.	Accept	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.66	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-09	Support in part	Supports the chapter as it has good provisions which incorporate the protection of the coastal environment and protection from Coastal Hazards.	Retain CE-09 (Measures to reduce damage from sea level rise and coastal erosion) as notified, subject to amendments in subsequent submission points	Accept	No
Yvonne Weeber	340.33	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P11	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain CE-P11 (Identification of coastal hazards) as notified.	Reject	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.313	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P11	Support in part	Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect of use and development and coastal hazards. As noted above, these provisions should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected	Amend CE-P11 (Identification of coastal hazards): Identify coastal hazards within the District Plan and take a risk-based approach to the management of subdivision, use and development based on the following: 1. The sensitivity of the activities to the impacts of coastal hazards; 2. The risk posed to people, property, and infrastructure, <u>natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values</u> by considering the likelihood and consequences of different coastal hazard events; and 3. The longer term impacts of climate change and sea level rise.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.99	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P11	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.210	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P11	Support	Considers this approach is appropriate.	Retain CE-P11 (Identification of coastal hazards) as notified.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.240	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P11	Support	CE-P11 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P11 (Identification of coastal hazards) as notified.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.77	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P11	Support in part	Supports this policy in so far that the risk-based approach needs to consider the impact, likelihood and consequences of different coastal hazard events. The Proposed Plan clearly identifies the risk of various coastal hazard events e.g. a high risk that a property will be affected if there is a tsunami. However, the Proposed Plan does not identify the probability of such events (which are low). This makes the identification of hazards misleading and potentially alarming	Retain CE-P11 (Identification of coastal hazards) as notified.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.250	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P11	Support	CE-P11 is generally supported.	Retain CE-P11 (Identification of coastal hazards) as notified.	Reject	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.38	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P11	Support in part	Supports this policy to the extent that the risk-based approach needs to consider the impact, likelihood, and consequences of different coastal hazards.	Retain CE-P11 (Identification of coastal hazards) as notified.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.316	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P11	Oppose	Opposes this policy. The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes CE-P11 (Identification of coastal hazards) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.317	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P11	Amend	Opposes this policy. The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Either delete, or amend CE-P11 (Identification of coastal hazards) as follows: Seeks that CE-P11 (Identification of coastal hazards) is amended to only apply to the coastal inundation hazard areas and recognise the concept of tolerability.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.95	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P11	Oppose	The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunamis are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate ¹ . Land use planning options must be considered, particularly when combined with other hazards along the coast (e.g. sea level rise, storm surge, liquefaction). The tsunami hazard overlay should not be deleted from the policy. Deletion of this provision is not an appropriate alternative to including risk tolerance, as it is important to limit development in areas at risk from natural hazards.	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington City Council	266.112	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Amend	Considers the policy isn't clear and needs minor changes.	Amend CE-P12 (Levels of risk) as follows: <u>Ensure</u> subdivision, use and development reduces the risk to people, property, and infrastructure by: 1. <u>Enable</u> <u>Enabling</u> subdivision, use and development that have either low occupancy, risk, or replacement value within the low, medium and high hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays; (...)	Accept	Yes
Yvonne Weeber	340.34	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Support	CE-P12 is supported, specifically the classification of Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal Hazard Area and the High Coastal Hazard Area.	Retain CE-P12 (Levels of risk) as notified.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.314	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Support in part	Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect of use and development and coastal hazards. As noted above, these provisions should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected	Amend CE-P12 (Levels of risk): Subdivision, use and development reduces the risk to people, property, and infrastructure by: 1. Enable subdivision, use and development that have either low occupancy, risk, or replacement value within the low, medium and high hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays; 2. Requiring mitigation for subdivision, use and development that addresses the impacts from the relevant coastal hazards to people, property, and infrastructure, <u>natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values</u> in the low and medium hazard areas; and 3. Avoiding subdivision, use and development in the high hazard area unless there is a functional and operational need for the building or activity to be located in this area and incorporates mitigation measures are incorporated that reduces the risk to people, property, and infrastructure.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.100	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.211	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Amend	Considers that amendments are necessary to have regard to the RPS Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as "as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)" and is in line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as practicable but is a clearer signal than reduce or do not increase, to actively look to bring down the risk in the design and planning of the development.	Seeks to amend CE-P12 (levels of risk) as follows: Subdivision, use and development <u>minimises</u> reduces the risk to people, property and infrastructure by... 3. Avoiding subdivision, use and development in the high hazard area unless there is a functional and operational need for the building or activity to be located in this area and incorporates <u>incorporates</u> mitigation measures are incorporated that reduces <u>minimise</u> the risk to people, property and infrastructure.	Accept in part	Yes
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.35	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GWRC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that 'minimise' natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than 'reduce' and 'reduce or do not increase'.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.241	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Support	CE-P12 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P12 (Levels of risk) as notified.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.78	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Oppose	<p>Opposes Policy CE-P12.1. This policy is very restrictive to enable only low occupancy, risk or replacement value development within the Coastal Hazard Overlays. The Coastal Hazard Overlays apply to approximately half of the CBD. It is considered that this policy does not appropriately recognise this context and existing built environment.</p> <p>Considers Policy CE-12.2 would also require mitigation for subdivision, use and development in the Low and Medium Hazard Areas. All of Argosy's properties are located in Low or Medium Hazard Areas. Policy CE-12.2 should apply to the Coastal Hazard Inundation Overlay only. It is not appropriate to require mitigation for tsunami risk based on the likelihood of an event occurring, and the inability to mitigate this type of event. Further, it is unrealistic to provide that mitigation can address the impacts from coastal hazards, rather than to reduce or not increase the risk.</p> <p>Considers CE-P12.3 is similarly restrictive and equally fails to recognise that a significant portion of the CBD is subject to High Hazard Areas under the Coastal Hazard Overlays. As noted above, the Proposed Plan fails to recognise that there is already significant investment in the CBD. It is also inappropriate for this policy to apply to tsunami risk.</p>	<p>Amend CE-P12 (Levels of risk) as follows:</p> <p>Subdivision, use and development reduces the risk to people, property, and infrastructure by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Enable subdivision, use and development that have either low occupancy, risk, or replacement value within the low, medium and high hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays; Requiring mitigation for subdivision, use and development to reduce or not increase that addresses the impacts from the relevant coastal hazards to people, property, and infrastructure in the low, and medium <u>and high hazard</u> areas Avoiding subdivision, use and development in the high hazard area <u>of the Coastal Inundation Overlay</u> unless there is a functional and or operational need for the building or activity to be located in this area and incorporates mitigation measures are incorporated that reduces the risk to people, property, and infrastructure 	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.4	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Oppose	Coastal hazard risk is going to increase in the near future with the impact of climate change and sea level rise, and high occupancy developments in high risk areas will expose more people to increasing risk. Additionally, mitigation of risks from tsunami is possible with land use planning and building design, and tsunami risk should not be deleted from the policy.	Disallow	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.251	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Support in part	CE-P12 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain CE-P12 (Levels of risk) with amendment.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.252	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Amend	Considers that CE-P12 should be amended so that the policy enables mitigation of hazard risk in high hazard areas.	<p>Amend CE-P12 (Levels of risk) as follows:</p> <p>New <u>5</u> subdivision, use and development reduces <u>does not increase</u> the risk to people, property, and infrastructure by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Enable subdivision, use and development that have either low occupancy, risk, or replacement value within the Coastal Hazard Overlays; Requiring mitigation for subdivision, use and development that addresses the impacts from the relevant coastal hazards to people, property, and infrastructure in the low and medium hazard areas; and Avoiding subdivision, use and development in the high hazard area unless there is a functional and operational need for the building or activity to be located in this area and incorporates mitigation measures are incorporated that reduces the risk to people, property, and infrastructure. 	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.63	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Oppose	The category of high hazard area is afforded to those areas where the level of risk from natural hazard is such that mitigation is not sufficient to bring risk to a tolerable level. Many natural hazard risks are going to increase in the near future with the impact of climate change and sea level rise, and high occupancy developments in high risk areas will expose more people to increasing risk. As such avoidance of subdivision and development in these areas is appropriate, and risks should be reduced where possible, rather than keeping the status quo i.e. not increasing risks.	Disallow	Accept	No
Ministry of Education	400.63	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Support	Supports CE-P12 as the submitter may at times need to locate educational facilities in these areas to meet the needs of existing communities. The submitter notes that where required, development of these facilities would incorporate mitigation measures to reduce the risks to people, property and infrastructure.	Retain CE-P12 (Levels of risk) as notified.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Oyster Management Limited	404.39	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Amend	Opposes CE-P12.1.Considers this policy is very restrictive in only enabling low occupancy, risk or replacement value development within the Coastal Hazard Overlays, as it applies to approximately half of the CBD. Considers this policy does not appropriately recognise this context and existing built environment.	Amend CE-P12 (Levels of risk) as follows: Subdivision, use and development reduces the risk to people, property, and infrastructure by: 1.Enable subdivision, use and development that have either low occupancy, risk, or replacement value within the low, medium and high hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays; ...	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	F570.71	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Oppose	The category of high hazard area is afforded to those areas where the level of risk from natural hazard is such that mitigation is not sufficient to bring risk to a tolerable level. Many natural hazard risks are going to increase in the near future with the impact of climate change and sea level rise, and high occupancy developments in high risk areas will expose more people to increasing risk. As such avoidance of subdivision and development in these areas is appropriate.	Disallow	Accept	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.40	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Oppose	Opposes CE-P12.1.Considers this policy is very restrictive in only enabling low occupancy, risk or replacement value development within the Coastal Hazard Overlays, as it applies to approximately half of the CBD. Considers this policy does not appropriately recognise this context and existing built environment.	Delete CE-P12.1 (Levels of risk) in its entirety.	Reject	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.41	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Amend	Considers that Policy CE-12.2 would require mitigation for subdivision, use and development in the Low and Medium Hazard Areas. Policy CE-12.2 should apply to the Coastal Hazard Inundation Overlay only. Considers that it is not appropriate to require mitigation for tsunami risk because of the likelihood of an event occurring, and the inability to mitigate this type of event. Further, the submitter considers that it is unrealistic to provide that mitigation can address the impacts from coastal hazards, rather than to reduce or not increase the risk.	Amend CE-12.2 (Levels of risk) as follows: ... 2. Requiring mitigation for subdivision, use and development to reduce or not increase that addresses the impacts from the relevant coastal hazards to people, property, and infrastructure in the low, and medium, <u>and high hazard</u> areas; ...	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	F570.72	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Oppose	The category of high hazard area is afforded to those areas where the level of risk from natural hazard is such that mitigation is not sufficient to bring risk to a tolerable level. Coastal hazard risk is going to increase in the near future with the impact of climate change and sea level rise, and high occupancy developments in high risk areas will expose more people to increasing risk.	Disallow	Accept	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.42	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Amend	Considers Policy CE12.3 is similarly restrictive and equally fails to recognise that a significant portion of the CBD is subject to High Hazard Areas under the Coastal Hazard Overlays. As noted above, the Proposed Plan fails to recognise that there is already significant investment in the CBD. It is also inappropriate for this policy to apply to tsunami risk.	Amend CE-12.3 (Levels of risk) as follows: ... 3. Avoiding subdivision, use and development in the high hazard area of the <u>Coastal Inundation Overlay</u> unless there is a functional and or operational need for the building or activity to be located in this area and incorporates mitigation measures are incorporated that reduces <u>or does not increase</u> the risk to people, property, and infrastructure.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	F570.73	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Oppose	Coastal hazard risk is going to increase in the near future with the impact of climate change and sea level rise, and high occupancy developments in high risk areas will expose more people to increasing risk. Additionally, mitigation of risks from tsunami is possible with land use planning and building design, and tsunami risk should not be deleted from the policy (ref tsunami guidance). A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes.	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.318	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Oppose	Opposes this policy. The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes CE-P12 (Levels of risk) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.319	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Amend	<p>Opposes this policy.</p> <p>The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Either delete or amend CE-P12 (Levels of risk) as follows:</p> <p>Seeks that CE-P12 (Levels of risk) is amended to only apply to the coastal inundation hazard areas and recognise the concept of tolerability.</p>	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.96	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Oppose	<p>The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunamis are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate. Land use planning options must be considered, particularly when combined with other hazards along the coast (e.g. sea level rise, storm surge, liquefaction). The tsunami hazard overlay should not be deleted from the policy. Deletion of this provision is not an appropriate alternative to including risk tolerance, as it is important to limit development in areas at risk from natural hazards.</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.36	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Oppose	<p>Considers that CE-P12.1 is very restrictive to enable only low occupancy, risk or replacement value development within the Coastal Hazard Overlays. The Coastal Hazard Overlays apply to approximately half of the CBD. It is considered that this policy is not an appropriate control in this context and existing built environment.</p> <p>Similarly, Policy CE-12.2 would require mitigation for subdivision, use and development in the Low and Medium Hazard Areas. Four of Fabric's properties are located in Low or Medium Hazard Areas. Policy CE-12.2 should apply to the Coastal Hazard Inundation Overlay only. It is not appropriate to require mitigation for tsunami risk based on the likelihood of an event occurring, and the inability to mitigate this type of event. Further, it is unrealistic to provide that mitigation can address the impacts from coastal hazards, rather than to reduce or not increase the risk.</p> <p>Policy CE10.3 is similarly restrictive and equally fails to recognise that a significant portion of the CBD is subject to High Hazard Areas under the Coastal Hazard Overlays. This policy fails to recognise that there is already significant investment in the CBD, and is inconsistent with CE-08, which is to provide for activities in the City Centre Zone which do not increase the risk to people, property or infrastructure. It is also inappropriate for this policy to apply to tsunami risk.</p>	Opposes CE-P12 (Levels of risk) as notified and seeks amendments.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fabric Property Limited	425.37	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Oppose	<p>Considers that Policy CE-P12.1 is very restrictive to enable only low occupancy, risk or replacement value development within the Coastal Hazard Overlays. The Coastal Hazard Overlays apply to approximately half of the CBD. It is considered that this policy is not an appropriate control in this context and existing built environment.</p> <p>Similarly, Policy CE-12.2 would require mitigation for subdivision, use and development in the Low and Medium Hazard Areas. Four of Fabric's properties are located in Low or Medium Hazard Areas. Policy CE-12.2 should apply to the Coastal Hazard Inundation Overlay only. It is not appropriate to require mitigation for tsunami risk based on the likelihood of an event occurring, and the inability to mitigate this type of event. Further, it is unrealistic to provide that mitigation can address the impacts from coastal hazards, rather than to reduce or not increase the risk.</p> <p>Policy CE10.3 is similarly restrictive and equally fails to recognise that a significant portion of the CBD is subject to High Hazard Areas under the Coastal Hazard Overlays. This policy fails to recognise that there is already significant investment in the CBD, and is inconsistent with CE-08, which is to provide for activities in the City Centre Zone which do not increase the risk to people, property or infrastructure. It is also inappropriate for this policy to apply to tsunami risk.</p>	<p>Amend CE-P12 (Levels of risk) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>1. Enable subdivision, use and development that have either low occupancy, risk, or replacement value within the low, medium and high hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays;</p> <p>1. 2. Requiring mitigation for subdivision, use and development to reduce or not increase that addresses the impacts from the relevant coastal hazards to people, property, and infrastructure in the low, and medium and high hazard areas;</p> <p>2. 3. Avoiding subdivision, use and development in the high hazard area of the Coastal Inundation Overlay unless there is a functional and or operational need for the building or activity to be located in this area and incorporates mitigation measures are incorporated that reduces the risk to people, property, and infrastructure.</p>	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.14	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Oppose	Coastal hazard risk is going to increase in the near future with the impact of climate change and sea level rise, and high occupancy developments in high risk areas will expose more people to increasing risk. Additionally, mitigation of risks from tsunami is possible with land use planning and building design, and tsunami risk should not be deleted from the policy. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes. GNS guidelines for integrating tsunami modelling into land use planning supports a risk-based approach to avoid, mitigate, or reduce tsunami risk.	Disallow	Accept	No
