Wellington City Proposed District Plan

Hearing Stream 5 - Natural Hazards

Appendix B - Recommended Responses to Submissions and Further Submissions

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Victoria University of	123.37	Hazards and Risks /	Not	Considers that community resilience is an incredibly important factor in terms of natural hazard	Seeks that infrastructure facilitates bringing people together.		
Wellington Students'		Natural Hazards /	specified	response.			
Association	221.28	General NH	A	[Alson with a second desiring	Contraction to the state of the	Reject	No
Tyers Stream Group	221.28	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards /	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.		
		General NH			Steam contact overlay, the overland now rath overlay and the ronding overlay.	Reject	No
Chorus New Zealand	FS25.27	Part 2 / Hazards and	Oppose	The submission seeking stricter rules to manage infrastructure in stated hazard areas is too	Disallow	,	
Limited (Chorus), Spark		Risks / Natural Hazards		uncertain. Infrastructure may need to be located in these areas such to operational need or			
New Zealand Trading		/ General NH		functional need. The existing framework in the INF-NH chapter is considered to be satisfactory. Any			
Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand				provision for infrastructure should also be contained in the INF-NH chapter and not the general NH chapter to which the submission relates.			
Limited (Vodafone)				chapter to which the submission relates.			
,						Accept	No
Powerco Limited	FS61.41	Part 2 / Hazards and	Oppose	The submission seeking stricter rules to manage infrastructure in stated hazard areas is too	Disallow		
		Risks / Natural Hazards		uncertain. Infrastructure may need to be located in these areas such to operational need or			
		/ General NH		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.		Accept	No
Tyers Stream Group	221.29	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports Natural Hazards chapter as it relates to the Tyers stream catchment	Retain Natural Hazards chapter as notified.	лосерс	110
,		Natural Hazards /			·		
		General NH			[Inferred decision requested]	Reject	No
Wellington City Council	266.65	Hazards and Risks /	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:		
		Natural Hazards / General NH			To assist with determining the consequences associated with natural hazards, buildings and activities		
		General INFI			have been allocated a sensitivity rating (see Definitions – less hazard sensitive activities, potentially		
					hazard sensitive activities, hazard sensitive activities).		
						Accept	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.66	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Considers 'Sheppards Gully' is spelled incorrectly and should instead be 'Shepards Gully'.	Amend, in the introduction, the Natural Hazard Overlay title as follows:		
		Natural Hazards / General NH			Sheppards Shepards Gully Fault Overlay		
					Consequential re-naming of 'Sheppards Gully' in the following provisions:		
					NIE NIE DEG 4		
					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 /	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	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		
		General NH		applied inconsistently. They also allow for developments which do not require earthworks in areas	landslide hazard overlav.		
		ochera i i i		which are at risk of slope failure. Applying a Landslide Hazard overlay (such as the non regulatory	landshide hazara overlay.		
				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.		Reject	No
Greater Wellington	FS84.127	Part 2 / Hazards and	Support	Greater Wellington support the submitter's request for additional provisions to control developmen	t Allow / Supports the submission in part and seeks additional controls on landslide bazards to	Reject	INO
Regional Council	1304.127	Risks / Natural Hazards	Support	on land that is at higher risk of slope failure. By identifying and managing this risk, the risk to life,	manage landslide risk on steep land. Considers that some controls should apply to slopes from ~20-		
		/ General NH		property and well-being of future urban intensification can be appropriately minimised. These	34°. Seeks that the matters of control for these areas include a site-specific geotechnical		
				changes would have regard to Proposed RPS Plan Change 1, specifically Policy 51.	investigation to ensure slope failure hazards are appropriately managed.		
T T-4 F00	202.5					Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	282.6	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards /	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	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.		
		General NH		uncertain fault areas where appropriate. Considers that the supporting s32 information indicates	Avoidance zone and include commed, disconined, distributed, and discertain laute areas.		
				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			
			1	are at different widths on the map, which we assume reflects the certainty of the fault location.		A t int	V
Aggregate and Quarry	202 12	Hazards and Risks /	Not	Considers that it is important that the PDP does not shut off access to potential aggregate sources to	Sooks that the Proposed District Plan provisions do not rule out quarries along the faultline	Accept in part	Yes
Aggregate and Quarry Association	303.13	Natural Hazards /	specified	provide for Wellington's current and future construction needs.	process that the proposed district Plan provisions do not rule out quarries along the faultline.		
		General NH	-pecinicu	p. 2			
				As aggregate is expensive to transport, sources of this need to be close to the place of construction.			
		1	1	1	T control of the cont	Accept in part	V

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 1 of 38

Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.33	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	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"	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.		
				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).		Reject	No
David Karl	309.5	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	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 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	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. Mount Cook is especially vulnerable int times of earthquake, as it has several major education facilities that could be cut-off from whânau. Residents that travel between the CBD and Mt Cook may also be cut-off from their home by impassable roads. 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.		Reject	No
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.9	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	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. Käinga 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.		Reject	No
Property Council New Zealand	338.6	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	public places. 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 clocation, 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.	status. These provisions need to be drafted and included in the District Plan.		
Kimberley Vermaey	348.4	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	discretionary activity status. 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.	o 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.		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,	Seeks that the Coastal Inundation Overlay be adjusted to remove inundation depths below a certain low-hazard level.		
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.31	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Support	but it may be 0.15m and less. (Option B) Support	Retain NH – Ngā Mōrearea ā-Taiao - Natural Hazards as notified.	Accept in part Accept in part	Yes No.
					•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 2 of 38

	254.440	I				1	T
Greater Wellington	351.118	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Considers that intensification in any flood hazard zone is not in line with regional, national or	Seeks that WCC continues to work with Greater Wellington to discuss the City's flood hazards in		
Regional Council		Natural Hazards /		international direction on hazards or climate change, and would impact Greater Wellington's ability	relation to the proposed intensification.		
		General NH		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.			
						Accept in part	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.20	Part 2 / Hazards and	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC support natural hazard provisions based on current and accurate research.	Allow		
		Risks / Natural Hazards		Continued collaboration between agencies is important to keep hazard information up to date and			
		/ General NH		consistent across the region.		Accept in part	No
Jane Szentivanyi and	369.12	Hazards and Risks /	Not	Considers that natural hazard such as flooding and slips are an important qualifying factor in	Not specified.	,	
Ben Briggs	505.12	Natural Hazards /	specified	determining future development.	The specifical		
ben briggs		General NH	specifica	determining ruture development.		No decision requested	No
BP Oil New Zealand,	372.88	Hazards and Risks /	Cupport in	The Natural Hazard shapter is supported for its intent, as it socks to protest people, property and	Retain the Natural Hazard chapter, with amendments.	No decision requested	INO
	372.88	·	Support in		Retain the Natural Hazard Chapter, with amendments.		
Mobil Oil New Zealand		Natural Hazards /	part	infrastructure from natural hazards. The chapter's 'risk-based approach' is also supported as it seeks			
Limited and Z Energy		General NH		to manage effects from natural hazards by classifying activities and providing separate provisions for			
Limited (the Fuel				these activities depending on their level of hazard sensitivity.			
Companies)						Accept in part	No
WCC Environmental	377.55	Hazards and Risks /	Support	The Natural Hazards chapter' Introduction is supported, including the risk framework, the use of	Retain the Natural Hazards chapter's Introduction as notified.		
Reference Group		Natural Hazards /		both buildings and activities, and the three focus areas of people, property and infrastructure.			
		General NH				Accept in part	No
Argosy Property No. 1	383.19	Hazards and Risks /	Support in	Supports the Introduction to the extent that it takes an adaptation approach to natural hazards.	Delete "Natural Hazard Overlay" table in Introduction.		
Limited	505.15	Natural Hazards /	part	Retreat from the Wellington CBD is unlikely to occur, and therefore it would be more appropriate for	belete Hatara Hazara overlay table il little addition.		
Limited		General NH	part	the Proposed Plan to anticipate a protection or adaptation approach to climate change hazards.			
		Generalism					
				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			
				liquefication and tsunami (discussed below), where the risk cannot be mitigated and the probability			
				of an event is low		Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.1	Part 2 / Hazards and	Oppose	High, medium and low risk ranking is important in assessing the level of activity appropriate in areas	Disallow	neject	110
TORU TU ARC EQC	1370.1	Risks / Natural Hazards	Оррозс	at risk from natural hazards.	Disanow		
		/ General NH		at 115k II OIII Hatulai Hazalus.		A	N -
		-				Accept	No
Taranaki Whānui ki te	389.63	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Considers further engagement with Council is appropriate to ensure existing consents can be	Seeks that amendments that are most appropriate to address concerns around ensuring that		
Upoko o te Ika		Natural Hazards /		implemented without future impediment and to ensure the District Plan reflects the aspirations of	Taranaki Whānui can implement existing consents around Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula,		
		General NH		Taranaki Whānui.	Mount Crawford, and Shelly Bay Taikuru without future impediment.		
				Natural Hazard overlays are identified over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford,			
				and Shelly Bay Taikuru.		Reject	No
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.5	Part 2 / Hazards and	Oppose	Submission 389 states as a Submission Point, that "Taranaki Whānui opp oses the zoning and extent	Disallow		
		Risks / Natural Hazards		of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford."			
		/ General NH		It lists the relevant PDP Chapter as:			
		,					
				Planning maps			
				He Rohe Ahoaho Māori Natural Open Space Zone chapter			
				Ngā Wāhi Tapu ki te Māori Sites a nd 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 L andscapes chapter			
				Wawaetanga Subdivision chapter			
				Taiao Takutai Coastal Environment chapter		1	
				Opposes in total Submission 389 on these points, which appears to be a wholesale rejection of			
						Accept	No
				planning rules in these areas.		Mccchi	INO

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 3 of 38

Buy Back the Bay FS7	79.22	Part 2 /Hazards and	Onnoco	Submission 389 states: "Taranaki Whānui's RFR [Right of First Refusal] opportunities in Te Motu	Disallow		1
Buy back tile bay		Risks / Natural Hazards	Oppose		DISGIIOW		
		/ General NH		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,			
		/ General Nn		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."			
				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.			
				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."			
						Accept	No
Buy Back the Bay FS7		Part 2 / Hazards and	Oppose	Refers to submission 389 states: Taranaki Whānui opposes the extent of the proposed zoning of	Disallow		
		Risks / Natural Hazards		Shelly Bay Taikuru and the proposed height control limits." Buy Back the Bays opposes the			
	,	/		submission on both points.			
	•	General NH					
				Specifically, the Submission 389 for Taranaki Whānui seeks that:			
				"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.			
				The Height Control Area is amended to 27m being the maximum height of development			
				consented under the Shelly Bay Masterplan resource consent."			
				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			
				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 393	91.154	Hazards and Risks /	Support in	The inclusion of rules in relation to flood hazards is partially supported, as well as the risk-based	Retain the Natural Hazards chapter with amendment.		
Communities	- 1	Natural Hazards /	part	approach to the management of natural hazards. However, an amendment is sought.			
		General NH				Accept in part	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and 393		Hazards and Risks /	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.		
Communities		Natural Hazards /					
Talan To Alan FOC		General NH	0	Assessed and side bound are deban bound are as in a start to distall 1980 D	Disella	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC FS7		Part 2 / Hazards and	Oppose	Accurate and risk-based regulatory hazard maps are an important tool in the WCC Proposed District	DISAHOW		
		Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH		Plan to limit subdivision and development within areas subject to natural hazard risk. Removing part			
	,	/ General NH		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.		Accept	No
Greater Wellington FS8	84.57	Part 2 / Hazards and	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan		
Regional Council		Risks / Natural Hazards		the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a nonstatutory GIS.	,		
Regional Council							

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 4 of 38

Kāinga Ora Homes and	391.156	Hazards and Risks /	0	The indusing officed based associated as the District Plan is associated by sixth and	Control to the tractional through the prince of the prince of the District Discount deleted and the Athe	1	
	391.156		Oppose in	The inclusion of flood hazard mapping as part of the District Plan is opposed, despite the risk-based	Seeks that natural hazard flooding overlays from the District Plan are deleted and that the		
Communities		Natural Hazards /	part	approach to the management of natural hazards being generally supported. Including Flood Hazard	information be held in non-statutory GIS maps instead.		
		General NH		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.			
				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.			
				·			
				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".			
				The mapping of other, non-flooding natural hazards to be incorporated into the District Plan maps,			
				such as Liquefaction and Fault Hazards (in additional to Coastal Hazards) are otherwise supported, as			
				these hazards are less subject to change.			
TI I D : I I I	F0.50.5	0 10/11 1 1			D: II	Reject	No
Thorndon Residents'	FS69.6	Part 2 / Hazards and	Oppose	Thorndon is susceptible to flooding. This must be an urban planning consideration.	Disallow		
Association Inc		Risks / Natural Hazards					
		/ General NH		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].			
						Accept	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.52	Part 2 / Hazards and	Oppose	Accurate and risk-based regulatory hazard maps are an important tool in the WCC Proposed District	Disallow		
		Risks / Natural Hazards		Plan to limit subdivision and development within areas subject to natural hazard risk. Removing part			
		/ General NH		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.		Accept	No
Onslow Residents	FS80.32	Part 2 / Hazards and	Oppose	Considers that mapping flood hazards remains an important priority for residents.	Disallow		
Community Association		Risks / Natural Hazards					
,		/ General NH				Accept	No
Greater Wellington	FS84.58	Part 2 / Hazards and	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan	i i	
Regional Council	7	Risks / Natural Hazards		the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a nonstatutory GIS.	,		
		/ General NH		The state of the s		Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and	391.157	Hazards and Risks /	Onnose in	The term "Natural Hazard Overlays" is opposed and should be removed and replaced by a newly	Delete all references to "Natural Hazard Overlays" and refer to the newly defined term of Natural		
Communities		Natural Hazards /	part	defined term 'Natural Hazard Areas". Natural Hazard Overlays should instead be included as non-	Hazard Areas instead.		
comunices		General NH	part	statutory, information-only mapping layer that sits outside the Proposed District Plan.	Tidadia / II cas insecus.		
		Generalivii		Statutory, information only mapping layer that sits outside the Proposed District Plan.		Reject	No
L		ı	1	1	1	Inciect	1

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 5 of 38

Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.7	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].		Accept	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.53	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	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 underlaying 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
Elliott Thornton	399.1	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Amend	Considers that while the PDP regulates the location and sitting of buildings to be sufficiently flood- free, it does not address people tyring to traverse flood waters, which is one of the primary causes of death or injury from flooding.	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.	Reject	No
CentrePort Limited	402.91	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / General NH	Oppose	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	402.92	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	3	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.	3	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
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

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 6 of 38

	•	,					
Oyster Management	404.8	Hazards and Risks /	Oppose in	Opposes the Proposed Plan in part.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan applies appropriate provisions to reflect the probability and		
Limited		Natural Hazards /	part		limitations in mitigating risks of liquefaction and tsunamis.		
		General NH				Reject	No
Oyster Management	404.9	Hazards and Risks /	Oppose in	Opposes the Proposed Plan in part.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan provides consistency in the approach to potentially hazard		
Limited		Natural Hazards /	part		sensitive activities in the Natural Hazards and Coastal Hazards Overlays.		
		General NH				Reject	No
Oyster Management	404.10	Hazards and Risks /	Support in	The submitter's properties at 6 Hurring Place and 12 Newlands Road are partly within the Flood	Retain the Natural Hazards Introduction as notified to the extent that it takes an adaptation		
Limited		Natural Hazards /	part	Hazard Overlay – Inundation Area and 6 Hurring Place is partly within the Flood Hazard Overlay –	approach to natural hazards, with amendments.		
		General NH		Overland Flowpath.			
					[Refer to original submission for maps of the submitter's properties under the Proposed District		
					Plan].	Accept in part	
Oyster Management	404.11	Hazards and Risks /	Oppose in	The submitter's properties at 6 Hurring Place and 12 Newlands Road are partly within the Flood	Not specified.		
Limited		Natural Hazards /	part	Hazard Overlay – Inundation Area and 6 Hurring Place is partly within the Flood Hazard Overlay –			
		General NH		Overland Flowpath.	[Refer to original submission for maps of the submitter's properties under the Proposed District		
					riunj.	Not specified.	No
Oyster Management	404.12	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports the Introductory text to the extent that it takes an adaptation approach to natural hazards.	. Retain NH (Natural Hazards) - Introduction as notified.		
Limited		Natural Hazards /				L	
		General NH	<u> </u>			Accept in part	
Wellington	406.208	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports Natural Hazards chapter introduction.	Retain Natural Hazards chapter introduction as notified.		
International Airport		Natural Hazards /				L	
Ltd		General NH	<u> </u>	Supports the recognition of Wellington Airport within the introductory text.		Accept in part	
VicLabour	414.20	Hazards and Risks /	Support in	Supports restrictions on development in areas at risk of coastal innundation and tsunami with	Retain coastal inundation and tsunami provisions with amendment.		
		Natural Hazards /	part	amendment as detailed in other submission point.		L	
		General NH	<u> </u>			Accept in part	
VicLabour	414.21	Hazards and Risks /	Not	Considers that the reality of sea level rise means Council must start considering a programe of	Seeks that the Council start considering a programe of managed		
		Natural Hazards /	specified	managed retreat.	retreat.		
		General NH					
				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		Reject	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.9	Hazards and Risks /	Oppose in	It is important that the Proposed Plan accurately conveys the probabilities of different natural	Option 1: Seeks that the introduction to the Natural Hazards chapter is amended to delete the		
		Natural Hazards /	part	hazards, and does not unduly create an impression of greater risk than is the case.	hazard rankings from the table.		
		General NH					
				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	t		
				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.		Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.10	Part 2 / Hazards and	Oppose	High, medium and low risk ranking is important in assessing the level of activity appropriate in areas	Disallow		
		Risks / Natural Hazards		at risk from natural hazards. Deleting the rankings will undermine the risk-based approach that has			
		/ General NH		been taken.		Accept	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.10	38	Oppose in	It is important that the Proposed Plan accurately conveys the probabilities of different natural	Option 2: If the hazards ranking table is not deleted from the Natural Hazards chapter introduction:		
			part	hazards, and does not unduly create an impression of greater risk than is the case.			
					Amend the Natural Hazards chapter introduction to remove the 'High' hazard ranking for the		
				The introduction to the Natural Hazards chapter identifies the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay with a	Liquefaction Hazard Overlay.		
			1	'High' hazard ranking. However, the provisions associated with the Liquefaction Overlay suggest that	1		İ
				these are areas of lower hazard risk. We also note the natural hazards overlays apply to all levels of			1
				risk either in the same way, or in relation to the specific type of risk. Accordingly, Fabric seeks			1
			1	amendments to the introduction to remove the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay from the 'High' hazard			İ
				ranking, to better reflect the risks associated with liquefaction and to achieve better consistency			
				with the associated provisions.		Accept	Yes
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.11	Part 2 / Hazards and	Oppose	Liquefaction is a hazard associated with earthquakes. Much of central Wellington is built on ground	Disallow		1
		Risks / Natural Hazards		likely toliquefy in an earthquake, and the risk of earthquakes in Wellington is high. Liquefaction is a			
		/ General NH		real risk that has already been experienced in Wellington (e.g. during the 2016 Kaikoura			İ
				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 liquefaction3 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			1
				and high risk areas.		Reject	No
Argosy Property No. 1	383.20	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Considers here should be an additional objective in the Natural Hazards overlays which provides for	Add new objective NH-OX to the Natural Hazards chapter as follows:		<u> </u>
Limited		Natural Hazards / New	1	a range of activities that maintain the vibrancy and vitality of the City Centre zone, while also			İ
		NH	1	ensuring that subdivision, development and use in these areas do not increase the risk to people,	Provide for a range of activities that maintain the vibrancy and vitality of the City Centre Zone, while	_	İ
1				property, and infrastructure. This would be consistent with Objective CE-O8 in relation to coastal	also ensuring that subdivision, development and use in these areas do not increase the risk to		1
		1	1	hazards. It is appropriate for a similar approach to be taken to coastal hazards and natural hazards to	people, property, and infrastructure	I	
				recognise that here is significant existing investment in the CBD and there are social and economic			