Yvonne Weeber	340.35	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P13	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain CE-P13 (Less hazard sensitive activities) as notified.	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.315	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P13	Support in part	Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect of use and development and coastal hazards. As noted above, these provisions should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected	Amend CE-P13 (Less hazard sensitive activities) to also address risks posed to natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.101	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P13	Oppose	<p>WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably:</p> <p>1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified;</p> <p>2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and,</p> <p>3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.212	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P13	Support	Considers this approach is appropriate.	Retain CE-P13 (Less hazard sensitive activities) as notified.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.242	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P13	Support	CE-P13 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P13 (Less hazard sensitive activities) as notified.	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.20	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Support	Supports this policy as it provides for additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area.	Retain CE-P14 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area) as notified.	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.137	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Support	Supports the policy as it enables additions to buildings that accommodate existing hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area where the additions enable the continued use of the existing building.	Retain CE-P14 (Additions to buildings for potential hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area) as notified.	Reject	No
Yvonne Weeber	340.36	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Support in part	CE-P14 is supported. However, the related planning maps should be clearly mapped using the language from CE-P14.	Retain CE-P14 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area) as notified.	Reject	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.316	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Support in part	Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect of use and development and coastal hazards. As noted above, these provisions should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected	Amend CE-P14 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area) to also address risks posed to natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.102	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.243	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Support	CE-P14 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P14 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area) as notified.	Reject	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.79	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Support in part	Supports the direction that additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities should be enabled within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area where the risk can be mitigated. However, it is difficult to provide mitigation measures in relation to tsunami risk, because of the remoteness of tsunami risk. It would also be reasonable for policy CE-P14 to enable uses of the same level of hazard sensitivity in additions to buildings, rather than enabling the continued existing use. The risk assessment framework in the Proposed Plan provides classifications of activities based on their risk level i.e. Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities. There is no reason for uses within the same level of hazard sensitivity to be differentiated.	Retain CE-P14 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area) as notified, subject to amendments.	Accept in part	Yes
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.80	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Amend	Supports the direction that additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities should be enabled within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area where the risk can be mitigated. However, it is difficult to provide mitigation measures in relation to tsunami risk, because of the remoteness of tsunami risk. It would also be reasonable for policy CE-P14 to enable uses of the same level of hazard sensitivity in additions to buildings, rather than enabling the continued existing use. The risk assessment framework in the Proposed Plan provides classifications of activities based on their risk level i.e. Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities. There is no reason for uses within the same level of hazard sensitivity to be differentiated.	Amend CE-P14 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area): Enable additions to buildings that accommodate existing potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area in the <u>Coastal Inundation Overlay</u> , where: 1. They enable the continued use <u>same level of hazard sensitivity of the existing use of the building</u> ; 2. The risk from the coastal hazard is low due to either: a. Proposed mitigation measures; or b. The size and the activity of the addition	Accept in part	Yes

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.5	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Oppose	Mitigation of risks from tsunami is possible with land use planning and building design, and tsunami risk should not be deleted from the policy. Tsunami are not a 'remote' risk. The current probability of a rupture of the Hikurangi subduction zone is calculated as 25% in the next 50 years. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes.	Disallow / Seeks that the part of this submission regarding hazard overlays be disallowed.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.253	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Support	CE-P14 is generally supported.	Retain CE-P14 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area) as notified.	Reject	No
Ministry of Education	400.64	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Support	Supports CE-P14 as proposed.	Retain CE-P14 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area) as notified.	Reject	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.91	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Support in part	Supports the direction that additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities should be enabled within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area where the risk can be mitigated.	Retain CE-P14 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area) with amendments.	Accept in part	Yes
Oyster Management Limited	404.92	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Amend	Supports the direction that additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities should be enabled within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area where the risk can be mitigated. However, considers it difficult to provide mitigation measures for tsunami risk because of the remoteness of the risk. Considers it would be reasonable for policy CE-P14 to enable uses of the same level of hazard sensitivity in additions to buildings, rather than enabling the continued existing use. The risk assessment framework in the Proposed Plan provides classifications of activities based on their risk level i.e. Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities. Considers there is no reason for uses within the same level of hazard sensitivity to be differentiated.	Amend CE-P14 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area) as follows: Enable additions to buildings that accommodate existing potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area <u>in the Coastal Inundation Overlay</u> , where: 1. They enable the continued use <u>same level of hazard sensitivity</u> of the existing <u>use of the building</u> ; 2. The risk from the coastal hazard is low due to either: a. Proposed mitigation measures; or b. The size and the activity of the addition.	Accept in part	Yes
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.74	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Oppose	Mitigation of risks from tsunami is possible with land use planning and building design, and tsunami risk should not be deleted from the policy. Tsunami are not a 'remote' risk. The current probability of a rupture of the Hikurangi subduction zone is calculated as 25% in the next 50 years. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes.	Disallow / Toka Tū Ake EQC seeks that the part of this submission regarding the flood hazard overlay be disallowed.	Reject	No
Investore Property Limited	405.42	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Support	Supports the policy as it provides for additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area.	Retain CE-R14 (Additions and alterations to existing buildings and structures within in the coastal environment: - Within coastal or riparian margins) as notified.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.320	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Oppose	Opposes this policy. The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes CE-P14 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.321	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Amend	Opposes this policy. The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Either delete or amend CE-P14 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area) as follows: Seeks that CE-P14 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area) is amended to only apply to the coastal inundation hazard areas and recognise the concept of tolerability.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.97	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Oppose	Mitigation of risks from tsunami is possible with land use planning and building design, and tsunami risk should not be deleted from the policy. Tsunami are not a remote risk. The current probability of a rupture of the Hikurangi subduction zone is calculated as 25% in the next 50 years. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes. Deletion of this provision is not an appropriate alternative to including risk tolerance, as it is important to limit development in areas at risk from natural hazards.	Disallow	Accept	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.38	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Support	Supports this policy as it provides for additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard area.	Retain CE-P14 (Additions to buildings) as notified.	Reject	No
Wellington City Council	266.113	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P15	Amend	Considers the policy isn't clear and needs minor changes in a manner consistent with the wording of CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas)	Amend CE-P15 (Subdivision and hazard sensitive activities within the low coastal hazard areas) as follows: Provide for hazard sensitive activities within the low coastal hazard area, or any subdivision where the building platform for a hazard sensitive activity activities is within the low coastal hazard area, where it can be demonstrated that: (...)	Accept	Yes
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.138	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P15	Support	Supports the policy as it provides for hazard sensitive activities within the low and medium coastal hazard areas.	Retain CE-P15 (Subdivision and hazard sensitive activities within the low coastal hazard areas) as notified.	Reject	No
Yvonne Weeber	340.37	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P15	Support in part	CE-P15 is generally supported, however it is unclear where the low, medium and high coastal hazard areas are on the map.	Not specified.	No relief specified	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.317	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P15	Support in part	Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect of use and development and coastal hazards. As noted above, these provisions should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected	Amend CE-P15 (Subdivision and hazard sensitive activities within the low coastal hazard areas) to also address risks posed to natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.103	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P15	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.213	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P15	Support	Considers this approach is appropriate.	Retain CE-P15 (Subdivision and hazard sensitive activities within the low coastal hazard areas) as notified.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.244	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P15	Support	CE-P15 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P15 (Subdivision and hazard sensitive activities within the low coastal hazard areas) as notified.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.254	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P15	Support	CE-P15 is generally supported.	Retain CE-P15 (Subdivision and hazard sensitive activities within the low coastal hazard areas) as notified.	Reject	No
Ministry of Education	400.65	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P15	Support	Supports CE-P15 as proposed. The submitter considers that where educational facilities are required in these areas, appropriate mitigation measures and evacuation plans should be implemented to ensure the safety of staff, students and the community.	Retain CE-P15 (Subdivision and hazard sensitive activities within the low coastal hazard areas) as notified.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.322	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P15	Oppose	Opposes this policy. The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes CE-P15 (Subdivision and hazard sensitive activities within the low coastal hazard areas) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.323	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P15	Amend	Opposes this policy. The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Either delete, or amend CE-P15 (Subdivision and hazard sensitive activities within the low coastal hazard areas) as follows: Seeks that CE-P15 (Subdivision and hazard sensitive activities within the low coastal hazard areas) is amended to only apply to the coastal inundation hazard areas and recognise the concept of tolerability.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	F570.98	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P15	Oppose	The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunamis are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate. Land use planning options must be considered, particularly when combined with other hazards along the coast (e.g. sea level rise, storm surge, liquefaction). The tsunami hazard overlay should not be deleted from the policy. Deletion of this provision is not an appropriate alternative to including risk tolerance, as it is important to limit development in areas at risk from natural hazards.	Disallow	Accept	No
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.21	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Support	Supports CE-P16 as it provides for potentially hazard-sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas.	Retain CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas) as notified.	Reject	No
Yvonne Weeber	340.38	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Support in part	CE-P16 is generally supported, however it is unclear where the low, medium and high coastal hazard areas are on the map.	Not specified.	No relief specified	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.318	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Support in part	Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect of use and development and coastal hazards. As noted above, these provisions should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected	Amend CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas) to also address risks posed to natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.104	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Oppose	<p>WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure; 	Disallow	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.214	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Amend	<p>Considers that amendments are necessary to have regard to the RPS Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as “as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)” and is in line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as practicable but is a clearer signal than reduce or do not increase, to actively look to bring down the risk in the design and planning of the development.</p>	<p>Amend CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas) as follows:</p> <p>Provide for potentially hazard-sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas, or any subdivision where the building platform for a potentially hazard-sensitive activity will be within the medium coastal hazard areas where it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The activity, building, or subdivision incorporates measures that <u>minimise</u> reduce or do not increase the risk to people and property from the coastal hazard; and <p>...</p>	Accept	Yes
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.36	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Support	<p>Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GWRC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that ‘minimise’ natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than ‘reduce’ and ‘reduce or do not increase’.</p>	Allow	Accept	Yes