	1						
Argosy Property No. 1	383.21	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Considers there should be an additional policy which recognises that development in the natural	Add new policy NH-PX to the Natural Hazards chapter as follows:		
Limited		Natural Hazards / New NH		hazard overlays in the City Centre zone is appropriate in some instances. This would be consistent	Facility and division of a second and a second a second and a second and a second and a second and a second and a second and a second and a second and a second and a second a		
		NH		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.	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		
				to coastal nazards and natural nazards.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Dojact	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.2	Part 2 / Hazards and	Oppose	Some areas within natural hazard overlays are not appropriate for development and the NH	occupied by members of the public or the creation of vacant allotments Disallow	Reject	NO
TORA TU ARE EQC	F3/U.2	Risks / Natural Hazards	Oppose	provisions in the plan are reflective of this.	DISGILOW		
		/ New NH		provisions in the plan are reflective or this.		Accept	No
Argosy Property No. 1	383.22	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Considers there should be an additional policy which recognises that development in the natural	Add new policy NH-PX to the Natural Hazards chapter as follows:	Ассерт	NO
Limited	505.22	Natural Hazards / New	7 1111 1110	hazard overlays in the City Centre zone is appropriate in some instances. This would be consistent	That her policy the factor in racial as chapter as follows:		
Limited		NH		with Policies CE-921 and CE-P22. As noted above, it is appropriate for a similar approach to be taken	Manage subdivision, development and use within the City Centre Zone and within all of the Natural		
				to coastal hazards and natural hazards.	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		
						Reject	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.11	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Considers that there should be an additional objective in the Natural Hazards overlays which	Add new Objective as follows:	,	
' '		Natural Hazards / New		provides for a range of activities that maintain the vibrancy and vitality of the City Centre zone, while			
		NH		also ensuring that subdivision, development and use in these areas do not increase the risk to	NH-O5 (City Centre Zone):		
				people, property, and infrastructure.			
					Provide for a range of activities that maintain the vibrancy and vitality of the City Centre Zone, while		
				This would be consistent with Objective CE-O8 in relation to coastal hazards. It is appropriate for a	also ensuring that subdivision, development and use in these areas do not increase the risk to		
				similar approach to be taken to coastal hazards and natural hazards to recognise that there is	people, property, and infrastructure.		
				significant existing investment in the CBD and there are social and economic benefits to enabling			
	<u> </u>		<u></u>	development that does not increase risks arising from natural hazards.		Reject	No
Greater Wellington	351.119	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Considers it appropriate to amend to have regard to the Proposed RPS Change 1 Objectives 19 and	Amend NH-O1 (Risk from natural hazards) as follows:		
Regional Council		Natural Hazards / NH-		20 and Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as "as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)" and is in			
		01		line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far	Subdivision, use and development within the Natural Hazard Overlays minimises reduce or do not		
				as practicable but is a clearer signal than 'reduce or do not increase', to actively look to bring down	increase the risk from natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure.		
				the risk in the design and planning of the development.		Accept in part	Yes
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.21	Part 2 / Hazards and	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC proposed RPS	Allow		
		Risks / Natural Hazards		Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the			
		/ NH-O1		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'.		Accept in part	Yes
Stride Investment	FS107.10	Part 2 / Hazards and	Oppose	Stride is opposed to amending the wording of the natural hazard policies from "reduce or avoid an	Disallow		
Management Limited		Risks / Natural Hazards		increase in risk" to "minimise risk" which would impose an unreasonable and greater burden than			
		/ NH-01		the current wording of the Proposed Plan.		Reject	No
Investore Property	FS108.10	Part 2 / Hazards and	Oppose	Investore is opposed to amending the wording of the natural hazard policies from "reduce or avoid	Disallow		
Limited		Risks / Natural Hazards		an increase in risk" to "minimise risk" which would impose an unreasonable and greater burden than			
		/ NH-O1		the current wording of the Proposed Plan.		Reject	No
Argosy Property No. 1	383.23	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports the objective as it enables use and development within the Natural Hazard Overlays that	Retain NH-O1 (Risk from natural hazards) as notified.		
Limited		Natural Hazards / NH-		do not increase the risk from natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure			
Maintenant Calmentina	400.44	O1	Comment	Commands AUL Of the condition with the consideration and information	Details All I Od (Dist. form asternal beauty) as assessed	Reject	No
Ministry of Education	400.44	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports NH-O1 to reduce risk to people, property, and infrastructure.	Retain NH-O1 (Risk from natural hazards) as proposed.		
		Natural Hazards / NH- O1					
		01		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).			1
				and that any development of these would be subject to these provisions (ii not designated).		Reject	No
i				NACTOR MARKET CONTRACTOR CONTRACT	Allow	neject	140
Waka Kotabi N7	ES102 E0		Support				1
Waka Kotahi NZ	FS103.50	Part 2 / Hazards and	Support	Waka Kotahi supports providing for subdivision and development where this does not increase risk to people property and infrastructure	Allow		l l
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.50	Risks / Natural Hazards	Support	waka kotani supports providing for suddivision and development where this does not increase risk to people property and infrastructure.	Allow	Reject	No
Transport Agency		Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O1		to people property and infrastructure.		Reject	No
	FS103.50 402.96	Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O1 Hazards and Risks /	Support		Retain NH-O1 (Risk from natural hazards) as notified.	Reject	No
Transport Agency		Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O1		to people property and infrastructure.		7	No No
Transport Agency CentrePort Limited	402.96	Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O1 Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH- O1	Support	to people property and infrastructure. Support the intent of this Objective.	Retain NH-O1 (Risk from natural hazards) as notified.	Reject Reject	, no
Transport Agency CentrePort Limited Oyster Management		Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O1 Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH- O1 Hazards and Risks /		to people property and infrastructure. Support the intent of this Objective. Supports NH-O1 to the extent that it enables use and development within the natural hazard		7	, no
Transport Agency CentrePort Limited	402.96	Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O1 Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH- O1	Support	to people property and infrastructure. Support the intent of this Objective.	Retain NH-O1 (Risk from natural hazards) as notified.	7	, no
Transport Agency CentrePort Limited Oyster Management Limited	402.96	Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O1 Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH- O1 Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH- O1	Support Support	to people property and infrastructure. Support the intent of this Objective. Supports NH-O1 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-O1 (Risk from natural hazards) as notified. Retain NH-O1 (Risks from natural hazards) as notified.	Reject	, no
Transport Agency CentrePort Limited Oyster Management	402.96 404.13	Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O1 Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH- O1 Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-	Support	to people property and infrastructure. Support the intent of this Objective. Supports NH-O1 to the extent that it enables use and development within the natural hazard	Retain NH-O1 (Risk from natural hazards) as notified.	Reject	no no
Transport Agency CentrePort Limited Oyster Management Limited Wellington International Airport	402.96 404.13	Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-01 Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH- 01 Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH- 01 Hazards and Risks /	Support Support	to people property and infrastructure. Support the intent of this Objective. Supports NH-O1 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. Opposes NH-O1.	Retain NH-O1 (Risk from natural hazards) as notified. Retain NH-O1 (Risks from natural hazards) as notified.	Reject	no no
Transport Agency CentrePort Limited Oyster Management Limited Wellington International Airport	402.96 404.13	Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O1 Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH- O1 Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH- O1 Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-	Support Support	to people property and infrastructure. Support the intent of this Objective. Supports NH-O1 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-O1 (Risk from natural hazards) as notified. Retain NH-O1 (Risks from natural hazards) as notified.	Reject	no no
Transport Agency CentrePort Limited Oyster Management Limited Wellington International Airport	402.96 404.13	Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O1 Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH- O1 Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH- O1 Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-	Support Support	to people property and infrastructure. Support the intent of this Objective. Supports NH-O1 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. Opposes NH-O1. Furthermore, and as set out in Objective SRCC-O2, the risks from natural hazards should be avoided where they are intolerable. This concept should be brought into this policy and acknowledges that	Retain NH-O1 (Risk from natural hazards) as notified. Retain NH-O1 (Risks from natural hazards) as notified.	Reject	no no
Transport Agency CentrePort Limited Oyster Management Limited Wellington	402.96 404.13	Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O1 Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH- O1 Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH- O1 Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-	Support Support	to people property and infrastructure. Support the intent of this Objective. Supports NH-O1 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. Opposes NH-O1. Furthermore, and as set out in Objective SRCC-O2, the risks from natural hazards should be avoided	Retain NH-O1 (Risk from natural hazards) as notified. Retain NH-O1 (Risks from natural hazards) as notified.	Reject	no no
Transport Agency CentrePort Limited Oyster Management Limited Wellington International Airport	402.96 404.13	Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-O1 Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH- O1 Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH- O1 Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-	Support Support	to people property and infrastructure. Support the intent of this Objective. Supports NH-O1 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. Opposes NH-O1. Furthermore, and as set out in Objective SRCC-O2, the risks from natural hazards should be avoided where they are intolerable. This concept should be brought into this policy and acknowledges that	Retain NH-O1 (Risk from natural hazards) as notified. Retain NH-O1 (Risks from natural hazards) as notified.	Reject	no no

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 8 of 38

					1		
Wellington	406.210	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Opposes NH-O1.	Submitter seeks either deletion of NH-O1 (Risk from natural hazards) or an amendment to NH-O1		
International Airport		Natural Hazards / NH-			(Risk from natural hazards) as follows:		
Ltd		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	Subdivision, use and development in the Natural Hazard Overlays do not create an intolerable level		
				people, activities, property and infrastructure have varying levels of coastal hazard tolerance.	of reduces or does not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure.		
				people, activities, property and infrastructure have varying levels of coastal hazard tolerance.	or reduces or does not increase the lisk to people, property, and intrastructure.		
				[See paragraph 4.85 to 4.92 in original submission for full reason]			
						Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.91	Part 2 / Hazards and	Oppose	Toka Tū Ake supports the suggestion that the concept of risk tolerance be included in natural hazard	Disallow		
		Risks / Natural Hazards		provisions. However, natural hazard risk tolerance is a concept which varies widely between people			
		/ NH-O1		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 ar			
				appropriate alternative to including risk tolerance, as it is important to limit development in areas at risk from natural hazards.		Accept	N-
KiwiRail Holdings	408.93	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports the objective to provide for operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail	Retain NH-O1 (Risk from natural hazards) as notified.	Ассері	NO
Limited	400.55	Natural Hazards / NH-	Support	activities while ensuring these activities do not increase the risk to people, property and	netali Ni O I (nisk nom natara nazaras) as notinea.		
		01		infrastructure.		Reject	No
Greater Wellington	351.120	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Supports the inclusion of "catchment management" in the objective as notified.	Retain NH-O2 (Planned natural hazard mitigation works), subject to amendments.		
Regional Council		Natural Hazards / NH-					
		02				Accept in part	Yes
Greater Wellington	351.121	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Considers it appropriate to amend to have regard to the Proposed RPS Change 1 Objectives 19 and	Amend NH-O2 (Planned natural hazard mitigation works) as follows:		1
Regional Council		Natural Hazards / NH-			There is reduced The risk to people, property and infrastructure from flood hazards through planned		1
		02		line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far	mitigation works and catchment management is minimised.		
				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.		Accept in part	Yes
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.22	Part 2 / Hazards and	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC proposed RPS	Allow	Accept in part	res
TORA TU ARE LQC	13/0.22	Risks / Natural Hazards	Зиррогі	Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the			
		/ NH-O2		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'.		Accept in part	Yes
CentrePort Limited	402.97	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Support the intent of this Objective.	Retain NH-O2 (Planned natural hazard mitigation works) as notified.		
		Natural Hazards / NH-					
		02				Reject	No
Fire and Emergency	273.60	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-	Support	Supports the policy as it seeks to protect natural features that reduce the susceptibility of people,	Retain NH-O3 (Natural systems and features) as notified.		
New Zealand		O3		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			
		US		from or into any area of continuous flammable material.		Accept	No
Greater Wellington	351.122	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Considers the wording of this objective is generally consistent with the expectations of Greater	Retain NH-O3 (Natural systems and features) as notified.	лесере	110
Regional Council		Natural Hazards / NH-		Wellington in respect of natural features and RPS direction.			
		03				Accept	No
CentrePort Limited	402.98	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Support the intent of this Objective.	Retain NH-O3 (Natural systems and features) as notified.		
		Natural Hazards / NH-					
		03				Accept	No
Greater Wellington	351.123	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Considers this approach is appropriate	Retain NH-O4 (Operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.		
Regional Council		Natural Hazards / NH-				Reject	No
CentrePort Limited	402.99	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Support specific objective for Port Activities.	Retain NH-O4 (Operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.	neject	140
- Santa Control Control	.02.33	Natural Hazards / NH-	-appoin		2 - (Specialization por Cacarraces) passenger por Cacarraces and rail activities) as notified.		1
		04				Reject	No
Wellington	406.211	Hazards and Risks /	Oppose in	Opposes NH-O4.	Opposes NH-O4 (Operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) and seeks		
International Airport		Natural Hazards / NH-	part		amendment.		
Ltd		04		The activities listed have operational and functional constraints which ultimately govern the location			1
				of these activities, including within areas exposed to natural hazard risk. This objective needs to			1
				appropriately recognise this, and consistent with the directive contained within SRCC-O2, avoid			1
				areas where the risks are intolerable, taking into consideration operational and functional constraints associated with identified activities.		Reject	No
Wellington	406.212	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Opposes NH-O4.	Submitter seeks either deletion of NH-O4 (Operational port activities, passenger port facilities and	neject	INO
International Airport		Natural Hazards / NH-	, anchu	opposes in a n	rail activities) or an amendment to NH-O4 (Operational port activities, passenger port facilities and		
Ltd		04		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	NH-O4 Airport, Opperational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities		1
				areas where the risks are intolerable, taking into consideration operational and functional			1
				constraints associated with identified activities.	<u>Airport, Oo</u> perational 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 the</u> risk to people, property, and infrastructure.	Accept in part	Yes
L	l .	1	1	I	Tisk to people, property, and initiastructure.	Accept iii part	163

				T	T		
Greater Wellington	351.124	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports a risk-based approach to manage subdivision use and development within the identified	Retain NH-P1 (Identification of natural hazards) as notified.		
Regional Council		Natural Hazards / NH-		areas, specifically sensitivity to impacts and the hazard posed to lives and wellbeing. This aligns with			
		P1		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.			
						Reject	No
Waka Kotahi NZ	FS103.51	Part 2 / Hazards and	Support	Waka Kotahi supports a risk-based approach in providing for subdivision and development based on	Allow		
Transport Agency		Risks / Natural Hazards		the likelihood and consequence to people property and infrastructure.			
		/ NH-P1				Reject	No
Argosy Property No. 1	383.24	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports the policy in that the risk-based approach needs to consider the impact, likelihood and	Retain NH-P1 (Identification of natural hazards) as notified.		
Limited		Natural Hazards / NH-		consequences of different natural hazard events.			
		P1				Reject	No
Ministry of Education	400.45	Hazards and Risks /	Support in	Support NH-P1 in part.	Retain NH-P1 (Identification of natural hazards) with amendment.		
		Natural Hazards / NH-	part				
		P1				Accept in part	Yes
Ministry of Education	400.46	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Seeks that NH-P1 be amended. The submitter acknowledges the risk that natural hazards pose to	Amend NH-P1 (Identification of natural hazards) as follows:		
		Natural Hazards / NH-		hazard sensitive activities.			
		P1			Identify natural hazards within the District Plan and take a risk-based approach to the management		
				However the submitter seeks that this policy be amended so that an operational need for the	of subdivision, use and development based on:		
				Ministry to locate educational facilities in natural hazard areas to serve existing communities can be	1. The sensitivity of the activities to the impacts of natural hazards; and		
				considered when managing development in natural hazard areas.	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	FS36.78	Part 2 / Hazards and	Support	WIAL supports the intent of this relief to the extent that it is consistent with the outcomes sought	Allow / Seeks that part of submission to be allowed.		
International Airport		Risks / Natural Hazards		from its primary submission.			
Limited		/ NH-P1				Accept in part	Yes
Oyster Management	404.14	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports NH-P1 to the extent that the risk-based approach needs to consider the impact, likelihood,	Retain NH-P1 (Identification of natural hazards) as notified.		
Limited		Natural Hazards / NH-		or consequences of different natural hazard events.			
		P1				Reject	No
Wellington	406.213	Hazards and Risks /	Oppose	Opposes NH-P1.	Opposes NH-P1 (Identification of natural hazards) and seeks amendment.		
International Airport		Natural Hazards / NH-					
Ltd		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]		Reject	No
Wellington	406.214	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Opposes NH-P1.	Seeks that NH-P1 (Identification of natural hazards) is amended to introduce the concept of	,	
International Airport	100.221	Natural Hazards / NH-	7 1111 1110	оррозси и и 2.	tolerability.		
Itd		P1		The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to			
Liu				recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance			
				to the effects of coastal hazards.			
				to the effects of coastal nazarasi			
				[See paragraph 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]		Reject	No
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271 18	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports the risk-based approach within the policy.	Retain NH-P2 (Levels of risk) as notified.	nejeet	
Horokiwi Quarries Eta	271.10	Natural Hazards / NH-	Support	Supports the risk based approach within the policy.	Netali 1911 2 (Ecvels of 13k) as notified.		
		D2				Reject	No
Fire and Emergency	273.61	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports the policy as the policy makes an allowance for buildings or activities in the low, medium	Retain NH-P2 (Levels of risk) as notified.	neject	140
New Zealand	273.01	Natural Hazards / NH-	Support	and high hazard areas where mitigation measures are incorporated to address the impacts from the	The Country of 12 (cevers of 115K) as Hottilleu.		
New Zealand		P2					
		F-2		relevant natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure. A number of established fire station are located in either the low, medium of high hazard areas and it is supported that an opportunity			
						Reject	N =
Greater Wellington	351.125	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	exists for future additions or site layout amendments.	Amend NH-P2 (Levels of risk) as follows:	Reject	NO
	351.125		Amena	Considers it appropriate to amend to have regard to the Proposed RPS Change 1 Objectives 19 and			
Regional Council		Natural Hazards / NH-		20 and Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as "as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)" and is in			
		P2			Subdivision, use and development minimises reduce or do not increase the risk to people, property		
	I			as practicable	and infrastructure by:		
					1		
				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			
				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			
				design and planning of the development. Considers that Change's requested to the policies may necessitate amendments to the rules to have regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS Change 1.		Accept in part	Yes
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.23	Part 2 / Hazards and	Support	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. Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC proposed RPS	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.23	Risks / Natural Hazards	Support	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. Toka Tü Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the		Accept in part	Yes
Toka Tü Ake EQC	FS70.23		Support	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. Toka Tü Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC 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	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Toka Tü Ake EQC	FS70.23	Risks / Natural Hazards	Support	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. Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC 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	Allow		Yes
		Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2		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. Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC 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 Accept in part	Yes
	FS70.23	Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2 Part 2 / Hazards and	Support Oppose	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. Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC 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	Allow		Yes
		Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2 Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards		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. Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC 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		Yes
Stride Investment	FS107.11	Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2 Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2		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. Toka Tü Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC 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'. Stride is opposed to amending the wording of the natural hazard policies from "reduce or avoid an	Allow		Yes Yes
Stride Investment		Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2 Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards		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. Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC 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'. 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	Allow	Accept in part	
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.11	Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2 Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Oppose	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. Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC 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'. 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.	Allow Disallow Disallow	Accept in part	

				·			
0 , , ,	383.25	Hazards and Risks /	Oppose in	Consider NH-P2.1 is restrictive to allow only low occupancy or low replacement value development	Amend NH-P2 (Levels of risk) as follows:		
Limited		Natural Hazards / NH- P2	*	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	Subdivision, use and development reduce or do not increase the risk to pool		
		P2		existing built environment. Considers NH-P2.2 is unrealistic to provide that mitigation can address	Subdivision, use and development reduce or do not increase the risk to people, property and infrastructure by:		
				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	1. Allowing for those buildings and activities that have either low occupancy or low replacement		
				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	2. Requiring buildings and activities to reduce or not increase mitigate the impacts from natural		
				functional need in this location. Notes that all activities except emergency service facilities are	hazards to people, property and infrastructure in the low hazard, and medium and high hazard areas		
				permitted within the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay. The policy should be consistent with the level of	within the Natural Hazard Overlays; and		
				risk reflected in the rules	3. Avoiding buildings and activities in the high hazard areas of the Natural Fault Hazard Overlays		
					unless there is a functional 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.		
					illinastructure.		
						Reject	No
Ministry of Education	400.47	Hazards and Risks /	Support in	Support NH-P2 in part.	Retain NH-P2 (Levels of risk) with amendment.		
		Natural Hazards / NH-	part				
		P2				Accept in part	Yes
Ministry of Education	400.48	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Seeks that NH-P2 be amended. The submitter acknowledges the risk that natural hazards pose to	Amend NH-P2 (Levels of risk) as follows:		
		Natural Hazards / NH-		hazard sensitive activities.			
		P2			Subdivision, use and development reduce or do not increase the risk to people, property and]
				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 submitters seeks an	infrastructure by:		
				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.			
					3. Avoiding buildings and activities in the high hazard areas of the Natural Hazard Overlays unless		
					there is an exceptional reason or operational need 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.	Accept in part	Yes
	FS103.52	Part 2 / Hazards and	Support	Waka Kotahi supports a risk-based approach in providing for subdivision and development, and only	Allow		
Transport Agency		Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2		in circumstances where there is an operational need provide for activities to be undertaken in the		A ti	N-
CentrePort Limited	402.100	Hazards and Risks /	Support in	Inign nazard area. Considers that the area within the Special Purpose Port Zone has a number of hazard risks including	Retain NH-P2 (Levels of risk), with amendment.	Accept in part	NO
Centrer ort Limited	402.100	Natural Hazards / NH-	part	those categorised as high. However this policy seeks to only allow buildings and activities in	Retail MI-F2 (Levels of risk), with amendment.		
		P2		exceptional circumstances rather than recognising there may be a functional need or operational			
				requirement for the building or activity.		Accept in part	Yes
CentrePort Limited	402.101	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Considers that the area within the Special Purpose Port Zone has a number of hazard risks including	Amend NH-P2 (Levels of risk) as follows:		
		Natural Hazards / NH-		those categorised as high. However this policy seeks to only allow buildings and activities in			
		P2		exceptional circumstances rather than recognising there may be a functional need or operational	***		
				requirement for the building or activity.	2. A saiding heildings and a skirking in Abrahimban and a saiding heart of Abraham Harring Harring Condenses and a skirking in Abraham Harring Harring Condenses and a skirking in Abraham Harring Condenses and a skirking in Abraham Harring Condenses and a skirking in Abraham Harring Condenses and a skirking in Abraham Harring Condenses and a skirking in Abraham Harring Condenses and a skirking in Abraham Harring Condenses and a skirking in Abraham Harring Condenses and a skirking in Abraham Harring Condenses and a skirking in Abraham Harring Condenses and a skirking in Abraham Harring Condenses and a skirking in Abraham Harring Condenses and a skirking in Abraham Harring Condenses and Abr		
					 Avoiding buildings and activities in the high hazard areas of the Natural Hazard Overlays unless there is an there is a functional need or operational requirement or other 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.	Accept in part	Yes
Wellington	FS36.79	Part 2 / Hazards and	Support	WIAL supports the intent of this relief to the extent that it is consistent with the outcomes sought	Allow / Seeks that part of submission to be allowed.		
International Airport		Risks / Natural Hazards		from its primary submission.			
Limited		/ NH-P2				Accept in part	Yes
Wellington	406.215	Hazards and Risks /	Oppose	Opposes NH-P2.	Opposes NH-P2 (Levels of risk) and seeks amendment.		
International Airport		Natural Hazards / NH- P2		The second of the least life and the behavior to the second secon			
Ltd		P2		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.			
				The second of th			
				[See paragraph 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]		Reject	No
	406.216	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Opposes NH-P2.	Seeks that NH-P2 (Levels of risk) is either deleted or amended to introduce the concept of		
International Airport		Natural Hazards / NH-			tolerability.		
Ltd		P2		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]		Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.92	Part 2 / Hazards and	Oppose	Toka Tū Ake supports the suggestion that the concept of risk tolerance be included in natural hazard	Disallow	,	
		Risks / Natural Hazards		provisions. However, natural hazard risk tolerance is a concept which varies widely between people			
		/ NH-P2		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.		Accept	No

Fabric Property Limited	425.12	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH- P2	Oppose in part	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.	Opposes NH-P2 (Levels of risk) in part.		
				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.			
				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.			
				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.			
	405.40				A 1491 02 (1 1 5 1 1 5 1)	Reject	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.13	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH- P2	Amend	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.	Amend NH-P2 (Levels of risk) as follows: 1. Allowing for those buildings and activities that have either low occupancy or low replacement-		
				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.	value within the low, medium and high hazard areas of the Natural Hazard Overlays; 1. 4-Requiring buildings and activities to reduce or not increase mitigate the impacts from natural hazards topeople, property and infrastructure in the low, and medium and high hazard areas within the Natural Hazard Overlays;		
				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.	2. 3- Avoiding buildings and activities in the high hazard areas of the Natural Fault Hazard Overlays unless there is a <u>functional or operational an exceptional</u> -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.		
				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.			
						Reject	No
Toka Tû Ake EQC	FS70.12	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P2	Oppose	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 catsatrophic 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.	Disallow		
				Saladings Willer die appropriate to detecop in median dia night isk dreas.		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	No
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.		
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	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	No
				hazard sensitive activities in an identified inundation area.		Accept	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.		
ì	1		1			Reject	No

		•				T	
Fire and Emergency	273.63	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that	Amend NH-P4 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive		
New Zealand		Natural Hazards / NH-		accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within	activities in an identified inundation area of the flood hazard overlay) as follows:		
		P4		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.			
					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.	D-!+	No
Greater Wellington	254 427	Hazards and Risks /	C	Supports where buildings containing hazard sensitive activities are located within the inundation		Reject	NO
	351.127	1	Support	,,	Retain NH-P4 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive		
Regional Council		Natural Hazards / NH-		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	activities in an identified inundation area of the flood hazard overlay) as notified.		
		P4		necessitate amendments to the rules to have regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS			
				Change 1.		Accept	No
Argosy Property No. 1	383.26	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports this policy to the extent that enables additions to buildings that accommodate potentially	Retain NH-P4 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive	Ассерт	140
Limited	505.20	Natural Hazards / NH-	зарроге	hazard sensitive activities.	activities in an identified inundation area of the flood hazard overlay) as notified.		
Limited		P4		THE BUT OF THE STATE OF THE STA	delivities in an identified intriduction area of the flood flatard overlay) as florified.	Accept	No
Oyster Management	404.15	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports NH-P4 to the extent that it enables additions to buildings that accommodate potentially	Retain NH-P4 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive		
Limited		Natural Hazards / NH-		hazard sensitive activities.	activities in an identified inundation area of the flood hazard overlay) as notified.		
		P4				Accept	No
Fire and Emergency	273.64	Hazards and Risks /	Support in	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that	Support NH-P5 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive		
New Zealand		Natural Hazards / NH-	part	accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within	activities within the overland flow paths and stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlays) with		
		P5	ľ	identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies	amendment.		
				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.			
						Reject	No
Fire and Emergency	273.65	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that	Amend NH-P5 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive		
New Zealand		Natural Hazards / NH-		accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within	activities within the overland flow paths and stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as		
		P5		identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies	follows:		
				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.			
					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
Greater Wellington	351.128	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports this approach.	Retain NH-P5 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive		
Regional Council		Natural Hazards / NH-			activities within the overland flowpaths and stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as		
s 11 s	200.20	P5		o complete and the comp	notified.	Reject	No
Southern Cross	380.28	Hazards and Risks /	Oppose in	Opposes in part to Policy NH-P5.3 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities	Opposes Policy NH-P5 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard		
Healthcare Limited		Natural Hazards / NH- P5	part	and hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths and stream corridors of the Flood	sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths and stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlays) in its current form and seeks amendment.		
		25		Hazard Overlays).	in its current form and seeks amendment.		
				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".			
		İ		conveyancing or mode waters .		Reject	No
Southern Cross	380.29	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Seeks to amend Policy NH-P5.3 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and	Amend Policy NH-P5.3 (Additions to buildings for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard	nejest	
Healthcare Limited	10.25					1	
		Natural Hazards / NH-		hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths and stream corridors of the Flood Hazard	sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths and stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlays)		
1		Natural Hazards / NH- P5		hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths and stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlavs).	sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths and stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as follows:		
				hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths and stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlays).			
				Overlays).	as follows:		
				Overlays). Considers that the intention is that additions to buildings will allow for the conveyancing of flood	as follows: Only a Allow additions to buildings that accommodate existing potentially 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,	as follows: Only-a Allow additions to buildings that accommodate existing potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities.		
				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	as follows: Only a 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:		
				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	as follows: Only a 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:		
				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	as follows: Only-a 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;		
				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	as follows: Only a 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		
				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	as follows: Only a 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		
				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	as follows: Only a 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		
		P5		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.	as follows: Only a 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	139.6		Oppose	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	as follows: Only a 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.	<u>Reject</u>	No
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.6	P5	Oppose	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.	as follows: Only a 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.	<u>Reject</u>	<u>No</u>