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.245	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Support	<p>CE-P16 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.</p>	Retain CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas) as notified.	Reject	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.81	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Support in part	<p>Supports this provision to the extent that it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities within medium hazard areas where appropriate. However, as noted above, it is difficult to provide mitigation measures in relation to tsunami risk, because of the remoteness of tsunami risk, so it is appropriate to require safe evacuation routes to address tsunami risk.</p>	Retain CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas) as notified, subject to amendments.	Reject	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.82	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Amend	<p>Supports this provision to the extent that it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities within medium hazard areas where appropriate. However, as noted above, it is difficult to provide mitigation measures in relation to tsunami risk, because of the remoteness of tsunami risk, so it is appropriate to require safe evacuation routes to address tsunami risk.</p>	<p>Amend CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas):</p> <p>Provide for potentially hazard-sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas, or any subdivision where the building platform for a potentially hazard sensitive activity will be within the medium coastal hazard areas where it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The activity, building, or subdivision incorporates measures that reduce or do not increase the risk to people and property from the coastal hazard; and or 2. There is the ability to access safe evacuation routes for occupants of the building in case of a tsunami. 	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.6	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Oppose	<p>Mitigation of risks from tsunami and other coastal hazards are possible with land use planning and building design, and land use planning may be required to ensure that tsunami evacuation routes are secured. It is therefore appropriate to require measures that reduce or do not increase risk from activities within medium coastal hazard areas, as well as requiring safe tsunami evacuation routes.</p>	Disallow	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.255	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Support	CE-P16 is generally supported.	Retain CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas) as notified.	Reject	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.93	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Support in part	Supports the policy to the extent it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities within medium hazard areas where appropriate	Retain CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas) with amendments.	Reject	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.94	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Amend	Supports the policy to the extent it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities within medium hazard areas where appropriate. However, notes that it is difficult to provide mitigation measures for tsunami risk because of the remoteness of the risk, so considers that it is appropriate to require safe evacuation routes to address tsunami risk.	Amend CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas) as follows: Provide for potentially hazard-sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas, or any subdivision where the building platform for a potentially hazard sensitive activity will be within the medium coastal hazard areas where it can be demonstrated that: 1. The activity, building, or subdivision incorporates measures that reduce or do not increase the risk to people and property from the coastal hazard; and 2. There is the ability to access safe evacuation routes for occupants of the building in case of a tsunami.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.75	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Oppose	While the trigger of a tsunami cannot be mitigated, the consequences can be reduced through good design, evacuation planning and communication of the risk, and land use planning may be required to ensure that tsunami evacuation routes are secured. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes. It is therefore appropriate to require measures that reduce or do not increase risk from activities within medium coastal hazard areas, as well as requiring safe tsunami evacuation routes.	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.324	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Oppose	Opposes this policy. The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.325	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Amend	Opposes this policy. The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Either delete, or amend CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas) as follows: Seeks that CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas) is amended to only apply to the coastal inundation hazard areas and recognise the concept of tolerability.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.99	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Oppose	The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunamis are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate. Land use planning options must be considered, particularly when combined with other hazards along the coast (e.g. sea level rise, storm surge, liquefaction). The tsunami hazard overlay should not be deleted from the policy. Deletion of this provision is not an appropriate alternative to including risk tolerance, as it is important to limit development in areas at risk from natural hazards.	Disallow	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fabric Property Limited	425.39	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Support	Supports CE-P16 as it provides for potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas. Considers that is difficult to provide mitigation measures in relation to tsunami risk, because of the remoteness of tsunami risk, so it is appropriate to require safe evacuation routes to address tsunami risk.	Retain CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities) as notified.	Reject	No
Wellington City Council	266.114	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P17	Amend	Considers the policy isn't clear.	Amend CE-P17 (Hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas) as follows: Only allow hazard-sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area where, or any subdivision where the building platform for a hazard-sensitive activity will be within the medium coastal hazard area, where it can be demonstrated that: (...)	Accept	Yes
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.139	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P17	Support	Supports the policy as it provides for hazard sensitive activities within the low and medium coastal hazard areas.	Retain CE-P17 (Hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas) as notified.	Reject	No
Yvonne Weeber	340.39	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P17	Support in part	CE-P17 is generally supported, however it is unclear where the low, medium and high coastal hazard areas are on the map.	Not specified.	No relief specified	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.319	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P17	Support in part	Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect of use and development and coastal hazards. As noted above, these provisions should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected	Amend CE-P17 (Hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas) to also address risks posed to natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.105	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P17	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.215	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P17	Amend	Considers that amendments are necessary to have regard to the RPS Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as "as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)" and is in line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as practicable but is a clearer signal than reduce or do not increase, to actively look to bring down the risk in the design and planning of the development.	Amend CE-P17 (Hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas) as follows: Only allow hazard-sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area where, or any subdivision where the building platform for a hazard-sensitive activity will be within the medium coastal hazard area, where it can be demonstrated that: 1. The activity, building or subdivision incorporates measures that demonstrate that minimise reduce or not increase the risk to people and property from the coastal hazard, and; ...	Accept	Yes
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.246	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P17	Support	CE-P17 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P17 (Hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas) as notified.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.83	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P17	Support in part	Supports this provision to the extent that it enables activities in the medium coastal hazard areas. However, due to the extent of the high coastal hazard area and the extent of potentially hazard sensitive activities, this policy should also apply in those scenarios.	Retain CE-P17 (Hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas) as notified, subject to amendments.	Reject	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.84	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P17	Support in part	Supports this provision to the extent that it enables activities in the medium coastal hazard areas. However, due to the extent of the high coastal hazard area and the extent of potentially hazard sensitive activities, this policy should also apply in those scenarios.	Amend CE-P17 (Hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas) so that it also applies to hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard areas	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.7	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P17	Oppose	It is not appropriate to allow hazard-sensitive activities, which include emergency facilities, hospitals, major hazardous facilities and childcare, within the high coastal hazard area, not only due to the current risk but because that risk will increase in the near future due to the effects of climate change.	Disallow	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.256	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P17	Support	CE-P17 is generally supported.	Retain CE-P17 (Hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas) as notified.	Reject	No
Ministry of Education	400.66	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P17	Support	Supports CE-P17 as proposed. The submitter considers that where educational facilities are required in these areas, appropriate mitigation measures and evacuation plans should be implemented to ensure the safety of staff, students and the community.	Retain CE-P17 (Hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas) as notified.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.326	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P17	Oppose	Opposes this policy. The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes CE-P17 (Hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.327	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P17	Amend	Opposes this policy. The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Either delete, or amend CE-P17 (Hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas) as follows: Seeks that CE-P17 (Hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas) is amended to only apply to the coastal inundation hazard areas and recognise the concept of tolerability.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.100	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P17	Oppose	The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunamis are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate. Land use planning options must be considered, particularly when combined with other hazards along the coast (e.g. sea level rise, storm surge, liquefaction). The tsunami hazard overlay should not be deleted from the policy. Deletion of this provision is not an appropriate alternative to including risk tolerance, as it is important to limit development in areas at risk from natural hazards.	Disallow	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.22	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Amend	<p>Considers that the use of the term “avoid” is unnecessarily onerous and suggests that the establishment of Hazard-Sensitive Activities and Potentially-Hazard-Sensitive Activities within the High Coastal Hazard Areas should not occur at all.</p> <p>The requested amendment would provide appropriate policy support to the Restricted Discretionary status in rule CE-R20.</p> <p>The Restricted Discretionary status is enabling of activities, potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities in high coastal hazard areas within the City Centre Zone and this needs to be recognised with appropriate wording in the supporting policy.</p>	<p>Amend CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area) as follows:</p> <p>Avoid Only allow Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area or any subdivision where the building platform for a potentially hazard sensitive activity or hazard sensitive activity will be within the high coastal hazard area where it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The activity, building or subdivision has an operational or functional need to locate within the high coastal hazard area and locating outside of these high coastal hazard areas is not a practicable option; 2. The activity, building, or subdivision incorporates measures that demonstrate that reduce or <u>do</u> not increase the risk to people, and property from the coastal hazard; 3. There is the ability to access safe evacuation routes for occupants of the building from the coastal hazard; and 4. The activity does not involve the removal or modification of a natural system or feature that provides protection to other properties from the natural hazard. 	Reject	No
Wellington City Council	266.115	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Amend	<p>Considers the policy isn't clear and requires a consequential change to remove the capital 'H'.</p>	<p>Amend CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area) as follows:</p> <p>Avoid Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area, or any subdivision where the building platform for a potentially hazard sensitive activity or hazard sensitive activity will be within the high coastal hazard area, <u>except</u> where it can be demonstrated that: (...)</p>	Accept	Yes
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.140	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Support	<p>Supports the policy as it allows hazard sensitive activities within the high coastal hazard area where the activity has an operational or functional need to locate within the high coastal hazard area and locating outside of these areas is not a practicable option. However, FENZ considers the wording of CE-P18 is unclear and seeks an amendment to address this.</p>	<p>Retain (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area), with amendment.</p>	Accept	Yes
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.141	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Amend	<p>Supports the policy as it allows hazard sensitive activities within the high coastal hazard area where the activity has an operational or functional need to locate within the high coastal hazard area and locating outside of these areas is not a practicable option. However, FENZ considers the wording of CE-P18 is unclear and seeks an amendment to address this.</p>	<p>Amend CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area) as follows:</p> <p>Avoid Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area or any subdivision where the building platform for a potentially hazard sensitive activity or hazard sensitive activity will be within the high coastal hazard area where <u>unless</u> it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The activity, building or subdivision has an operational or functional need to locate within the high coastal hazard area and locating outside of these high coastal hazard areas is not a practicable option; 	Accept	Yes
Dawid Wojasz	295.5	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that the coastal hazard overlays put much of the CBD in a high or medium hazard area, limiting development within the central city. Density in the Central city should be encouraged, and the hazard can be dealt with as an engineering issue.</p> <p>If the City Centre is not exempt from the overlay then point one in CE-P18 should be removed or amended.</p>	<p>Opposes application of High, Medium and Low Coastal Hazard overlay within the City Centre and seeks amendment.</p>	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Dawid Wojasz	295.6	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Amend	<p>Considers that the coastal hazard overlays put much of the CBD in a high or medium hazard area, limiting development within the central city. Density in the Central city should be encouraged, and the hazard can be dealt with as an engineering issue. (Option A)</p> <p>If the City Centre is not exempt from the overlay then point one in CE-P18 should be removed or amended.</p>	<p>Seeks that CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area) is amended as follows:</p> <p>Avoid Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area or any subdivision where the building platform for a potentially hazard sensitive activity or hazard sensitive activity will be within the high coastal hazard area where it can be demonstrated that:</p> <p>1. The activity, building or subdivision has an operational or functional need to locate within the high coastal hazard area and locating outside of these high coastal hazard areas is not a practicable option;</p> <p>1. 2. The activity, building, or subdivision incorporates measures that demonstrate that reduce or not increase the risk to people, and property from the coastal hazard;</p> <p>2. 3. There is the ability to access safe evacuation routes for occupants of the building from the coastal hazard; and</p> <p>3. 4. The activity does not involve the removal or modification of a natural system or feature that provides protection to other properties from the natural hazard.</p>	Reject	No
Dawid Wojasz	295.7	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Amend	<p>Considers that the coastal hazard overlays put much of the CBD in a high or medium hazard area, limiting development within the central city. Density in the Central city should be encouraged, and the hazard can be dealt with as an engineering issue. (Option B)</p>	<p>Seeks that CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area) is amended to include high density as functional need to locate a building within the high hazard area.</p>	Reject	No
Yvonne Weeber	340.40	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Support in part	<p>CE-P18 is generally supported, however it is unclear where the low, medium and high coastal hazard areas are on the map.</p>	<p>Not specified.</p>	No relief specified	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.320	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Support in part	<p>Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect of use and development and coastal hazards. As noted above, these provisions should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected</p>	<p>Amend CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area) to also address risks posed to natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.</p>	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.106	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Oppose	<p>WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably:</p> <p>1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified;</p> <p>2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and,</p> <p>3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;</p>	<p>Disallow</p>	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.216	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Amend	Considers that amendments are necessary to have regard to the RPS Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as "as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)" and is in line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as practicable but is a clearer signal than reduce or do not increase, to actively look to bring down the risk in the design and planning of the development.	Amend CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area) as follows: Avoid Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area or any subdivision where the building platform for a potentially hazard sensitive activity or hazard sensitive activity will be within the high coastal hazard area where it can be demonstrated that... 1. The activity, building or subdivision incorporates measures that demonstrate minimise reduce or not increase the risk to people and property from the coastal hazard, and...	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.37	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GWRC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that 'minimise' natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than 'reduce' and 'reduce or do not increase'.	Allow	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.247	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Support	CE-P18 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area) as notified.	Reject	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.85	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Oppose	Opposes this provision as it is not practical to avoid hazard sensitive and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area.	Delete CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area).	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.8	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Oppose	It is not appropriate to allow hazard-sensitive activities, which include emergency facilities, hospitals, major hazardous facilities and childcare, within the high coastal hazard area, not only due to the current risk but because that risk will increase in the near future due to the effects of climate change.	Disallow	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.257	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Support in part	CE-P18 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area) with amendment.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.258	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Amend	Considers that CE-P18 should be amended to enable the potential for Hazard Sensitive Activities and Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities in the High Coastal Hazard Area to be provided in some circumstances where the risks can be managed through mitigation measures.	Amend CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area) as follows: Avoid <u>Only allow</u> Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area or any subdivision where the building platform for a potentially hazard sensitive activity or hazard sensitive activity will be within the high coastal hazard area where it can be demonstrated that: 1. The activity, building or subdivision has an operational or functional need to locate within the high coastal hazard area and locating outside of these high coastal hazard areas is not a practicable option; <u>or is within an existing urban area</u> ; 2. The activity, building, or subdivision incorporates measures that demonstrate that it <u>reduces or does not increase</u> the risk to people, and property from the coastal hazard; ...	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.64	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Oppose	The category of high coastal hazard area is afforded to those areas where the level of risk from coastal hazard is such that mitigation is not sufficient to bring risk to a tolerable level. As such avoidance of subdivision and development in these areas is appropriate even within an existing urban area. Coastal hazard risk is going to increase in the near future with the impact of climate change and sea level rise, and high occupancy developments in high risk areas will expose more people to increasing risk.	Disallow	Accept	No
Ministry of Education	400.67	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Support	Supports CE-P18 as proposed. The submitter considers that where educational facilities are required in these areas, appropriate mitigation measures and evacuation plans should be implemented to ensure the safety of staff, students and the community.	Retain CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area) as notified.	Reject	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.95	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Oppose in part	Opposes CE-P18 in part as the submitter considers it is not practical to avoid hazard sensitive and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the High Coastal Tsunami Hazard Area.	Amend CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area) as follows: Avoid hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the High Coastal Hazard area Inundation Overlay or any subdivision where the building platform for a potentially hazard sensitive activity or hazard sensitive activity will be within the High Coastal Hazard area Inundation Overlay where it can be demonstrated that: 1. The activity, building or subdivision has an operational or functional need to locate within the high Coastal Hazard area Inundation Overlay and locating outside of these high Coastal Hazard areas Inundation Overlay is not a practicable option; 2. The activity, building, or subdivision incorporates measures that demonstrate that reduce or not increase the risk to people, and property from the coastal inundation hazard; 3. There is the ability to access safe evacuation routes for occupants of the building from the coastal inundation hazard; and 4. The activity does not involve the removal or modification of a natural system or feature that provides protection to other properties from the natural hazard.	Reject	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.96	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Amend	Considers it is not practical to avoid hazard sensitive and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the High Coastal Tsunami Hazard Area.	Amend CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area) as follows: Avoid hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the High Coastal Hazard area Inundation Overlay or any subdivision where the building platform for a potentially hazard sensitive activity or hazard sensitive activity will be within the High Coastal Hazard area Inundation Overlay where it can be demonstrated that: 1. The activity, building or subdivision has an operational or functional need to locate within the high Coastal Hazard area Inundation Overlay and locating outside of these high Coastal Hazard areas Inundation Overlay is not a practicable option; 2. The activity, building, or subdivision incorporates measures that demonstrate that reduce or not increase the risk to people, and property from the coastal inundation hazard; 3. There is the ability to access safe evacuation routes for occupants of the building from the coastal inundation hazard; and 4. The activity does not involve the removal or modification of a natural system or feature that provides protection to other properties from the natural hazard.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.76	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Oppose	It is not appropriate to allow hazard-sensitive activities, which include emergency facilities, hospitals, major hazardous facilities and childcare, within the high coastal tsunami hazard area. While the trigger of a tsunami cannot be mitigated, the consequences can be reduced through good design, evacuation planning and communication of the risk (refer to GNS guidance on land use planning which incorporates tsunami modelling).	Disallow	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fabric Property Limited	425.40	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Oppose in part	<p>Seeks amendment of CE-P18 to change the word "avoid" to "only allow where...".</p> <p>The use of the term "avoid" is unnecessarily onerous and suggests that the establishment of Hazard-Sensitive Activities and Potentially Hazard-Sensitive Activities within the High Coastal Hazard Areas should not occur at all.</p> <p>The requested amendment would provide appropriate policy support to the Restricted Discretionary status in rule CE-R20. The Restricted Discretionary status is enabling of Potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities in high coastal hazard areas within the City Centre Zone and this needs to be recognised with appropriate wording in the supporting policy.</p>	Opposes CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities) in part and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.41	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Amend	<p>Seeks amendment of CE-P18 to change the word "avoid" to "only allow where...".</p> <p>The use of the term "avoid" is unnecessarily onerous and suggests that the establishment of Hazard-Sensitive Activities and Potentially Hazard-Sensitive Activities within the High Coastal Hazard Areas should not occur at all.</p> <p>The requested amendment would provide appropriate policy support to the Restricted Discretionary status in rule CE-R20. The Restricted Discretionary status is enabling of Potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities in high coastal hazard areas within the City Centre Zone and this needs to be recognised with appropriate wording in the supporting policy.</p>	<p>Amend CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities) as follows:</p> <p>Avoid <u>Only allow</u> Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the...</p> <p>2. The activity, building, or subdivision incorporates measures that demonstrate that reduce or <u>do</u> not increase the risk to people, and property from the coastal hazard;</p> <p>...</p>	Reject	No
Wellington City Council	266.116	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P19	Amend	<p>Considers the policy needs minor amendments for consistency with the rest of the chapter/plan.</p>	<p>Amend CE-P19 (Subdivision, use and development which will not be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the Airport, operation port Activities, passenger port facilities⁴ and rail activities in the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows:</p> <p>Subdivision, use and development which will not be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the Airport, operational port Activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays</p> <p>Enable subdivision, development and use associated with the Airport, operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Coastal Hazard Overlays, where they do not involve the construction of new buildings which will be occupied by members of the public, or more than 10 employees associated with either of these activities or the creation of vacant allotments.</p>	Accept	Yes
Yvonne Weeber	340.41	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P19	Support in part	<p>CE-P19 is generally supported, however it is unclear where the low, medium and high coastal hazard areas are on the map.</p>	Not specified.	No relief specified	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.321	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P19	Support in part	<p>Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect of use and development and coastal hazards. As noted above, these provisions should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected</p>	<p>Amend CE-P19 (Subdivision, use and development which will not be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the Airport, operation port Activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays) to also address risks posed to natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.</p>	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.107	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P19	Oppose	<p>WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure; 	Disallow	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.217	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P19	Support	Considers this approach is appropriate.	Retain CE-P19 (Subdivision, use and development which will not be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the Airport, operation port Activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified.	Accept – noting amendments recommended in response to other submission points	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.248	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P19	Support	CE-P19 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P19 (Subdivision, use and development which will not be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the Airport, operation port Activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified.	Accept – noting amendments recommended in response to other submission points	No
CentrePort Limited	402.116	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P19	Support in part	Supports policy, but opposes the structure of the plan managing Natural Hazards as it is confusing. There are Natural Hazards provisions in the infrastructure chapter, the Natural Hazards Chapter as well as this chapter dealing with coastal hazards in the Coastal Environment. For CentrePort related matters you potentially have to look at all three. This is considered inefficient and could lead to duplication. Of the hazards listed CentrePort has fault hazard, liquefaction, coastal inundation and tsunami (high) risk.	Seeks that all Natural Hazards provisions are consolidated in the same place or stronger cross-referencing is provided.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.328	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P19	Oppose	<p>Opposes this policy.</p> <p>The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]</p>	Opposes CE-P19 (Subdivision, use and development which will not be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the Airport, operation port Activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.329	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P19	Amend	<p>Opposes this policy.</p> <p>The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Either delete, or amend CE-P19 (Subdivision, use and development which will not be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the Airport, operation port Activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as follows:</p> <p>Seeks that CE-P19 (Subdivision, use and development which will not be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the Airport, operation port Activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays) is amended to only apply to the coastal inundation hazard areas and recognise the concept of tolerability.</p>	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.101	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P19	Oppose	The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunamis are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate. Land use planning options must be considered, particularly when combined with other hazards along the coast (e.g. sea level rise, storm surge, liquefaction). The tsunami hazard overlay should not be deleted from the policy. Deletion of this provision is not an appropriate alternative to including risk tolerance, as it is important to limit development in areas at risk from natural hazards.	Disallow	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.100	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P19	Support	Supports policy that enables subdivision, development and use associated within the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Coastal Hazards Overlay.	Retain CE-P19 (Subdivision, use and development which will not be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the Airport, operation port Activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified.	Accept – noting amendments recommended in response to other submission points	No
Guardians of the Bays	452.25	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P19	Not specified	Submitter is 'neutral' on provision. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.	No relief specified	No
Yvonne Weeber	340.42	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P20	Support in part	CE-P20 is generally supported, however it is unclear where the low, medium and high coastal hazard areas are on the map.	Not specified.	No relief specified	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.322	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P20	Support in part	Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect of use and development and coastal hazards. As noted above, these provisions should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected	Amend CE-P20 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays) to also address risks posed to natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.108	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P20	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.218	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P20	Amend	Considers that amendments are necessary to have regard to the RPS Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies S1 and S2. Minimise is defined as "as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)" and is in line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as practicable but is a clearer signal than reduce or do not increase, to actively look to bring down the risk in the design and planning of the development.	Amend CE-P20 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as follows: Manage subdivision, development and use associated with the Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Coastal Hazard Overlays where they involve the construction of new buildings which will be occupied by members of the public, or over 10 employees associated with either of these activities by ensuring that: 1. The activity, building or subdivision incorporates measures that <u>minimise</u> do not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure; and ...	Accept	Yes
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.38	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P20	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GWRC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that 'minimise' natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than 'reduce' and 'reduce or do not increase'.	Allow	Accept	Yes
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.249	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P20	Support	CE-P20 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P20 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
CentrePort Limited	402.117	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P20	Support in part	Supports policy, but opposes the structure of the plan managing Natural Hazards as it is confusing. There are Natural Hazards provisions in the infrastructure chapter, the Natural Hazards Chapter as well as this chapter dealing with coastal hazards in the Coastal Environment. For CentrePort related matters you potentially have to look at all three. This is considered inefficient and could lead to duplication. Of the hazards listed CentrePort has fault hazard, liquefaction, coastal inundation and tsunami (high) risk.	Seeks that all Natural Hazards provisions are consolidated in the same place or stronger cross-referencing is provided.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.330	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P20	Oppose	Opposes this policy. The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes CE-P20 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.331	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P20	Amend	Opposes this policy. The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Either delete, or amend CE-P20 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as follows: Seeks that CE-P20 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays) is amended to only apply to the coastal inundation hazard areas and recognise the concept of tolerability.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.102	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P20	Oppose	The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunamis are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate. Land use planning options must be considered, particularly when combined with other hazards along the coast (e.g. sea level rise, storm surge, liquefaction). The tsunami hazard overlay should not be deleted from the policy. Deletion of this provision is not an appropriate alternative to including risk tolerance, as it is important to limit development in areas at risk from natural hazards.	Disallow	Accept	No
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.101	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P20	Support	Supports policy that enables subdivision, development and use associated within the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Coastal Hazards Overlay.	Retain CE-P20 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified.	Reject	No
Guardians of the Bays	452.26	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P20	Not specified	Submitter is 'neutral' on provision. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.	No relief specified	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.323	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P21	Support in part	Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect of use and development and coastal hazards. As noted above, these provisions should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected	Amend CE-P21 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will not be occupied by members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays): Enable subdivision, development and use associated within the City Centre Zone and within all of the Coastal Hazard Overlays, where they do not involve the construction of new buildings which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees or the creation of vacant allotments.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.109	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P21	Oppose	<p>WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure; 	Disallow	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.219	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P21	Support	Considers this approach is appropriate.	Retain CE-P21 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will not be occupied by members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.250	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P21	Support	CE-P21 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P21 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will not be occupied by members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified.	Accept	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.86	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P21	Amend	Supports this provision to the extent that it enables development in the coastal hazard overlays in the City Centre zone in some instances. However, it is impractical to only enable activities in buildings which will not be occupied by employees, and this would be inconsistent with the purpose and objectives and policies in the City Centre zone. The city centre is a major employment hub and contains entertainment, educational, government and commercial activities which involve employees.	<p>Amend CE-P21 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will not be occupied by members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays):</p> <p>Enable subdivision, development and use associated within the City Centre Zone and within all of the Coastal Hazard Overlays, where they do not involve the construction of new buildings which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees or the creation of vacant allotments</p>	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.259	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P21	Oppose	CE-P21 is opposed as notified. Considers that the policy places inappropriate restrictions on the City Centre Zone. It sought that this policy is deleted, and considered that more appropriate outcomes are achieved by CE-P22.	Delete CE-P21 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will not be occupied by members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) in its entirety.	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.84	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P21	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose the deletion of CE-P21 as this would not have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1.	Disallow / Seeks that CE-P21 is retained as notified.	Accept	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.97	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P21	Support in part	Supports the policy in that it enables development in the coastal hazard overlays in the City Centre in some instances.	Retain CE-P21 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will not be occupied by members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) with amendments.	Reject	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.99	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P21	Amend	<p>Supports the policy in that it enables development in the coastal hazard overlays in the City Centre in some instances.</p> <p>However, considers it is impractical to enable only activities in buildings that will not be occupied by employees, and this would be inconsistent with the purpose and objectives and policies in the City Centre zone. The city centre is a major employment hub and contains entertainment, educational, government and commercial activities which involve employees.</p>	<p>Amend CE-P21 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will not be occupied by members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as follows:</p> <p>Enable subdivision, development and use associated within the City Centre Zone and within all of the Coastal Hazard Overlays, where they do not involve the construction of new buildings which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees or the creation of vacant allotments."</p>	Reject	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.42	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P21	Support in part	<p>Supports this provision to the extent that it enables development in the coastal hazard overlays in the City Centre zone in some instances.</p> <p>However, it is impractical to only enable activities in buildings which will not be occupied by employees, and this would be inconsistent with the purpose and objectives and policies in the City Centre zone. The city centre is intended to be the primary centre for the region and contains entertainment, educational, government and commercial activities which involve employees.</p>	Retain Policy CE-P21 (Subdivision), with amendment.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fabric Property Limited	425.43	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P21	Amend	Supports this provision to the extent that it enables development in the coastal hazard overlays in the City Centre zone in some instances. However, it is impractical to only enable activities in buildings which will not be occupied by employees, and this would be inconsistent with the purpose and objectives and policies in the City Centre zone. The city centre is intended to be the primary centre for the region and contains entertainment, educational, government and commercial activities which involve employees.	Amend Policy CE-P21 (Subdivision) as follows: ... Enable subdivision, development and use associated within the City Centre Zone and within all of the Coastal Hazard Overlays, where they do not involve the construction of new buildings which will be occupied by members of the public, <u>or employees</u> or the creation of vacant allotments.	Reject	No