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 13 of 38

Single and Service and	273.66	Hannada and Diele /	Commont in	Commented to the control of the cont	Constant DC (Debugge) to the second s		1
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	2/3.00	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-	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	Support NH-P6 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the identified inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays) with amendment.		
New Zealallu		P6	part	identified hazardous areas where certain conditions can be met. Notwithstanding, these policies	identified fiditidation areas of the Flood hazard Overlays) with afficialitient.		
		FU		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.			
				have a functional of operational freed to locate in fuertified hazardous areas.		Reject	No
Fire and Emergency	273.67	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that	Amend NH-P6 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the	,	
New Zealand		Natural Hazards / NH-		accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within	identified inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as follows:		
		P6		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	III		
				have a functional or operational need to locate in identified hazardous areas.			
					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
Greater Wellington	351.129	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Considers it appropriate to amend to have regard to the Proposed RPS Change 1 Objectives 19 and	Amend NH-P6 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the		
Regional Council		Natural Hazards / NH- P6		20 and Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as "as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)" and is in	identified inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as follows:		
		Pb		line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as practicable	Provide subdivision development and use for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard		
				but is a clearer signal than 'reduce or do not increase', to actively look to bring down the risk in the	sensitive activities within the inundation area provided that mitigation measures are incorporated to		
				design and planning of the development. Considers that Changes requested to the policies may	ensure the risk to people and property both on the site and on adjacent properties is minimised not		
				necessitate amendments to the rules to have regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS			
	1			Change 1.		Accept	Yes
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.24	Part 2 / Hazards and	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC proposed RPS	Allow	• *	
		Risks / Natural Hazards		Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the			1
		/ NH-P6		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'.		Accept	Yes
Stride Investment	FS107.12	Part 2 / Hazards and	Oppose	Stride is opposed to amending the wording of the natural hazard policies from "reduce or avoid an	Disallow		
Management Limited		Risks / Natural Hazards		increase in risk" to "minimise risk" which would impose an unreasonable and greater burden than			
		/ NH-P6		the current wording of the Proposed Plan.		Reject	No
Investore Property	FS108.12	Part 2 / Hazards and	Oppose	Investore is opposed to amending the wording of the natural hazard policies from "reduce or avoid	Disallow		
Limited		Risks / Natural Hazards		an increase in risk" to "minimise risk" which would impose an unreasonable and greater burden than			l
Assess December No. 4	383.27	/ NH-P6 Hazards and Risks /	Comment	the current wording of the Proposed Plan. Supports this policy to the extent that it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities within the	Retain NH-P6 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the	Reject	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.27	Natural Hazards / NH-	Support	identified inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays.	identified inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as notified.		
Lillited		P6		identified mandation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays.	deciding individual of a cas of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as notified.	Reject	No
Ministry of Education	400.49	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports NH-P6 and its requirement for mitigation measures to be incorporated into the	Retain NH-P6 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the	Nejeet	
,.		Natural Hazards / NH-		development of hazard sensitive activities in inundation areas of flood hazard overlays.	identified inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as notified.		
		P6				Reject	No
Oyster Management	404.16	Hazards and Risks /	Support in	Supports NH-P6 to the extent it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities within the inundation	Retain NH-P6 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the		
Limited		Natural Hazards / NH-	part	areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays.	identified inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays) with amendments.		
		P6				Reject	No
Oyster Management	404.17	Hazards and Risks /	Oppose in	Supports NH-P6 to the extent it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities within the inundation			
Limited		Natural Hazards / NH-	part	areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays. Seeks to amend the policy so that it only applies when significan	t identified inundation areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays) to:		
		P6		risk is posed to people and property.			
	1				Provide <u>for</u> subdivision, development and use for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard		1
					sensitive activities within the inundation area provided that mitigation measures are incorporated to		1
					ensure the that significant risk to people and property both on the site and on adjacent properties is not increased or is reduced.	Reiect	No
Oyster Management	404.18	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Supports NH-P6 to the extent it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities within the inundation	Amend NH-P6 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the	neject	
Limited		Natural Hazards / NH-		areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays. Seeks to amend the policy so that it only applies when significan			1
		P6		risk is posed to people and property.	7-1		1
					Provide for subdivision, development and use for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard		Ì
	1				sensitive activities within the inundation area provided that mitigation measures are incorporated to		1
					ensure the that significant risk to people and property both on the site and on adjacent properties is		1
					not increased or is reduced.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.66	Part 2 / Hazards and	Oppose	The submission does not make it clear what constitutes a "significant risk", and the level of risk	Disallow		<u> </u>
		Risks / Natural Hazards		deemed significant may vary between communities. While the level of risk may vary within the flood			1
		/ NH-P6		inundation overlay, it is appropriate to require mitigation measures for hazard sensitive and			Ì
				potentially hazard sensitive activities throughout the zone. Any risk (not just significant risk) to			I
				people and property on the site and adjacent properties should be reduced or not increased.			l.,
Size and Su	272.66	Uses de ser l'article	Comm	people and property on the site and adjacent properties should be reduced or not increased.		Accept	No
Fire and Emergency	273.68	Hazards and Risks /		people and property on the site and adjacent properties should be reduced or not increased. Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that	Supports NH-P7 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the	Accept	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.68	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-	Support in part	people and property on the site and adjacent properties should be reduced or not increased. 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	Supports NH-P7 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the overland flow paths of the Flood Hazard Overlays) with amendment.	Accept	No
	273.68			people and property on the site and adjacent properties should be reduced or not increased. 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		Accept	No
	273.68			people and property on the site and adjacent properties should be reduced or not increased. 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		Accept	No

Fire and Emergency	273.69	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that	Amend NH-P7 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the		
New Zealand		Natural Hazards / NH-		accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within	overland flow paths of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as follows:		
		P7		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.			
					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		
	254 420				Overlays is not a practicable option.	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.130	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Considers it appropriate to amend to have regard to the Proposed RPS Change 1 Objectives 19 and	Amend NH-P7 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the		
Regional Council		Natural Hazards / NH-		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	overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as follows:		
		F 7		as practicable	Manage subdivision, development and use associated with potentially hazard sensitive activities and		
				but is a clearer signal than 'reduce or do not increase', to actively look to bring down the risk in the	hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths by:		
				design and planning of the development. Considers that Changes requested to the policies may	mazara sensitive activities within the overland nowpaths by.		
					1. Incorporating mitigation measures that minimise the reduce or avoid an increase in risk to people		
				Change 1.	and property from the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability flood;		
						Accept	Yes
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.25	Part 2 / Hazards and	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC proposed RPS	Allow	·	
		Risks / Natural Hazards		Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the			
		/ NH-P7		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'.		Accept	Yes
Stride Investment	FS107.13	Part 2 / Hazards and	Oppose	Stride is opposed to amending the wording of the natural hazard policies from "reduce or avoid an	Disallow		
Management Limited		Risks / Natural Hazards		increase in risk" to "minimise risk" which would impose an unreasonable and greater burden than			
		/ NH-P7		the current wording of the Proposed Plan.		Reject	No
Investore Property	FS108.13	Part 2 / Hazards and	Oppose	Investore is opposed to amending the wording of the natural hazard policies from "reduce or avoid	Disallow		
Limited		Risks / Natural Hazards		an increase in risk" to "minimise risk" which would impose an unreasonable and greater burden than			No
Adminton of Februarium	400.50	/ NH-P7	Comment	the current wording of the Proposed Plan.	Description D7 / Description below the control of t	Reject	NO
Ministry of Education	400.50	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-	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	Retain NH-P7 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as notified.		
		D7		activities.	overland nowpaths of the riood hazard overlays) as nothied.	Reject	No
Oyster Management	404.19	Hazards and Risks /	Support in	Supports NH-P7 to the extent it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities within the inundation	Retain NH-P7 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the	Reject	IVO
Limited	10 1.13	Natural Hazards / NH-	part	areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays.	overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlays) with amendments.		
		P7	p =			Reject	No
Oyster Management	404.2	Hazards and Risks /	Oppose in	Supports NH-P7 to the extent it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities within the inundation	Amend NH-P7 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the	,	
Limited		Natural Hazards / NH-	part	areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays. Seeks to amend the policy so that it only applies when significant	overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as follows:		
		P7		risk is posed to people and property.			
					Incorporating mitigation measures that reduce or avoid an increase in significant risk to people and		
					property from the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability flood;	Reject	No
Oyster Management	404.21	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Supports NH-P7 to the extent it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities within the inundation	Amend NH-P7 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the		
Limited		Natural Hazards / NH-		areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays. Seeks to amend the policy so that it only applies when significant	overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlays) as follows:		
		P7		risk is posed to people and property.			
					Incorporating mitigation measures that reduce or avoid an increase in <u>significant</u> risk to people and		
Talia Tā Alia FOC	FC70 C7	Dont 2 / Hannada a d	0	The subscience of a subscience of the land of the subscience of th	property from the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability flood;	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.67	Part 2 / Hazards and	Oppose	The submission does not make it clear what constitutes a "significant risk", and the level of risk	Disallow		
		Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P7		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.			
		/ 1411-77		Any risk (not just significant risk) to people and property on the site and adjacent properties should			
				be reduced or not increased.		Accept	No
Fire and Emergency	273.70	Hazards and Risks /	Support in		Supports NH-P8 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the		
New Zealand	1	Natural Hazards / NH-	part	accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within	stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlay) with amendment.		
		P8	[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			
	1			have a functional or operational need to locate in identified hazardous areas.			
						Reject	No
Fire and Emergency	273.71	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that	Amend NH-P8 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the stream		
New Zealand		Natural Hazards / NH-		accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within	corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows:		
		P8		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.			
					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	L	
Dating and Miller	250.64	Hannada and Diele /	0	Considers About Ab	Overlays is not a practicable option.	Reject	No
Retirement Villages	350.61	Hazards and Risks /	Oppose in	Considers that the use of both 'avoid' and 'unless it can be demonstrated' in NH-P8 is contradictory,	Opposes NH-P8 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the		
Association of New Zealand Incorporated		Natural Hazards / NH- P8	part	and that the policy should be amended to be enabling when standards are met, rather than restrictive when standards are not met.	stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlay) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
zcalanu mcorporateu	<u> </u>	110	<u> </u>	reserved which standards are not met.	ı	neject	140

		T		I- 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	T		1
Retirement Villages	350.62	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Considers that the use of both 'avoid' and 'unless it can be demonstrated' in NH-P8 is contradictory,	Amend NH-P8 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the stream		
Association of New		Natural Hazards / NH-		and that the policy should be amended to be enabling when standards are met, rather than	corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows:		
Zealand Incorporated		P8		restrictive when standards are not met.	Avoid Enable subdivision development and use associated with potentially hazard sensitive activities		
					and hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridors, <u>unless</u> it can be demonstrated		
					that:	Reiect	N-
Greater Wellington	351.131	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Considers it appropriate to amend to have regard to the Proposed RPS Change 1 Objectives 19 and	Amend NH-P8 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the stream	Reject	NO
Regional Council	351.131	Natural Hazards / NH-	Amena	20 and Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as "as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)" and is in			
Regional Council		P8		line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far	Corridors of the Flood nazard Overlay) as follows.		
		78		as practicable	Avaid subdivision days language and use associated with notantially bayard consitive activities and		
				but is a clearer signal than 'reduce or do not increase', to actively look to bring down the risk in the	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:		
				design and planning of the development. Considers that Changes requested to the policies may	inazard sensitive activities within the stream corndors, unless it can be demonstrated that.		
				necessitate amendments to the rules to have regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS	2. Mitigation measures are incorporated that minimise the reduce or avoid an increase in risk to		
				Change 1.	people and property from the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability Flood;		
				change I.	people and property from the 170 Annual Exceedance 1100ability 1100a,	Accept	Yes
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.26	Part 2 / Hazards and	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC proposed RPS	Allow	лесере	103
TORU TU TIRE EQE	1370.20	Risks / Natural Hazards	зарроге	Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the			
		/ NH-P8		WCC proposed district plan. We agree that 'minimise' natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to			
		ĺ		bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than 'reduce' and 'reduce or do not			
				increase'.		Accept	Yes
Stride Investment	FS107.14	Part 2 / Hazards and	Oppose	Stride is opposed to amending the wording of the natural hazard policies from "reduce or avoid an	Disallow	•	
Management Limited		Risks / Natural Hazards	.,	increase in risk" to "minimise risk" which would impose an unreasonable and greater burden than			
		/ NH-P8		the current wording of the Proposed Plan.		Reject	No
Investore Property	FS108.14	Part 2 / Hazards and	Oppose	Investore is opposed to amending the wording of the natural hazard policies from "reduce or avoid	Disallow		
Limited		Risks / Natural Hazards		an increase in risk" to "minimise risk" which would impose an unreasonable and greater burden than			
		/ NH-P8		the current wording of the Proposed Plan.		Reject	No
Ministry of Education	400.51	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports NH-P8 as the submitter acknowledges the risk which flood hazards can pose to people and	Retain NH-P8 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the stream	•	
,		Natural Hazards / NH-		property. However the submitter considers, at times, there is an operational need for the submitter	corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.		
		P8		to locate educational facilities in flood hazard overlays to provide for existing communities. The	"		
				submitter therefore supports the provision as proposed.		Reject	No
Fire and Emergency	273.72	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports the policy insofar as it seeks to avoid the development of new emergency facilities within	Supports NH-P9 (Emergency facilities in the Liquefaction Overlay).		
New Zealand		Natural Hazards / NH-		the liquefaction overlay, unless it can be demonstrated that the facility will be able to maintain			
		P9		functionality following an earthquake and emergency vehicles will be able to service the impacted			
				community.		Accept in part	No
Fire and Emergency	273.73	Hazards and Risks /	Support in	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that	Supports NH-P9 (Emergency facilities in the Liquefaction Overlay) with amendment.		
New Zealand		Natural Hazards / NH-	part	accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within			
		P9		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.			
						Reject	No
Fire and Emergency	273.74	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that	Amend NH-P9 Emergency facilities in the Liquefaction Overlay) as follows:		
New Zealand		Natural Hazards / NH-		accommodate existing Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and Hazard Sensitive Activities within			
		P9		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.	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> </u>				Reject	No
Greater Wellington	351.132	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Considers there is a risk here from allowing critical infrastructure in liquefaction prone areas. It is	Amend NH-P9 (Emergency facilities in the Liquefaction Overlay) to add a clause to say that the		
Regional Council		Natural Hazards / NH-		important to specify that the foundations are designed to the highest standard to minimise the risk	foundation designs must be designed and certified by qualified Geotech engineer in order to prevent		
		P9		that the building will be able to operate after an event. Good geotechnical design is able to achieve	liquefaction induced deformation of the building and in doing so maintains its post event		
				this and the clause would not add an unreasonable burden to the development design and makes it	functionality.		
				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.			
			-			Accept in part	Yes
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.27	Part 2 / Hazards and	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC support requiring a qualified geotechnical engineer to certify foundation designs	Allow		
		Risks / Natural Hazards		for emergency facilities within the liquefaction hazard overlay, to increase resilience of the building			ļ.,
		/ NH-P9		and maintain post-event functionality.		Accept	No
CentrePort Limited	402.102	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	The equivalent definition is Emergency Service Facilities which should be used here as Emergency	Amend NH-P9 (Emergency facilities in the Liquefaction Overlay) as follows:		
		Natural Hazards / NH-		Facility may be subject to interpretation.			
		P9			Only allow new emergency <u>service</u> facilities within the Liquefaction Overlay where it can be		
					demonstrated that:		
					1. The emergency service facility will be able to maintain post disaster functionality following an		
					earthquake; and	l	l,
		10	1	1	[Z.EL.	Accept	Yes

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 16 of 38

CentrePort Limited	402.103	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-	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.		
		P9	<u> </u>			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</u> of 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: 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
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.133	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH- P10	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.	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: 3. The activity incorporates mitigation measures that ensure the risk from fault rupture to people,		
					property and infrastructure is minimised reduced or not increased.; or	Deinet	N-
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.28	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P10	Support	Toka Tü Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC 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	<u>Reject</u>	No No
WCC Environmental	377.56	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Considers that NH-P10 should be clarified, namely the 20 meter rule. It is assumed 20m is meant to	Amend NH-P10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the Wellington Fault Overlay and	Reject	NO
Reference Group	577.50	Natural Hazards / NH- P10		be a buffer and amended wording is proposed to reflect this.	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 of from the Wellington Faultline or Ohariu Faultline; and		
					The activity incorporates mitigation measures that ensure the risk from fault rupture to people, property and infrastructure is reduced or not increased.	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-	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.		No
Fire and Emergency	273.77	P10 Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new buildings or additions to buildings that	Retain NH-P11 (Hazard sensitive activities, excluding a single residential dwelling on an existing site,	Reject	INU
New Zealand	2.3.11	Natural Hazards / NH- P11	Allenu	supports the policy as it seeks to only allow new official or authorists of uniffings 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.	within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay) as notified.		
						Reject	No

1							
Toka Tū Ake EQC	282.7	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH- P11	Amend	Considers that the plan does not adequately manage the risks of fault rupture, with single residentia dwellings able to be located 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 (52000 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-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 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-residential-dwelling on an existing site, within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay unless it can be demonstrated that: 1. The activity is located more than 20m from the Wellington Faultine or Ohariu Faultline, or 2. The activity, excluding additions to existing building, has a operational and functional need to locate within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay and locating outside of these Overlays is not a practicable option; and 3. The activity incorporates mitigation measures that ensure the risk from fault rupture to people and property is reduced or not increased; or 4. For additions to existing buildings, the change in risk from fault rupture to people and property is reduced or not increased;	Accept	Yes
Retirement Villages Association of New	350.63	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-	Oppose in part	Considers that the use of both 'avoid' and 'unless it can be demonstrated' in NH-P11 is contradictory, and that the policy should be amended to be enabling when standards are met,	Opposes NH-11 (Hazard sensitive activities, excluding a single residential dwelling on an existing site, within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay) and seeks amendment.		
Zealand Incorporated Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.64	P11 Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH- P11	Amend	rather than restrictive when standards are not met. Considers that the use of both 'avoid' and 'unless it can be demonstrated' in NH-P11 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-11 (Hazard sensitive activities, excluding a single residential dwelling on an existing site, within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay) as follows: Avoid-Faable subdivision, development or use associated with hazard sensitive activities, excluding a single residential dwelling on an existing site, within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay-unless where it can be demonstrated that:	Accept in part Accept in part	Yes
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.134	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH- P11	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-P11 (Hazard sensitive activities, excluding a single residential dwelling on an existing site, within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay) as follows: Avoid subdivision, development or use associated with hazard sensitive activities, excluding a single residential dwelling on an existing site, within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay unless it can be demonstrated that: 3. The activity incorporates mitigation measures that ensure the risk from fault rupture to people	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 GRWC 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 no!	Allow		
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.57	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH- P11	Amend	Increase.' 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 existing 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 existing site, within the Wellington Fault Overlay and Ohariu Fault Overlay.	Reject 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 provision as proposed. Supports the provision as proposed. 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
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: 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	ing.wt	
					Overlays is not a practicable option.	Reject	No