Wellington City Council	266.117	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	Amend CE-P22 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will be occupied by members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as follows: Manage subdivision, development and use within the City Centre Zone and within all of the Coastal Hazard Overlays, where they involve the construction of new buildings which will be occupied by members of the public, employees or result in the creation of a vacant allotment by ensuring that: (...)	Accept	Yes
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.324	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22	Support in part	Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect of use and development and coastal hazards. As noted above, these provisions should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected	Amend CE-P22 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will be occupied by members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) to also address risks posed to natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.110	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.220	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22	Amend	Considers that amendments are necessary to have regard to the RPS Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as "as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)" and is in line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as practicable but is a clearer signal than reduce or do not increase, to actively look to bring down the risk in the design and planning of the development.	Amend CE-P22 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will be occupied by members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as follows: Manage subdivision, development and use within the City Centre Zone and within all of the Coastal Hazard Overlays, where they involve the construction of new buildings which will be occupied by members of the public, employees or result in the creation of a vacant allotment by ensuring that 1. The activity, building or subdivision incorporates measures that <u>minimise reduce or not increase</u> the risk to people, and property; and...	Accept	Yes
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.39	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GWRC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that 'minimise' natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than 'reduce' and 'reduce or do not increase'.	Allow	Accept	Yes

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.251	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22	Support	CE-P22 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P22 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will be occupied by members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified.	Reject	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.87	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22	Amend	Supports this provision to the extent that it recognises that development in the coastal hazard overlays in the City Centre zone is appropriate in some instances. This is important because the CBD is a social and economic hub of Wellington and it is important to recognise the existing investment in the CBD. However, as noted above, it is difficult to provide mitigation measures in relation to tsunami risk, because of the remoteness of tsunami risk, so it is appropriate to require safe evacuation routes to address tsunami risk.	Amend CE-P22 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will be occupied by members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays): Manage subdivision, development and use within the City Centre Zone and within all of the Coastal Hazard Overlays, where they involve the construction of new buildings which will be occupied by members of the public, employees or result in the creation of a vacant allotment by ensuring that 1. The activity, building or subdivision incorporates measures that reduce or not increase the risk to people, and property; and or 2. There is the ability to access safe evacuation routes for occupants of the building from the coastal hazard.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.260	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22	Support	CE-P22 is supported as notified.	Retain CE-P22 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will be occupied by members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified.	Reject	No
Ministry of Education	400.68	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22	Support	Supports CE-P22 as proposed. The submitter considers that where educational facilities are required in these areas, appropriate mitigation measures and evacuation plans should be implemented to ensure the safety of staff, students and the community.	Retain CE-P22 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will be occupied by members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified.	Reject	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.100	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22	Support in part	Supports the policy to the extent it recognises development in coastal hazard overlays in the City Centre is appropriate in some instances, given it is the social and economic hub of Wellington and there is significant existing investment in the CBD.	Retain CE-P22 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will be occupied by members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) with amendments.	Reject	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.101	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22	Amend	Supports the policy to the extent it recognises development in coastal hazard overlays in the City Centre is appropriate in some instances, given it is the social and economic hub of Wellington and there is significant existing investment in the CBD. However, considers it is difficult to provide mitigation measures in relation to tsunami risk, because of the remoteness of tsunami risk, so it is appropriate to require safe evacuation routes to address tsunami risk.	Amend CE-P22 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will be occupied by members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays): Manage subdivision, development and use within the City Centre Zone and within all of the Coastal Hazard Overlays, where they involve the construction of new buildings which will be occupied by members of the public, employees or result in the creation of a vacant allotment by ensuring that 1. The activity, building or subdivision incorporates measures that reduce or not increase the risk to people, and property; and or 2. There is the ability to access safe evacuation routes for occupants of the building from the coastal hazard	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	F570.77	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22	Oppose	While the trigger of a tsunami cannot be mitigated, the consequences can be reduced through good design, evacuation planning and communication of the risk. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes. It is appropriate to require measures that reduce or do not increase risk from activities within medium coastal hazard areas, as well as requiring safe tsunami evacuation routes (refer to GNS guidance on land use planning which incorporates tsunami modelling).	Disallow	Reject	No
Reading Wellington Properties Limited	441.2	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22	Support	Supports CE-P22 as it clearly allows for development and use of sites within the City Centre Zone and within all Coastal Hazard Overlays, provided the development includes appropriate mitigation.	Retain CE-P22 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will be occupied by members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified.	Reject	No
Yvonne Weeber	340.43	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23	Support	CE-P23 is supported. The protection, restoration and enhancement of coastal natural systems and features to reduce risks posed by coastal hazards to people, property and infrastructure are supported.	Retain CE-P23 (Natural systems and features) as notified.	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.325	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23	Support in part	Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect of use and development and coastal hazards. As noted above, these provisions should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected	Amend CE-P23 (Natural systems and features): Protect, restore, and enhance natural systems and features where they will reduce the existing risk posed by coastal hazards to people, property, and infrastructure, <u>natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.</u>	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.111	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.221	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23	Support	Considers this approach is appropriate.	Retain CE-P23 (Natural systems and features) as notified.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.252	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23	Support	CE-P23 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P23 (Natural systems and features) as notified.	Accept	No
Guardians of the Bays	452.27	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23	Support	Supports the protection, restoration and enhancement of coastal natural systems and features to reduce risks posed by coastal hazards to people, property and infrastructure.	Retain CE-23 (Natural systems and features) as notified.	Accept	No
Wellington City Council	266.118	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P24	Amend	Considers the policy needs minor wording change.	Amend CE-P24 (Coastal hazard mitigation works involving green infrastructure) as follows: Enable green infrastructure undertaken by a Crown entity or their nominated contractors or agents within the identified Coastal Hazard Overlay where <u>this</u> they will reduce the risk from coastal hazards to people, property and infrastructure.	Accept	Yes
Yvonne Weeber	340.44	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P24	Support	CE-P24 is supported. The use of green infrastructure in coastal hazard mitigation is supported.	Retain CE-P24 (Coastal hazard mitigation works involving green infrastructure) as notified.	Reject	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.326	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P24	Support in part	Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect of use and development and coastal hazards. As noted above, these provisions should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected	Amend CE-P24 (Coastal hazard mitigation works involving green infrastructure): Enable green infrastructure undertaken by a Crown entity or their nominated contractors or agents within the identified Coastal Hazard Overlay where they will reduce the risk from coastal hazards to people, property and infrastructure, <u>natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.</u>	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.112	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P24	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.222	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P24	Amend	Considers that amendments are required to have regard to Policy 52 in Proposed RPS Change 1. Green infrastructure has been defined in the WCC PDP with a strong focus on engineering systems that mimic natural systems, however there are other natural hazard mitigation measures that the change to the RPS directs consideration of, which aren't captured by green infrastructure. We therefore seek for this policy to be broadened.	Seeks to amend policy to include non-structural, soft engineering or mātauranga Māori approaches.	Accept in part	Yes
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.253	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P24	Support	CE-P24 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P24 (Coastal hazard mitigation works involving green infrastructure) as notified.	Reject	No
Guardians of the Bays	452.28	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P24	Support	Supports the use of green infrastructure in coastal hazard mitigation.	Retain CE-24 (Coastal hazard mitigation works involving green infrastructure) as notified.	Reject	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.327	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P25	Support in part	Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect of use and development and coastal hazards. As noted above, these provisions should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected	Amend CE-P25 (Green infrastructure and planning coastal hazard mitigation works): Encourage green infrastructure measures when undertaking planned coastal hazard mitigation works within the identified Coastal Hazard Overlays where they will reduce the risk from coastal hazards risk to people, property and infrastructure, natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.113	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P25	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.223	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P25	Amend	Considers that amendments are required to have regard to Policy 52 in Proposed RPS Change 1. Green infrastructure has been defined in the WCC PDP with a strong focus on engineering systems that mimic natural systems, however there are other natural hazard mitigation measures that the change to the RPS directs consideration of, which aren't captured by green infrastructure. We therefore seek for this policy to be broadened.	Amend CE-P25 (Green infrastructure and planning coastal hazard mitigation works) to include non-structural, soft engineering or mātauranga Māori approaches.	Accept in part	Yes
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.254	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P25	Support	CE-P25 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P25 (Green infrastructure and planning coastal hazard mitigation works) as notified.	Reject	No
Yvonne Weeber	340.45	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26	Not specified	[No specific reason given - refer to original submission].	Not specified.	No relief specified	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.328	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26	Support in part	Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect of use and development and coastal hazards. As noted above, these provisions should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected	Amend CE-P26 (Hard engineering measures) to also address risks posed to natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.114	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.224	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26	Amend	Considers that amendments are required to have regard to Policy 52 in Proposed RPS Change 1. Green infrastructure has been defined in the WCC PDP with a strong focus on engineering systems that mimic natural systems, however there are other natural hazard mitigation measures that the change to the RPS directs consideration of, which aren't captured by green infrastructure. We therefore seek for this policy to be broadened.	Amend CE-P26 (Hard engineering measures) to include non-structural, soft engineering or mātauranga Māori approaches.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.255	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26	Support	CE-P26 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P26 (Hard engineering measures) as notified.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.332	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26	Oppose	The directive nature of this policy, coupled with the conjunction "and" sets an unduly onerous threshold for hard engineering measures which protect regionally significant infrastructure. It also discourages proactive maintenance and repair of hard engineering structures, as the policy pathway only triggers (due to the conjunction) when there is an 'immediate risk to life or property'. Leaving such structures until the risk reaches this threshold may also result in a larger scale repair/replacement programme, resulting in larger environmental effects and costs. Considers that the conjunction 'or' should be used between each limb. Considers that this policy should relate to new sea walls, and not the upgrading, maintenance or repair of existing sea walls (or existing sea walls that protect existing regionally significant infrastructure.	Opposes CE-P26 (Hard engineering measures) and seeks amendment.	Accept in part	Yes

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.333	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26	Amend	<p>The directive nature of this policy, coupled with the conjunction “and” sets an unduly onerous threshold for hard engineering measures which protect regionally significant infrastructure. It also discourages proactive maintenance and repair of hard engineering structures, as the policy pathway only triggers (due to the conjunction) when there is an ‘immediate risk to life or property’.</p> <p>Leaving such structures until the risk reaches this threshold may also result in a larger scale repair/replacement programme, resulting in larger environmental effects and costs.</p> <p>Considers that the conjunction ‘or’ should be used between each limb.</p> <p>Considers that this policy should relate to new sea walls, and not the upgrading, maintenance or repair of existing sea walls (or existing sea walls that protect existing regionally significant infrastructure.</p>	<p>Either delete, or amend CE-P26 (Hard engineering measures) as follows:</p> <p>Only allow for <u>new</u> hard engineering measures for the reduction of the risk from coastal hazards where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The engineering measures are needed to protect existing nationally and regionally significant infrastructure and it can be demonstrated that there is no practicable alternative; <u>or</u> 2. There is an immediate risk to life or private property from the coastal hazard; <u>or</u> 3. The construction of the hard engineering measures will not <u>create an intolerable</u> increase the risk from Coastal Hazards on adjacent properties that are not protected by the hard engineering measures; <u>or</u> 4. It avoids the modification or alteration of natural features and systems in a way that would compromise their function as natural defences; <u>or</u> 5. Hard engineering structures are designed to minimise adverse effects on the coastal environment; <u>and/or</u> 6. <u>Significant natural features and systems and any adverse effects are avoided; remedied or mitigated; or</u> 7. <u>It can be demonstrated that green infrastructure measures would not provide an appropriate level of protection in relation to the significance of the risk.</u> 	Accept in part	Yes
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.102	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26	Support	Supports policy which recognises that, in some instances, hard engineering measures within the coastal environment are necessary to reduce an immediate risk of serious harm to property or infrastructure.	Retain CE-P26 (Hard engineering measures) as notified.	Reject	No
Yvonne Weeber	340.60	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R16	Support	CE-R16 is generally supported, but it is unclear where the Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal Hazard Area and the High Coastal Hazard Area are in the coastal environment. These terms do not appear on the Wellington City Proposed District Plan maps. Submission may be amended in the future.	Retain CE-R16 (Less hazard sensitive activities within all the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.348	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R16	Support in part	Considers the provisions of this chapter should also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected. Ensure rules either cross reference appropriate provisions from other chapters, or include provisions to address adverse effects on these matters	Amend CE-R16 (Less hazard sensitive activities within all the Coastal Hazard Overlays) to acknowledge natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values are protected via reference to appropriate provisions from other chapters or by including provisions in the rule.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.125	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R16	Oppose	<p>WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure; 	Disallow	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.271	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R16	Support	CE-R16 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R16 (Less hazard sensitive activities within all the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Investore Property Limited	405.43	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R16	Support	Supports the policy as it provides for potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas. Fabric notes is difficult to provide mitigation measures in relation to tsunami risk, because of the remoteness of tsunami risk, so it is appropriate to require safe evacuation routes to address tsunami risk.	Retain CE-R16 (Less hazard sensitive activities within all the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.340	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R16	Oppose	Considers that to avoid unnecessary duplication in the Proposed Plan, this chapter should focus on those additional consent requirements necessary to manage effects within the coastal hazard overlays that cannot be adequately dealt with by the underlying zone rules. [See paragraphs 4.30 to 4.31 and 4.48 of original submission for full reason]	Delete CE-R16 (Less hazard sensitive activities within all the Coastal Hazard Overlays) in its entirety.	Reject	No