	351.135	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Considers it appropriate to amend to have regard to the Proposed RPS Change 1 Objectives 19 and	Amend NH-P12 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the		
Regional Council		Natural Hazards / NH-		20 and Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as "as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)" and is in			
		P12		line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far	Allow for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the Sheppard's		
				as practicable	Fault Overlay and Terawhiti Fault Overlay with the exception of educational facilities, health care		
				but is a clearer signal than 'reduce or do not increase', to actively look to bring down the risk in the	facilities and emergency facilities, where it can be demonstrated that the activity is more than 20m		
				design and planning of the development. Considers that Changes requested to the policies may	from either the Sheppard's Fault or Terawhiti Fault and the development incorporates mitigation		
				necessitate amendments to the rules to have regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS			
				Change 1.	increased.	Accept in part	Yes
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.30	Part 2 / Hazards and	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC proposed RPS	Allow		
		Risks / Natural Hazards		Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the			
		/ NH-P12		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'.		Accept	No
Ministry of Education	400.54	Hazards and Risks /	Support in	Supports NH-P12 in part.	Retain NH-P12 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the		
		Natural Hazards / NH-	part		Sheppard's Fault Overlay and Terawhiti Fault Overlay) with amendment.		
4=1		P12				Accept in part	Yes
Ministry of Education	400.55	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Seeks that NH-P12 be amended. The submitter acknowledges the risk that natural hazards can pose	Amend NH-P12 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the		
		Natural Hazards / NH-		to people and property. However, at times, there is an operational need for the submitter to locate	Sheppard's Fault Overlay and Terawhiti Fault Overlay) as follows:		
		P12		educational facilities in fault overlays to provide for existing communities.			
		1			Allow for potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the Sheppard's		
		İ		The submitter therefore requests an amendment to this policy to provide for development in fault	Fault Overlay and Terawhiti Fault Overlay with the exception of educational facilities, health care		
		1		overlays where there is an operational need to locate there.	facilities and emergency facilities (unless it can be demonstrated that these facilities have an		
					operational need to be located in these areas), where it can be demonstrated that the activity is		
				The submitter notes that this would still require resource consent as a Discretionary Activity, which	more than 20m from either the Sheppard's Fault or Terawhiti Fault and the development		
				is considered appropriate and is supported.	incorporates mitigation measures that ensure the risk from fault rupture to people and property is		
					reduced or not increased.	Accept in part	Yes
	FS14.5	Part 2 / Hazards and	Support	Fire and Emergency may have an operational and functional need to locate in the Sheppard's Fault	Allow		
New Zealand		Risks / Natural Hazards		Overlay and Terawhiti Fault Overlay to ensure Fire and Emergency can maintain efficient and			
Toka Tū Ake EQC 2	282.8	/ NH-P12 Hazards and Risks /	A	effective emergency response times to growing / changing communities.	A AND DAZ (C. b.di.:iri	Accept	NO
TOKA TU AKE EQC	282.8	Natural Hazards / NH-	Amend	Considers that the plan does not adequately manage the risks of fault rupture, with single residentia	Amend NH-P13 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public,		
		P13		dwellings able to be located within the Wellington and Ohariu Fault Overlays. MfE guidelines for	or employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail		
		P13		planning around an active fault advise that Buildings Importance Category (BIC) 2 (residential)	activities in the Wellington Fault Overlay.) as follows:		
				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	passenger port facilities and rail activities, within the Wellington Fault Overlay, where the		
				any residential development within the Fault Overlays should be avoided within 20 m of the	subdivision, development and use does not involve the construction of new buildings which will be		
				Wellington Fault, even on an existing site.	occupied by more than 10 employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port		
					facilities and rail activities or any members of the public, and where it can be demonstrated that the	Reiect	No
Greater Wellington 3	351.136	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Considers this provision is appropriate.	activity is located more than 20 m from the Wellington Fault. Retain NH-P13 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public,	Reject	NO
Regional Council	331.130	Natural Hazards / NH-	Support	Considers this provision is appropriate.	or employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail		
Regional Council		P13			activities in the Wellington Fault Overlay) as notified.	Reject	No
CentrePort Limited 4	402.105	Hazards and Risks /	Oppose	Opposes NH-P13 as it is considered unnecessary. Large parts of the Port Operations including the	Delete NH-P13 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public,	nejeet	110
control timited	702.103	Natural Hazards / NH-	Ohhose	Kaiwharawhara ferry terminal location are included within the fault overlay. A policy limitation to 10			
		P13		passengers or 10 employees would therefore render large parts of the Special Purpose Port Zone	activities in the Wellington Fault Overlay) in its entirety.		
		1 13		unusable for these activities.	activities in the weinington rault overlay) in its entirety.	Reject	No
KiwiRail Holdings 4	408.94	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports policy that provides for and manages subdivision, development and use associated within	Retain NH-P13 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public,	nejeet	110
Limited	.50.54	Natural Hazards / NH-	Support	the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Wellington Fault	or employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail		
Limited		P13		Overlav.	activities in the Wellington Fault Overlay) as notified.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC 2	282.9	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Considers that the plan does not adequately manage the risks of fault rupture, with single residentia		neject	
Tona Tarance Equ	202.3	Natural Hazards / NH-	, anchu	dwellings able to be located within the Wellington and Ohariu Fault Overlays. MfE guidelines for	or employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail		
		P14		planning around an active fault advise that Buildings Importance Category (BIC) 2 (residential)	activities in the Wellington Fault Overlay) as follows:		
		· - '		structures are not developed within the fault avoidance zones (within 20 m of the fault race) of	destrices in the wellington radic overlay) as follows.		
		1		Recurrence Interval Class (RIC) I (<2000 years) faults on brownfield sites and RIC I and II (2000 – 3500	Manage subdivision, development and use associated within the operational port activities		
		1		years) on greenfield sites. The Wellington Fault is RIC I and the Ohariu Fault is RIC II. Considers that	passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Wellington Fault Overlay where the subdivision,		
		1		any residential development within the Fault Overlays should be avoided within 20 m of the	development and use involves the construction of new buildings which will be occupied by members		
		1		Wellington Fault, even on an existing site.	of the public, or more than 10 employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger		
		1		Treaming controlling of the cont	port facilities and rail activities by ensuring that:		
		I	I		port recinities and rain activities by cristing that.		
					1 Mitigation measures are incorporated that avoid an increase in risk to people property and		
					Mitigation measures are incorporated that avoid an increase in risk to people, property and infrastructure from the fault rupture of the Wellington Faults; and		
					infrastructure from the fault rupture of the Wellington Fault- ; and		
						Accept in part	Yes

Segment Council Part								
with a second control of the companies o	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.137		Amend	line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far			
Line 1 lanker 100 Line 1 lanke					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	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		
Intelligible Conference of the					Crurge 2.			
Figure 1942 Figure 2. National Section 1942 And							Accort in part	Vos
Company 1 instead of 1975 in the property of the company of the co	Toka Tū Ake FOC	FS70.31	Part 2 / Hazards and	Support	Toka Tū Ake FOC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC proposed RPS	Allow	Accept in part	163
Security of Limited 50.500 March and Bias Propose			Risks / Natural Hazards	,	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			
Contracted Limited 24,20% Clause and effects Company Com							Assent	No
Land and Passard 1961. 134 135 135 135 135 135 135 135	CentrePort Limited	402 106	Hazards and Risks /	Onnose		Onnoses NH-P14 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the	Accept	NO
Standard and Risks / New York Standard and Risks / New York Standard and Risks / New York Standard Sta	Centrer of Cimited	402.100	Natural Hazards / NH-	Оррозе	Kaiwharawhara ferry terminal location are included within the fault overlay. A policy limitation to 10	public, or employees associated with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail		
Secret Wellington 31.10 Neutral search / No 12.10 Neutral secret / No 12.10 Neut					unusable for these activities.		Reject	No
segment of the Special Purpose would beerfore render large parts of the Special Purpose Pot Zone unsable for these activities. P34	CentrePort Limited	402.107		Amend				
Makes exablished, seek of the control of the contro					passengers or 10 employees would therefore render large parts of the Special Purpose Port Zone			
devidence of the public, are most positioned with the processing of the public, and process and a floring whether the public process and the public process and positioned with the positional post activities, passagery port facilities and rail activities by evaluating these than the process of the manufacture from the fault register of the Wellington Fault for the fault register fault for the fault register fault for the fault register fault for the fault register fault for the fault					and delivered delivered.	Manage subdivision, development and use associated within the operational port activities,		
a clase public, common that a Designation and the operational port activities, passenger port fulfillities and an activities by ensuring the failure and an activities, passenger port fulfillities and activities within the Wellington Sauth. Similar Wellington Size 133 Support Sauth and Risks / Net port of the provises for and manages subdivision, development and use associated within the Wellington Sauth. The operational port activities, passenger port facilities and all activities within the Wellington Sauth. The operational port activities, passenger port facilities and all activities within the Wellington Sauth of the designation of activities, passenger port facilities and all activities within the Wellington Sauth of the Wellington						passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Wellington Fault Overlay where the subdivision,		
ACCEPTION/CENTIFICATION Start Wellington Star								
infrastructure from the fault required or August 1 August 2 August 1 August 1 August 2 August 1 August 1 August 2 August 1 August 1 August 2 August 1 August 1 August 2 August 1 August 1 August 2 August 1 August 2 August 1 August 2 August 1 August 2 August 1 August 2 August 1 August 2 August 1 August 2 August								
infrastructure from the fault required or August 1 August 2 August 1 August 1 August 2 August 1 August 1 August 2 August 1 August 1 August 2 August 1 August 1 August 2 August 1 August 1 August 2 August 1 August 2 August 1 August 2 August 1 August 2 August 1 August 2 August 1 August 2 August 1 August 2 August						1 Militigation measures are incorporated that avoid an increase in risk to needle preparty and		
Nowelland Hoodings (Imited Williams) Natural Nazarda Am Bissix / Support Spoilty that provides for and manages subdivision, development and use associated within imited will be accipied by members of the public, the operational port activities, passingery port facilities and rail activities within the operational port activities, passingery port facilities and rail activities within the operational port activities, passingery port facilities and rail activities in the region of the public portion of t							Reject	No
Forester Wellington Regional Council ST-138	KiwiRail Holdings	408.95	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports policy that provides for and manages subdivision, development and use associated within			
Natural Hazards / NH- P15 Natural Hazards / NH- P15 Natural Hazards / NH- P15 Natural Hazards and Risks / NH- P15 Natural Hazards and Risks / NH- P15 Natural Hazards / NH- P15 Natural Hazards / NH- P15 Natural Hazards / NH- P15 Natural Hazards / NH- P15 Natural Hazards / NH- P15 Natural Hazards / NH- P15 Natural Hazards / NH- P15 Natural Hazards / NH- P15 Natural Hazards / NH- P15 Natural Hazards / NH- P15 Natural Hazards / NH- P15 Natural Hazards / NH- P15 Natural Hazards / NH- P15 Natural Hazards / NH- P15 Natural Hazards / NH- P16 No Natural Hazards / NH- P16 No No Natural Hazards / NH- P16 No No No No No No No No No N	Limited		P14		Overlay.	activities in the Wellington Fault Overlay) as notified.	Reject	No
P15 P0 Cicker 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. P15 Natural Hazards / NH- P15 Supported, an entirely subject to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS Change 1. P15 Natural Hazards / NH- P15 Natural Hazards / NH- P15 Natural Hazards / NH- P15 Natural Hazards / NH- P15 Natural Hazards / NH- P15 Natural Hazards / NH- P15 Natural Hazards / NH- P16 Natural Hazards / NH- P16 Natural Hazards / NH- P16 Natural Hazards / NH- P16 Natural Hazards / NH- P16 Natural Hazard (benefits in industry of the received in the NH- P17 and Policy 52 in Proposed RPS Change 1.		351.138		Support	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Retain NH-P15 (Natural systems and features) as notified.		
MCC Environmental Reference Group ACC Environmenta	Regional Council				(Policies 51 and 52). Considers that Changes requested to the policies may necessitate amendments			
Reference Group Reference Grou							Accept	No
Regional Council 35.1.39	WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.58	Natural Hazards / NH-	Support	sequestration, amenity value, attractiveness, cost-effectiveness and supporting biodiversity and	Retain NH-P15 (Natural systems and features) as notified.	Accept	No
Natural Hazards / NH- P16 Natural Hazards / NH- P16 Natural Hazards / NH- P16 Natural Hazards / NH- P16 Natural Hazards / NH- P16 Natural Hazards / NH- P16 Natural Hazards / NH- P17 This may not be the case, but it would be good to clarify in the 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. 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. Natural Hazards And Risks / Natural Hazards / NH- P17 Natural Hazards / NH- P17	Greater Wellington	351.139		Amend		Amend NH-P16 (Natural hazard mitigation works) as follows:	лесері	IVO
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. Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency Size at Waka Waka Mata Waka Waka Waka Waka Waka Waka Waka W	Regional Council		Natural Hazards / NH-		This may not be the case, but it would be good to clarify in the policy that the mitigation works could	1		
Waka Kotahi NZ FS103.53 Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards Amend MCE Environmental Reference Group R						agency or their nominated contractors or agents within Natural Hazard Overlays where there is no		
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency FS103.53 Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards /NH-P16 Greater Wellington Regional Council Source of the P17 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 andwellbeing, property and infrastructure. Reject No Reject No Amend Natural Hazards / NH-P17 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 andwellbeing, property and infrastructure as follows: Reject No 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 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. Considers that NH-P17 should be amended so that Green Infrastructure is the default choice for undertaking natural Hazards / NH-P17 Natural Hazard / NH-P17 Natural Hazard / NH-P17 Natural Hazard / NH-P17 Natural Hazard / NH-P17 Natural Hazard / NH-P17 Natural Hazard / NH-P17 Natural Hazard / NH-P17 Natural Hazard / NH-P17 Nat					regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS Change 1.			1
Natural Hazards / NH-P16 Natural Hazards / NH-P16 Natural Hazards / NH-P16 Natural Hazard Overlay where this will decrease the risk to people's lives andwellbeing, property and infrastructure. Screeter Wellington Regional Council S1.140 Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-P17 (Green infrastructure) as follows: Screeter Wellington Regional Council S1.140 Hazards / NH-P17 (Sreen infrastructure) as follows: Screeter Wellington Regional Council S1.140 Hazards / NH-P17 (Green infrastructure) as follows: Screeter Wellington Natural Hazards / NH-P17 (Green infrastructure) as follows: Screeter Wellington Natural Hazards / NH-P17 (Green infrastructure) well 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. WCC Environmental Reference Group Natural Hazards / NH-P17 (Screen Infrastructure) as follows: WCC Environmental Reference Group Natural Hazards / NH-P17 (Screen Infrastructure) as follows: WCC Environmental Reference Group Natural Hazards / NH-P17 (Screen Infrastructure) as follows: WCC Environmental Reference Group Natural Hazards / NH-P17 (Screen Infrastructure) as follows: WCC Environmental Reference Group Natural Hazards / NH-P17 (Screen Infrastructure) as follows: WCC Environmental Reference Group Natural Hazards / NH-P17 (Screen Infrastructure) as follows: WCC Environmental Reference Group Natural Hazard mitigation, with other options considered in circumstances where 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 unless 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 unless green infrastructure solutions do not exist, are not suitable or are proh	Waka Kotahi N7	EC102 E2	Part 2 / Hazards and	Cupport	Waka Katahi supports anahling hazard mitigation or stream and river management works within the		Reject	No
Natural Hazards / NH-P17 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. WCC Environmental Reference Group WCC Environmental Reference Group WCT Environmental Refer		3103.33	Risks / Natural Hazards	Зарроп	Natural Hazard Overlay where this will decrease the risk to people's lives andwellbeing, property and		Reject	No
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. WCC Environmental Reference Group WCF Environmental Reference Group WCF In Natural Hazards / NH-P17 should be amended so that Green Infrastructure is the default choice for 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	Greater Wellington	351.140		Amend		Amend NH-P17 (Green infrastructure) as follows:		
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 a statutory agency or their nominated contractors or agents within Natural Hazard Overlays. WCC Environmental Reference Group WCT En	Regional Council							
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. WCC Environmental Reference Group WCF Environmental Reference Group WCF Invironmental Reference Group WCF Invitor Ground Hazard Mitigation or Stream and river management works by a statutory agency or their nominated contractors or agents within Natural Hazard Mitigation or Stream and river management works by a statutory agency or their nominated contractors or agents within Natural Hazard Mitigation or Stream and river management works by a statutory agency or their nominated contractors or agents within Natural Hazard Mitigation or Stream and river management works by a statutory agency or their nominated contractors or agents within Natural Hazard Mitigation or Stream and river management works by a statutory agency or their nominated contractors or agents within Natural Hazard Mitigation or Stream and river management works by a statutory agency or their nominated contractors or agents within Natural Hazard Mitigation or Stream and river management works by a statutory agency or their nominated contractors or agents within Natural Hazard Mitigation or Stream and river management works by a statutory agency or their nominated contractors or agents within Natural Hazard Mitigation or Stream and river management works by a statutory agency or their			P17					
necessitate amendments to the rules to have regard to the natural hazard direction in Proposed RPS Change 1. WCC Environmental Reference Group WCE Environmental Reference Group WCT Environmental Reference Group WCT Environmental Reference Group WCT Environmental Reference Group WCT Environmental Reference Group WCT Environmental Reference Group WCT Environmental Reference Group WCT Environmental Reference Group WCT Environmental Reference Group WCT Environmental Reference Group WCT Environmental Reference Group WCT Environmental Reference Group WCT Environmental Reference Group WCT Environmental Reference Group WCT Environmental Reference Group WCT Environmental Reference Group WCT Environmental Reference Group WCT Environmental Reference Group WCT Environmental Considers that NH-P17 should be amended so that Green Infrastructure is the default choice for undertaking natural hazard mitigation or stream and river management works by a statutory agency or their nominated contractors or agents within Natural Hazard Overlays unless green infrastructure solutions do not exist, are not suitable or are prohibitively expensive. WCS Environmental Reference Group WCS Environm								
WCC Environmental Reference Group Hazards / 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 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> Amend NH-P17 (Green Infrastructure) as follows: Encourage Require 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>								
Natural Hazards / NH- P17 Infrastructure solutions do not exist, are not suitable, or are prohibitively expensive. Encourage Require 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 unless green infrastructure solutions do not exist, are not suitable or are prohibitively expensive.							Accept in part	Yes
P17 infrastructure solutions do not exist, are not suitable, or are prohibitively expensive. Encourage Require 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>	WCC Environmental	377.59		Amend		Amend NH-P17 (Green Infrastructure) as follows:		
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</u> , are not suitable or <u>are prohibitively expensive</u> .	кетегепсе Group					Encourage Paguire the use of green infractructure when undertaking natural based mitigation or		
within Natural Hazard Overlays <u>unless green infrastructure solutions do not exist, are not suitable or</u> <u>are prohibitively expensive.</u>			F1/		initiastructure solutions do not exist, are not suitable, or are promotively expensive.			
are prohibitively expensive.								
Reject No								
							Reject	No