Yvonne Weeber	340.61	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R17	Support	CE-R17 is generally supported, but it is unclear where the Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal Hazard Area and the High Coastal Hazard Area are in the coastal environment. These terms do not appear on the Wellington City Proposed District Plan maps. Submission may be amended in the future.	Retain CE-R17 (Green infrastructure for the purposes of coastal hazard mitigation works undertaken by a Crown entity or their nominated contractor or agent within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.349	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R17	Support in part	Considers the provisions of this chapter should also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected. Ensure rules either cross reference appropriate provisions from other chapters, or include provisions to address adverse effects on these matters	Amend CE-R17 (Green infrastructure for the purposes of coastal hazard mitigation works undertaken by a Crown entity or their nominated contractor or agent within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) to acknowledge natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values are protected via reference to appropriate provisions from other chapters or by including provisions in the rule.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.126	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R17	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.272	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R17	Support	CE-R17 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R17 (Green infrastructure for the purposes of coastal hazard mitigation works undertaken by a Crown entity or their nominated contractor or agent within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.	Accept	No
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.23	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Support	Supports this rule as proposed including the Permitted activity status, and Restricted Discretionary activity status for additions to buildings which do not comply with CE-R18.1.	Retain CE-R18 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.148	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Support	Supports the rule as the rule framework for the construction, addition, or alteration of buildings and structures within the coastal environment does not hinder FENZ's ability to establish fire stations within the coastal environment.	Retain CE-R18 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.	Reject	No
Yvonne Weeber	340.62	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Support	CE-R18 is generally supported, but it is unclear where the Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal Hazard Area and the High Coastal Hazard Area are in the coastal environment. These terms do not appear on the Wellington City Proposed District Plan maps. Submission may be amended in the future.	Retain CE-R18 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.	Reject	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.350	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Support in part	Considers the provisions of this chapter should also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected. Ensure rules either cross reference appropriate provisions from other chapters, or include provisions to address adverse effects on these matters	Amend CE-R18 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) to acknowledge natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values are protected via reference to appropriate provisions from other chapters or by including provisions in the rule.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.127	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Oppose	<p>WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure; 	Disallow	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.273	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Support	CE-R18 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R18 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.	Reject	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.88	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Amend	Supports this rule to the extent that it enables additions to buildings within the coastal hazards overlays. However, it is not appropriate to place controls on buildings in the Tsunami Hazard Overlay. Due to the nature of tsunamis, it is not realistic to construct additions to buildings to avoid tsunami risk.	Amend CE-R18.1 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays): <u>e. The additions are in the Tsunami Hazard Overlay</u>	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.9	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Oppose	Mitigation of risks from tsunami is possible with land use planning and building design, and tsunami risk should not be deleted from the policy. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes. Additions to buildings (e.g. for vertical evacuation purposes) should be encouraged to allow people to safely evacuate.	Disallow	Accept	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.102	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Support in part	Supports rule to the extent that it enables additions to buildings within coastal hazard overlays.	Retain CE-R18 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) with amendments.	Reject	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.103	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Amend	Supports rule to the extent that it enables additions to buildings within coastal hazard overlays. However, considers it is not appropriate to place controls on buildings in the Tsunami Hazard Overlay, due to the nature of tsunamis, it is not realistic to construct additions to buildings to avoid tsunami risk.	Amend CE-R18.1 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows: ... <u>e. The additions are in the Tsunami Hazard Overlay</u>	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.78	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Oppose	Mitigation of risks from tsunami is possible with land use planning and building design, and tsunami risk should not be deleted from the policy. The current probability of a rupture of the Hikurangi subduction zone is calculated as 25% in the next 50 years. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes. Additions to buildings (e.g. for vertical evacuation purposes) should be encouraged to allow people to safely evacuate.	Disallow	Accept	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.104	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Amend	Supports rule to the extent that it enables additions to buildings within coastal hazard overlays. However, considers it is not appropriate to place controls on buildings in the Tsunami Hazard Overlay, due to the nature of tsunamis, it is not realistic to construct additions to buildings to avoid tsunami risk.	Amend CE-R18.2.b (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows: ... b. The addition is to a potentially hazard sensitive activity or a hazard sensitive activity within a high coastal hazard area <u>other than the high tsunami hazard area.</u>	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.79	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Oppose	Mitigation of risks from tsunami is possible with land use planning and building design, and tsunami risk should not be deleted from the policy. The current probability of a rupture of the Hikurangi subduction zone is calculated as 25% in the next 50 years. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes. Additions to buildings (e.g. for vertical evacuation purposes) should be encouraged to allow people to safely evacuate.	Disallow	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Investore Property Limited	405.44	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Support in part	Supports the rule but considers that it would be appropriate to also enable additions within the Tsunami Hazard Overlay to be permitted to recognise that it is not realistic to construct additions to buildings to avoid tsunami risk.	Retain CE-R18.1 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Investore Property Limited	405.45	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Amend	Supports the rule but considers that it would be appropriate to also enable additions within the Tsunami Hazard Overlay to be permitted to recognise that it is not realistic to construct additions to buildings to avoid tsunami risk.	Amend CE-R18.1 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: ... e. The additions are in the Tsunami Hazard Overlay.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.43	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Oppose	A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes. Mitigation of risks from tsunami is possible with land use planning and building design, and tsunami risk should not be deleted from the policy. Additions to buildings (e.g. for vertical evacuation purposes) should be encouraged to allow people to safely evacuate.	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.341	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Oppose	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes CE-R18 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.342	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Oppose	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Delete CE-R18 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) in its entirety. (Option A).	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.103	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Oppose	Mitigation of risks from tsunami is possible with land use planning and building design, and tsunami risk should not be deleted from the policy. The current probability of a rupture of the Hikurangi subduction zone is calculated as 25% in the next 50 years. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes. Additions to buildings (e.g. for vertical evacuation purposes) should be encouraged to allow people to safely evacuate.	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.343	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Amend	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Amend CE-R18 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows: Seeks that CE-R18 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) is amended to apply to coastal inundation hazard areas only. (Option B).	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.104	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Oppose	Mitigation of risks from tsunami is possible with land use planning and building design, and tsunami risk should not be deleted from the policy. The current probability of a rupture of the Hikurangi subduction zone is calculated as 25% in the next 50 years. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes. Additions to buildings (e.g. for vertical evacuation purposes) should be encouraged to allow people to safely evacuate.	Disallow	Accept	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.45	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Support in part	Supports this rule as proposed including the Permitted activity status, and Restricted Discretionary activity status for additions to buildings which do not comply with CE-R18.1. In the event that the risk level for the Tsunami Hazard Overlay is not reduced to medium, it would be appropriate to also enable additions within the Tsunami Hazard Overlay to be permitted, to recognise that it is not realistic to construct additions to buildings to avoid tsunami risk.	Retain Rule CE-R18 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) with amendment.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fabric Property Limited	425.46	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Amend	Supports this rule as proposed including the Permitted activity status, and Restricted Discretionary activity status for additions to buildings which do not comply with CE-R18.1. In the event that the risk level for the Tsunami Hazard Overlay is not reduced to medium, it would be appropriate to also enable additions within the Tsunami Hazard Overlay to be permitted, to recognise that it is not realistic to construct additions to buildings to avoid tsunami risk.	Amend Rule CE-R18 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows: ... e. The additions are in the Tsunami Hazard Overlay.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.15	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18	Oppose	Mitigation of risks from tsunami is possible with land use planning and building design, and tsunami risk should not be deleted from the policy. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes. Additions to buildings (e.g. for vertical evacuation purposes) should be encouraged to allow people to safely evacuate.	Disallow	Accept	No
Yvonne Weeber	340.63	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R19	Support	CE-R19 is generally supported, but it is unclear where the Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal Hazard Area and the High Coastal Hazard Area are in the coastal environment. These terms do not appear on the Wellington City Proposed District Plan maps. Submission may be amended in the future.	Retain CE-R19 (Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Coastal Hazard Overlay) as notified.	Reject	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.351	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R19	Support in part	Considers the provisions of this chapter should also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected. Ensure rules either cross reference appropriate provisions from other chapters, or include provisions to address adverse effects on these matters	Amend CE-R19 (Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Coastal Hazard Overlay) to acknowledge natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values are protected via reference to appropriate provisions from other chapters or by including provisions in the rule.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.128	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R19	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.274	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R19	Support	CE-R19 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R19 (Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Coastal Hazard Overlay) as notified.	Reject	No
CentrePort Limited	402.118	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R19	Amend	Amend typographical error in rule title.	Amend CE-R19 (Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Coastal Hazard Overlay) as follows: Airport, operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Coastal Hazard Overlay	Accept in part	Yes

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
CentrePort Limited	402.119	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R19	Amend	Considers that large parts of the Port Operations including the Kaiwharawhara ferry terminal location are included within the Coastal Hazard Overlay. A permitted activity limitation to 10 passengers or 10 employees for port activities that by definition need to adjoin the coastal marine area is impractical. It is considered that if there is no practical alternative and this can be demonstrated, the Port activities with greater than 10 passengers or employees should be able to be a permitted activity.	Amend CE-R19 (Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Coastal Hazard Overlay) as follows: 1.[Activity status: Permitted Where: a.[t does not involve the construction of a building that would be occupied by more than 10 employees of the activity, or any members of the public; or b.[t does not involve the conversion of an existing building into a building that would be occupied by more than 10 employees of the activity, or any members of the public; or c.[t can be demonstrated that there is no other practical alternative for the location of the activity.	Reject	No
CentrePort Limited	402.120	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R19	Support in part	Supports CE-P19 with amendments - typographical error in rule title and new clause c.	Retain CE-R19 (Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Coastal Hazard Overlay), with amendment.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.344	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R19	Oppose	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes CE-R19 (Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Coastal Hazard Overlay) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.345	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R19	Amend	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Amend CE-R19 (Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Coastal Hazard Overlay) as follows: Seeks that CE-R19 (Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Coastal Hazard Overlay) is amended to apply to coastal inundation hazard areas only. (Option A).	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.105	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R19	Oppose	While the trigger of a tsunami cannot be mitigated, the consequences can be reduced through good design, evacuation planning and communication of the risk, and the tsunami hazard overlay should not be deleted from the policy. The current probability of a rupture of the Hikurangi subduction zone is calculated as 25% in the next 50 years. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes.	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.346	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R19	Oppose	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Delete CE-R19 (Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Coastal Hazard Overlay) in its entirety. (Option B).	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.106	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R19	Oppose	While the trigger of a tsunami cannot be mitigated, the consequences can be reduced through good design, evacuation planning and communication of the risk, and the tsunami hazard overlay should not be deleted from the policy. The current probability of a rupture of the Hikurangi subduction zone is calculated as 25% in the next 50 years. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes.	Disallow	Accept	No
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.24	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20	Support	Supports CE-R20 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City Centre Zone and are also within the medium and high coastal hazard areas) as notified, as it is enabling of development in medium and high coastal hazard areas in the City Centre Zone.	Retain CE-R20 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City Centre Zone and are also within the medium and high coastal hazard areas) as notified.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.149	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20	Support in part	Seeks to exclude restrictions on establishing emergency service facilities in these areas. Considers fire stations may have a functional need to be located in certain areas, including coastal hazard areas. The ability to construct and operate fire stations in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies is paramount the health, safety and wellbeing of people and the community.	Supports CE-R20 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the City Centre Zone and are also within the medium and high coastal hazard areas), with amendment.	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.150	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20	Amend	Seeks to exclude restrictions on establishing emergency service facilities in these areas. Considers fire stations may have a functional need to be located in certain areas, including coastal hazard areas. The ability to construct and operate fire stations in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies is paramount the health, safety and wellbeing of people and the community.	Amend CE-R20 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the City Centre Zone and are also within the medium and high coastal hazard areas) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. It does not involve the construction of a building that would be occupied by more than 10 employees of the activity, or any members of the public; or b. It does not involve the conversion of an existing building into a building that would be occupied by more than 10 employees of the activity, or any members of the public. <u>Note: The above restrictions do not apply to emergency service facilities.</u>	Reject	No
Yvonne Weeber	340.64	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20	Support	CE-R20 is generally supported, but it is unclear where the Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal Hazard Area and the High Coastal Hazard Area are in the coastal environment. These terms do not appear on the Wellington City Proposed District Plan maps. Submission may be amended in the future.	Retain CE-R20 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City Centre Zone and are also within the medium and high coastal hazard areas) as notified.	Reject	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.352	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20	Support in part	Considers the provisions of this chapter should also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected. Ensure rules either cross reference appropriate provisions from other chapters, or include provisions to address adverse effects on these matters	Amend CE-R20 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City Centre Zone and are also within the medium and high coastal hazard areas) to acknowledge natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values are protected via reference to appropriate provisions from other chapters or by including provisions in the rule.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.129	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.275	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20	Support	CE-R20 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R20 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City Centre Zone and are also within the medium and high coastal hazard areas) as notified.	Reject	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.89	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20	Amend	Supports this rule to the extent that it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City Centre zone where those activities are also within the medium and high coastal hazard areas. However, it is unclear why potentially hazard sensitive activities should be permitted where a building will be occupied by 10 or less employees of an activity. This number appears to be arbitrary and impractical. For example, five offices that are occupied by 10 or less employees are unlikely to have a different risk profile to one office occupied by 50 employees. This rule also does not achieve the objectives and policies of the coastal hazard overlays, specifically Objective CE-08 and Policy CE-P21. The rule should also be clarified to reflect that it would be very difficult for buildings to entirely avoid being occupied by members of the public occasionally e.g. a courier driver dropping off a parcel or a tradesperson undertaking a repair. Argosy supports this rule to the extent that activities which cannot comply with CE-R20.1 are restricted discretionary	Amend CE-R20 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City Centre Zone and are also within the medium and high coastal hazard areas): Activity status: Permitted Where: 1. It does not involve the construction of a building that would be occupied predominantly by more than 10 employees of the activity, or any members of the public; or 2. It does not involve the conversion of an existing building into a building that would be occupied predominantly by more than 10 employees of the activity, or any members of the public	Reject	No
Ministry of Education	400.71	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20	Support	Supports CE-R20 as the submitter considers the matters of discretion to be appropriate where the permitted activity standards are not met.	Retain CE-R20 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City Centre Zone and are also within the medium and high coastal hazard areas) as notified.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Oyster Management Limited	404.105	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20	Support in part	Supports the rule to the extent it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City Centre zone where those activities are also within the medium and high coastal hazard areas.	Retain CE-R20 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City Centre Zone and are also within the medium and high coastal hazard areas) with amendments.	Reject	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.106	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20	Amend	Supports the rule to the extent it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City Centre zone where those activities are also within the medium and high coastal hazard areas. However, considers it is unclear why potentially hazard sensitive activities should be permitted where a building will be occupied by 10 or less employees of an activity. This number appears to be arbitrary and impractical. For example, five offices that are occupied by 10 or less employees are unlikely to have a different risk profile to one office occupied by 50 employees. This rule also does not achieve the objectives and policies of the coastal hazard overlays, specifically Objective CE-O8 and Policy CE-P21. The rule should also be clarified to reflect that it would be very difficult for buildings to entirely avoid being occupied by members of the public occasionally e.g. a courier driver dropping off a parcel or a tradesperson undertaking a repair.	Amend CE-R20 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City Centre Zone and are also within the medium and high coastal hazard areas): Activity status: Permitted Where: 1. It does not involve the construction of a building that would be occupied <u>predominantly</u> by more than 10 employees of the activity, or any members of the public; or 2. It does not involve the conversion of an existing building into a building that would be occupied <u>predominantly</u> by more than 10 employees of the activity, or any members of the public	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.80	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20	Oppose	Coastal hazard risk is going to increase in the near future with the impact of climate change and sea level rise, and high occupancy developments in high risk areas will expose more people to increasing risk.	Disallow	Accept	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.107	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20	Support in part	Supports CE-R20 to the extent that activities which cannot comply with CE-R20.1 are restricted discretionary.	Retain CE-R20 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City Centre Zone and are also within the medium and high coastal hazard areas) with amendments.	Reject	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.47	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20	Amend	Supports the intention of CE-R20 to enable of development in medium and high coastal hazard areas in the City Centre Zone. Considers it to be arbitrary that a building being occupied by more than 10 employees triggers a restricted discretionary activity and it is unclear how this changes the risk profile. Seeks that this rule be amended to focus on buildings occupied by members of the public. There also needs to be clarification to reflect that it would be very difficult for buildings to entirely avoid being occupied by members of the public occasionally e.g. a courier driver dropping off a parcel or a tradesperson undertaking a repair.	Supports CE-R20 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City Centre Zone), with amendment.	Reject	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.48	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20	Amend	Supports the intention of CE-R20 to enable of development in medium and high coastal hazard areas in the City Centre Zone. Considers it to be arbitrary that a building being occupied by more than 10 employees triggers a restricted discretionary activity and it is unclear how this changes the risk profile. Seeks that this rule be amended to focus on buildings occupied by members of the public. There also needs to be clarification to reflect that it would be very difficult for buildings to entirely avoid being occupied by members of the public occasionally e.g. a courier driver dropping off a parcel or a tradesperson undertaking a repair.	Amend CE-R20 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City Centre Zone) as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: 1. It does not involve the construction of a building that would be occupied <u>predominantly</u> by more than 10 employees of the activity, or any members of the public; or 2. It does not involve the conversion of an existing building into a building that would be occupied <u>predominantly</u> by more than 10 employees of the activity, or any members of the public.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.16	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20	Oppose	Coastal hazard risk is going to increase in the near future with the impact of climate change and sea level rise, and high occupancy developments in high risk areas will expose more people to increasing risk.	Disallow	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.25	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R21	Support	Supports the Permitted activity status for potentially hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area provided by CE-R21 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area)	Retain CE-R21 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard areas) notified.	Accept	No
Yvonne Weeber	340.65	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R21	Support	CE-R21 is generally supported, but it is unclear where the Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal Hazard Area and the High Coastal Hazard Area are in the coastal environment. These terms do not appear on the Wellington City Proposed District Plan maps. Submission may be amended in the future.	Retain CE-R21 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) as notified.	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.353	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R21	Support in part	Considers the provisions of this chapter should also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected. Ensure rules either cross reference appropriate provisions from other chapters, or include provisions to address adverse effects on these matters	Amend CE-R21 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) to acknowledge natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values are protected via reference to appropriate provisions from other chapters or by including provisions in the rule.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.130	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R21	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.276	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R21	Support	CE-R21 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R21 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) as notified.	Accept	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.108	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R21	Support	Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being an RD activity in the low coastal hazard area	Retain CE-R21 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) as notified.	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.347	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R21	Oppose	Considers that to avoid unnecessary duplication with the Proposed Plan and for other reasons, this chapter should focus on those additional consent requirements necessary to manage effects within the coastal hazard overlays that cannot be adequately dealt with by the underlying zone rules. [See paragraphs 4.30 to 4.31 and 4.48 of original submission for full reason]	Delete CE-R21 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) in its entirety.	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.151	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R22	Support in part	Seeks to exclude restrictions on establishing emergency service facilities in these areas. Considers fire stations may have a functional need to be located in certain areas, including coastal hazard areas. The ability to construct and operate fire stations in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies is paramount the health, safety and wellbeing of people and the community.	Supports CE-R22 (Hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area), with amendment.	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.152	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R22	Amend	Seeks to exclude restrictions on establishing emergency service facilities in these areas. Considers fire stations may have a functional need to be located in certain areas, including coastal hazard areas. The ability to construct and operate fire stations in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies is paramount the health, safety and wellbeing of people and the community.	Amend CE-R22 (Hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) as follows: 1. Activity Status: Permitted Where: a. The development does not involve the construction of a childcare service, retirement village educational facility, hospital, emergency service facility or health care facility; or b. If the development involves the construction of residential units, the total number of residential units on a site is no more than three.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Yvonne Weeber	340.66	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R22	Support	CE-R22 is generally supported, but it is unclear where the Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal Hazard Area and the High Coastal Hazard Area are in the coastal environment. These terms do not appear on the Wellington City Proposed District Plan maps. Submission may be amended in the future.	Retain CE-R22 (Hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) as notified.	Reject	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.354	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R22	Support in part	Considers the provisions of this chapter should also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected. Ensure rules either cross reference appropriate provisions from other chapters, or include provisions to address adverse effects on these matters	Amend CE-R22 ([Hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) to acknowledge natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values are protected via reference to appropriate provisions from other chapters or by including provisions in the rule.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.131	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R22	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.277	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R22	Support	CE-R22 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R22 (Hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) as notified.	Reject	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.90	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R22	Support	Supports hazard sensitive activities being permitted in the low coastal hazard area.	Retain CE-R22 (Hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) as notified.	Reject	No
Ministry of Education	400.72	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R22	Support	Supports CE-R22 as the submitter supports the Restricted Discretionary Activity status for the establishment of educational facilities in the low coastal hazard area. In addition, the submitter considers the matters of discretion to be appropriate.	Retain CE-R22 (Hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) as notified.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.348	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R22	Oppose	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes CE-R22 (Hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.349	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R22	Amend	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Amend CE-R22 (Hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) as follows: Seeks that CE-R22 (Hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) is amended to apply to coastal inundation hazard areas only. (Option A).	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.107	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R22	Oppose	While the trigger of a tsunami cannot be mitigated, the consequences can be reduced through good design, evacuation planning and communication of the risk, and the tsunami hazard overlay should not be deleted from the policy. The current probability of a rupture of the Hikurangi subduction zone is calculated as 25% in the next 50 years. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes.	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.350	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R22	Oppose	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Delete CE-R22 (Hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) in its entirety. (Option B).	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.108	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R22	Oppose	While the trigger of a tsunami cannot be mitigated, the consequences can be reduced through good design, evacuation planning and communication of the risk, and the tsunami hazard overlay should not be deleted from the policy. The current probability of a rupture of the Hikurangi subduction zone is calculated as 25% in the next 50 years. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes.	Disallow	Accept	No
Yvonne Weeber	340.67	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23	Support	CE-R23 is generally supported, but it is unclear where the Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal Hazard Area and the High Coastal Hazard Area are in the coastal environment. These terms do not appear on the Wellington City Proposed District Plan maps. Submission may be amended in the future.	Retain CE-R23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.	Reject	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.355	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23	Support in part	Considers the provisions of this chapter should also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected. Ensure rules either cross reference appropriate provisions from other chapters, or include provisions to address adverse effects on these matters	Amend CE-R23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) to acknowledge natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values are protected via reference to appropriate provisions from other chapters or by including provisions in the rule.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.132	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.278	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23	Support	CE-R23 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.	Reject	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.91	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23	Support	Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being restricted discretionary in the medium coastal hazard area.	Retain CE-R23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area) as notified.	Reject	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.109	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23	Support	Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being an RD activity in the medium coastal hazard area	Retain CE-R23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.351	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23	Oppose	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes CE-23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.352	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23	Amend	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Amend CE-23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as follows: Seeks that CE-23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) is amended to apply to coastal inundation hazard areas only. (Option A).	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.109	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23	Oppose	While the trigger of a tsunami cannot be mitigated, the consequences can be reduced through good design, evacuation planning and communication of the risk, and the tsunami hazard overlay should not be deleted from the policy. The current probability of a rupture of the Hikurangi subduction zone is calculated as 25% in the next 50 years. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes.	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.353	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23	Oppose	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Delete CE-23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) in its entirety. (Option B).	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.110	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23	Oppose	While the trigger of a tsunami cannot be mitigated, the consequences can be reduced through good design, evacuation planning and communication of the risk, and the tsunami hazard overlay should not be deleted from the policy. The current probability of a rupture of the Hikurangi subduction zone is calculated as 25% in the next 50 years. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes.	Disallow	Accept	No
VictLabour	414.24	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23	Amend	Considers that the provision may insufficient given recent evidence that sea level rise and weather impacts related to climate change may become worse, quicker than thought not long ago. Considers that Council needs to consider a complete prohibition on all development of potentially or actually hazard sensitive activities within areas at-risk of coastal inundation or tsunami as a result of sea level rise.	[Inferred decision requested] Seeks that a prohibited activity status is applied to Rule CE-R23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities)	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.139	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23	Oppose	WIAL opposes this submission to the extent that it is inconsistent with the primary submission made by WIAL on this matter.	Disallow	Accept	No
Yvonne Weeber	340.68	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R24	Support	CE-R24 is generally supported, but it is unclear where the Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal Hazard Area and the High Coastal Hazard Area are in the coastal environment. These terms do not appear on the Wellington City Proposed District Plan maps. Submission may be amended in the future.	Retain CE-R24 (All hard engineering measures in the high coastal hazard area) as notified.	Reject	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.356	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R24	Support in part	Considers the provisions of this chapter should also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected. Ensure rules either cross reference appropriate provisions from other chapters, or include provisions to address adverse effects on these matters	Amend CE-R24 ([All hard engineering measures in the high coastal hazard area) to acknowledge natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values are protected via reference to appropriate provisions from other chapters or by including provisions in the rule.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.133	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R24	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.279	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R24	Support	CE-R24 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R24 (All hard engineering measures in the high coastal hazard area) as notified.	Reject	No
CentrePort Limited	402.121	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R24	Amend	Considers that hard engineering options are often the only options for protection and enhancement of Port Infrastructure which by necessity needs to be in the Coastal Environment. Therefore there should be an exclusion for the Special Purpose Port Zone.	Amend CE-R24 (All hard engineering measures in the high coastal hazard area) to exclude the Special Purpose Port Zone from the rule.	Reject	No
CentrePort Limited	402.122	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R24	Oppose in part	Considers that hard engineering options are often the only options for protection and enhancement of Port Infrastructure which by necessity needs to be in the Coastal Environment. Therefore there should be an exclusion for the Special Purpose Port Zone.	Opposes CE-R24 (All hard engineering measures in the high coastal hazard area) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.354	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R24	Oppose	Opposes this rule insofar as it relates to the existing seawall located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point. Considers that the rule should only be applicable to new hard engineering structures. The ongoing upgrade, maintenance and repair of existing hard engineering structures that protect existing regionally significant infrastructure should be permitted, as WIAL has provided for in the underlying Natural Open Space Zone. [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes CE-R24 (All hard engineering measures in the high coastal hazard area) and seeks amendment.	Accept in part	Yes
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.74	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R24	Oppose	Considers that Natural Open Space Zone between Lyall Bay and Moa Point should be retained within the Airport Zone. All amended changes are not required. The airport is a natural coastal environment. It is a complex environment which requires the NZCPS and Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement for land below MHWS.	Disallow	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.355	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R24	Amend	Opposes this rule insofar as it relates to the existing seawall located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point. Considers that the rule should only be applicable to new hard engineering structures. The ongoing upgrade, maintenance and repair of existing hard engineering structures that protect existing regionally significant infrastructure should be permitted, as WIAL has provided for in the underlying Natural Open Space Zone. [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Amend CE-R24 (All hard engineering measures in the high coastal hazard area) as follows: CE-R24 <u>New</u> . All hard engineering measures in the high coastal hazard area except measures associated with regionally significant infrastructure 1. Activity Status: Discretionary (Option A). [Note that it should not be ISPP as it does not relate to housing]	Reject	No
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.64	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R24	Support	Supports the amendment to allow for operation, maintenance and repair to existing hard engineering structures. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Allow	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.356	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R24	Oppose	Opposes this rule insofar as it relates to the existing seawall located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point. Considers that the rule should only be applicable to new hard engineering structures. The ongoing upgrade, maintenance and repair of existing hard engineering structures that protect existing regionally significant infrastructure should be permitted, as WIAL has provided for in the underlying Natural Open Space Zone. [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Delete CE-R24 (All hard engineering measures in the high coastal hazard area) in its entirety. (Option B).	Reject	No
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.75	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R24	Oppose	Considers that Natural Open Space Zone between Lyall Bay and Moa Point should be retained within the Airport Zone. All amended changes are not required. The airport is a natural coastal environment. It is a complex environment which requires the NZCPS and Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement for land below MHWS.	Disallow	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.103	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R24	Support	Supports provisions for hard protection structures as a Discretionary Activity within the Coastal Environment.	Retain CE-R24 (All hard engineering measures in the high coastal hazard area) as notified.	Reject	No
Yvonne Weeber	340.69	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R25	Support	CE-R25 is generally supported, but it is unclear where the Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal Hazard Area and the High Coastal Hazard Area are in the coastal environment. These terms do not appear on the Wellington City Proposed District Plan maps. Submission may be amended in the future.	Retain CE-R25 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the high coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.	Reject	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.357	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R25	Support in part	Considers the provisions of this chapter should also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected. Ensure rules either cross reference appropriate provisions from other chapters, or include provisions to address adverse effects on these matters	Amend CE-R25 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the high coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) to acknowledge natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values are protected via reference to appropriate provisions from other chapters or by including provisions in the rule.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.134	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R25	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.280	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R25	Support	CE-R25 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R25 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the high coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.	Reject	No
VictLabour	414.25	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R25	Amend	Considers that the provision may insufficient given recent evidence that sea level rise and weather impacts related to climate change may become worse, quicker than thought not long ago. Considers that Council needs to consider a complete prohibition on all development of potentially or actually hazard sensitive activities within areas at-risk of coastal inundation or tsunami as a result of sea level rise.	[Inferred decision requested] Seeks that a prohibited activity status is applied to Rule CE-R25 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the high coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities)	Reject	No
Yvonne Weeber	340.70	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R26	Support	CE-R26 is generally supported, but it is unclear where the Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal Hazard Area and the High Coastal Hazard Area are in the coastal environment. These terms do not appear on the Wellington City Proposed District Plan maps. Submission may be amended in the future.	Retain CE-R26 (Hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.	Reject	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.358	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R26	Support in part	Considers the provisions of this chapter should also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected. Ensure rules either cross reference appropriate provisions from other chapters, or include provisions to address adverse effects on these matters	Amend CE-R26 (Hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) to acknowledge natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values are protected via reference to appropriate provisions from other chapters or by including provisions in the rule.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.135	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R26	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter. Notably: 1. The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Disallow	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.281	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R26	Support	CE-R26 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R26 (Hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.	Reject	No
Ministry of Education	400.73	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R26	Support	Supports CE-R26 as it enables hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas as Discretionary Activities.	Retain CE-R26 (Hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport...) as notified.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.357	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R26	Oppose	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes CE-R26 (Hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.358	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R26	Amend	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Amend CE-R26 (Hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as follows: Seeks that CE-R26 (Hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) is amended to apply to coastal inundation hazard areas only. (Option A).	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.111	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R26	Oppose	While the trigger of a tsunami cannot be mitigated, the consequences can be reduced through good design, evacuation planning and communication of the risk, and the tsunami hazard overlay should not be deleted from the policy. The current probability of a rupture of the Hikurangi subduction zone is calculated as 25% in the next 50 years. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes.	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.359	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R26	Oppose	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Delete CE-R26 (Hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) in its entirety. (Option B).	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.112	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R26	Oppose	While the trigger of a tsunami cannot be mitigated, the consequences can be reduced through good design, evacuation planning and communication of the risk, and the tsunami hazard overlay should not be deleted from the policy. The current probability of a rupture of the Hikurangi subduction zone is calculated as 25% in the next 50 years. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes.	Disallow	Accept	No
VicLabour	414.26	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R26	Amend	Considers that the provision may insufficient given recent evidence that sea level rise and weather impacts related to climate change may become worse, quicker than thought not long ago. Considers that Council needs to consider a complete prohibition on all development of potentially or actually hazard sensitive activities within areas at-risk of coastal inundation or tsunami as a result of sea level rise.	[Inferred decision requested] Seeks that a prohibited activity status is applied to Rule CE-R26 (Hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities)	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.140	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R26	Oppose	WIAL opposes this submission to the extent that it is inconsistent with the primary submission made by WIAL on this matter.	Disallow	Accept	No
Yvonne Weeber	340.71	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R27	Support	CE-R27 is generally supported, but it is unclear where the Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal Hazard Area and the High Coastal Hazard Area are in the coastal environment. These terms do not appear on the Wellington City Proposed District Plan maps. Submission may be amended in the future.	Retain CE-R27 (Hazard sensitive activities within the high coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.359	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R27	Support in part	Considers the provisions of this chapter should also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected. Ensure rules either cross reference appropriate provisions from other chapters, or include provisions to address adverse effects on these matters	Amend CE-R27 (Hazard sensitive activities within the high coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) to acknowledge natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values are protected via reference to appropriate provisions from other chapters or by including provisions in the rule.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.282	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R27	Support	CE-R27 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-R27 (Hazard sensitive activities within the high coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.267	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R27	Support in part	CE-R27 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain CE-R27 (Hazard sensitive activities within the high coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) with amendment.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.268	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R27	Amend	Considers that CE-R27 should be amended to change the activity status of Hazard Sensitive Activities within the High Coastal Hazard Area from Non-Complying to Discretionary to enable the potential for these activities to be provided where the risks can be managed through mitigation measures.	Amend CE-R27 (Hazard sensitive activities within the high coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as follows: 1. Activity Status: Non-Complying <u>Discretionary</u>	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.65	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R27	Oppose	Hazard sensitive activities, which include emergency facilities, hospitals, major hazardous facilities and childcare, within high coastal hazard overlay should remain non-compliant. Coastal hazard risk is going to increase in the near future with the impact of climate change and sea level rise. Amending this to discretionary provides a path for development which puts more people at risk from increasing coastal hazard risk.	Disallow	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.83	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R27	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose the suggested change in activity status as this would not have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1.	Disallow / Seeks that SUB-R21 and SUB-R25 are retained as notified.	Addressed in Subdivision s42A report	
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.85	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R27	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose the suggested change in activity status as this would not have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1.	Disallow / Seeks that CE-R27 is retained as notified.	Accept	No
Ministry of Education	400.74	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R27	Support	Supports CE-R27 as the submitter considers that the non-complying activity status for hazard sensitive activities within the high coastal hazard area is appropriate.	Retain CE-R27 (Hazard sensitive activities within the high coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport...) as notified.	Reject	No
VicLabour	414.27	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R27	Amend	Considers that the provisions relating to restrictions on new development in areas at risk of coastal inundation and tsunamis due to sea level rise may be insufficient given recent evidence that sea level rise and weather impacts related to climate change may become worse, quicker than thought not long ago. Considers that Council needs to consider a complete prohibition on all development of potentially or actually hazard sensitive activities within areas at-risk of coastal inundation or tsunamis as a result of sea level rise.	Seeks that a prohibited activity status is applied to Rule CE-R27 (Hazard sensitive activities within the high coastal hazard area, excluding the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities). [Inferred decision requested]	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.15	Part 1/ Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COASTAL HAZARD OVERLAY	Oppose	WIAL opposes this submission to the extent that it conflicts with WIAL's primary submission which seeks to remove the application of the tsunami coastal hazard overlays.	Disallow	Accept	No
CentrePort Limited	402.6	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COASTAL HAZARD OVERLAYS	Support	Support the intent of this definition.	Retain the definition of 'Coastal Hazard Overlays' as notified.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.16	Part 1/ Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COASTAL HAZARD OVERLAY	Oppose	WIAL opposes this submission to the extent that it conflicts with WIAL's primary submission which seeks to remove the application of the tsunami coastal hazard overlays.	Disallow	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Not opposed to the coastal inundation mapping in principle, however, considers further nuancing of the provisions that relate to coastal hazards and more specifically, tsunami hazard, is required. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.89 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes the coastal hazard provisions that apply to coastal tsunami hazard overlays.	Reject	No
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Support WIAL's submission for the reasons set out in WIAL's submission.	Allow	Reject	No
Yvonne Weeber	340.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the District Plan maps need to be clearly mapped using the language and classifications from CE-P14. It is understood that there are no "medium coastal hazard area and high coastal hazard areas" mapped, and that there is an arbitrary mix of hazard and risk overlays instead, which are difficult to discern from each other (Coastal inundation, Liquefaction, Tsunami Hazard Overlay, etc...).	Seeks that the mapping of Coastal Hazards be more clearly categorized and mapped.	Accept in part	Yes
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.23	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the District Plan maps should be amended to display the high, medium, and low coastal hazards as separate layers that can be turned on and off individually in the GIS viewer.	Amend District Plan maps to display the high, medium, and low coastal hazards as separate layers that can be turned on and off individually in the GIS viewer.	Accept in part	Yes
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.13	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Not opposed to the coastal inundation mapping in principle, however, considers further nuancing of the provisions that relate to coastal hazards and more specifically, tsunami hazard, is required. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.89 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes the Coastal Tsunami Hazard overlay	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.14	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Not opposed to the coastal inundation mapping in principle, however, considers further nuancing of the provisions that relate to coastal hazards and more specifically, tsunami hazard, is required. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.89 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that provisions relating to Tsunami Hazard Overlay are amended to have further nuancing. [Inferred decision requested].	Reject	No
Dawid Wojasz	295.2	Mapping / All Overlays / Overlays General	Oppose	Considers that the coastal hazard overlays put much of the CBD in a high or medium hazard area, limiting development within the central city. Density in the Central city should be encouraged, and the hazard can be dealt with as an engineering issue.	Remove application of High, Medium and Low Coastal Hazard overlay within the City Centre.	Reject	No
Dawid Wojasz	295.3	Mapping / All Overlays / Overlays General	Amend	Considers that the coastal hazard overlays put much of the CBD in a high or medium hazard area, limiting development within the central city. Density in the Central city should be encouraged, and the hazard can be dealt with as an engineering issue.	Seeks that CE-P18 also be amended to include High Density as functional need to locate a building within the high hazard area. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject	No
Poneke Architects	292.1	Mapping / All Overlays / Coastal Inundation Overlay	Oppose	Considers that these overlays effectively stop development in Wellington and are too broad.	Delete the Coastal Inundation Overlays in their entirety.	Reject	No
David Karl	309.3	Mapping / All Overlays / Coastal Inundation Overlay	Amend	Considers that according to presentations from WCC staff and technical experts at a community climate adaptation meeting, modelling underpinning the current maps reflects some of the available, appropriate possible modelling, but does not account for wave dynamics. It is understood from these experts comments wave dynamics may have a significant bearing on the island.	Seeks that the coastal inundation overlay be amended to account for wave dynamics that include consideration of Tapu Te Rangī/the island in Island Bay.	Reject	No
VictLabour	414.11	Mapping / All Overlays / Coastal Inundation Overlay	Support in part	Supports restrictions on development in areas at risk of coastal inundation and tsunami with amendment as detailed below.	Retain coastal inundation and tsunami overlays.	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No /Point No	Sub-part / Chapter/Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Poneke Architects	292.2	Mapping / All Overlays / Tsunami Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Considers that these overlays effectively stop development in Wellington and are too broad.	Delete the Tsunami Hazard Overlays in their entirety.	Reject	No
David Karl	309.4	Mapping / All Overlays / Tsunami Hazard Overlay	Amend	Considers that according to presentations from WCC staff and technical experts at a community climate adaptation meeting, modelling underpinning the current maps reflects some of the available, appropriate possible modelling, but does not account for wave dynamics. It is understood from these experts comments wave dynamics may have a significant bearing on the island.	Seeks that the tsunami inundation overlay be amended to account for wave dynamics that include consideration of Tapu Te Ranga (the island in Island Bay).	Reject	No
VicLabour	414.12	Mapping / All Overlays / Tsunami Hazard Overlay	Support in part	Supports restrictions on development in areas at risk of coastal inundation and tsunami.	Retain coastal inundation and tsunami overlays.	Accept	No