		T		Tarana arang arang arang arang arang arang arang arang arang arang arang arang arang arang arang arang arang ar	T	1	1
Wellington City Council	266.68	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Considers amendment needed for clarity and consistency.	Amend NH-R1 (Less hazard sensitive activities within all hazard areas) as follows:		
		Natural Hazards / NH-			l h d iki iki ikhi ill h d Nak l l d Od	Accept	Vos
(āinga Ora – Homes	FS89.103	Part 2 / Hazards and	Onnoco	Käinga Ora opposes this submission as it is not consistent with the Käinga Ora's primary submission.	Less hazard sensitive activities within all hazard areas-Natural Hazard Overlays Disallow	Accept	res
and Communities	F369.105	Risks / Natural Hazards	Oppose	Rainga Ora opposes this submission as it is not consistent with the Rainga Ora's primary submission.	DISAHOW		
and communicies		/ NH-R1				Reject	No
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.20	Hazards and Risks /	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.	neject	NO
		Natural Hazards / NH-					
		R1				Reject	No
Greater Wellington	351.141	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Considers there appears to be a numbering error in respect of the discretionary activity rule for	Seeks to amend numbering to state '2', not '1' as notified.		
Regional Council		Natural Hazards / NH-		green infrastructure.			
		R3				Accept	Yes
Precinct Properties	139.7	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports NH-R4 (Additions to all buildings in	Retain NH-R4 (Additions to all buildings in the inundation area, overland flow paths or the stream		
New Zealand Limited		Natural Hazards / NH-		the inundation area, overland flow paths or the stream corridor) and in particular supports the	corridor) as notified.		
		R4		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.			
NA 11: 1 6: 6 11	255 52				A 1400 PA (A 180) A 181 PE 2 A 1 A 1 A 1 A 1 A 1 A 1 A 1 A 1 A 1 A	Reject	No
Wellington City Council	266.69	Hazards and Risks /	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		
		Natural Hazards / NH-			corridor) as follows:		
		1/4			Additions to all buildings in the inundation area, overland flow paths or the stream corridor within		
					the Flood Hazard Overlav	Accept in part	Yes
Kāinga Ora – Homes	FS89.104	Part 2 / Hazards and	Oppose	Käinga Ora opposes this submission as it is not consistent with the Käinga Ora's primary submission.	Disallow	Accept in part	163
and Communities	1 303.201	Risks / Natural Hazards	Оррозс	Training of a opposes this submission as it is not consistent with the runings of a sprintary submission.	Sisterior The Control of the Control		
		/ NH-R1				Reject	No
Fire and Emergency	273.80	Hazards and Risks /	Support in	Subject to the relief sought for NH-P4 (which forms a matter of discretion where permitted	Supports NH-R4 (Additions to all buildings in the inundation area, overland flow paths or the stream	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	
New Zealand		Natural Hazards / NH-	part	conditions are infringed, is supportive of this rule which seeks to provide for additions to buildings in	corridor) with amendment.		
		R4		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			
						Reject	No
Fire and Emergency	273.81	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Subject to the relief sought for NH-P4 (which forms a matter of discretion where permitted	Amend NH-R4.3 (Additions to all buildings in the inundation area, overland flow paths or the stream		
New Zealand		Natural Hazards / NH-		conditions are infringed, is supportive of this rule which seeks to provide for additions to buildings in	corridor) as follows:		
		R4		the Ponding Area and Overland Flow path as permitted, restricted discretionary or discretionary	2 Anti-its states Dispositions		
				activities. Notes that additions within a Stream Corridor would amount to a non-complying activity.	3. Activity status: Discretionary		
				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	Where:		
				In the lattice and therefore seeks a discretionary activity status under such circumstances	Wileie.		
					a. Compliance with the requirements of NH-R4.1.a cannot be achieved.		
					b. Compliance with the requirements of NH-R4.1.c cannot be achieved but there is a functional and		
					operational need for such an infringement.	Reject	No
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.20	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Considers that NH-R4 should be amended to clarify its wording. The wording used here conflicts with		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	
		Natural Hazards / NH-		itself. Finished floor level cannot be at "the bottom of the floor joists or the base of the concrete	corridor) as follows:		
		R4		floor slab".			
				There should also be some provision to allow small additions to be built at the existing floor level. It	1. Activity status: Permitted		
				may be impractical and very likely serve no purpose to have the addition built at a higher level if the	Where:		
				entire ground floor of the dwelling is subject to inundation as the result of extreme rain events.			
					a. When located within a 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</u> 1%		
					Flood Annual Exceedance Probability level <u>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		1
					slab and an allowance for freeboard; or		
					b. The additions are not located within an overland flowpaths; or c. The additions are not located within a stream corridor		
					or where the floor area of the extension is no more than 30m2.	Accept in part	Yes
BP Oil New Zealand.	372.89	Hazards and Risks /	Support	NH-R4 is supported as it permits additions to all buildings in the Inundation Area of the Flood Hazard		Accept iii part	163
Mobil Oil New Zealand	5,2.05	Natural Hazards / NH-	зарроге	Overlay where the finished floor levels of the addition for Hazard Sensitive and Potentially Hazard	corridor) as notified.		
Limited and Z Energy		R4		Sensitive Activities are located above the 1% Flood Annual Exceedance Probability Level. This rule is			
0,				supported as it would enable minor upgrading and maintenance works where those works will have			
Limited (the Fuel		1	I	minimal effect on the flood bearing capacity of the land.		Reject	No
Limited (the Fuel Companies)				inininal effect on the flood bearing capacity of the failu.		reject	INO
	380.30	Hazards and Risks /	Support in	Supports additions to buildings in an inundation area to be permitted where they comply with NH-	Retain rule NH-R4.1a (Construction of new buildings and structures) as notified.	Reject	NO
Companies)	380.30	Natural Hazards / NH-	Support in part	Garley Control of the	Retain rule NH-R4.1a (Construction of new buildings and structures) as notified.	neject	NO
Companies) Southern Cross	380.30			Supports additions to buildings in an inundation area to be permitted where they comply with NH-	Retain rule NH-R4.1a (Construction of new buildings and structures) as notified.	Reject	INU

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 21 of 38

				T	T		1
Southern Cross	380.31	Hazards and Risks /	Oppose in	Seeks that the provisions for NH-R4.2 are amended to be restricted discretionary. Considers that it is			
Healthcare Limited		Natural Hazards / NH-	part	inappropriate for additions to existing buildings to trigger a discretionary process, where the existing	overland flowpaths) in its current form and seeks amendment.		
		R4		building is already subject to an overland flowpath.			
				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.		Reject	No
Southern Cross	380.32	Hazards and Risks /	Amend		Amend NH-R4.2 (Additions to all buildings in the inundation area, overland flowpaths or the stream	Neject	110
Healthcare Limited	500.52	Natural Hazards / NH-	runcha	inappropriate for additions to existing buildings to trigger a discretionary process, where the existing			
		R4		building is already subject to an overland flowpath.			
					2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary		
				Considers it would be more appropriate for additions to buildings within an overland flowpath to be	Where:		
				a restricted discretionary activity, which would still give a consent authority appropriate discretion	a. Compliance with the requirements of NH-R4.1.a and NH-R4.1.b cannot be		
				to consider natural hazard risks.	achieved.		
				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).			l.,
Southern Cross	380.33	Hazards and Risks /	0	Considers that it is inappropriate for additions to existing buildings to trigger a discretionary process,	Amend NH-R4 (Additions to all buildings in the inundation area, overland flowpaths or the stream	Reject	NO
Healthcare Limited	380.33	Natural Hazards / NH-	Oppose	where the existing building is already subject to an overland flowpath.	corridor) as follows:		
rieatticare cirriteu		RA		where the existing building is already subject to an overland howpath.	corridor) as ronows.		
		174		Considers it would be more appropriate for additions to buildings within an overland flowpath to be	3. Activity status: Discretionary		
				a restricted discretionary activity, which would still give a consent authority appropriate discretion	S. Activity Status. Discretionary		
				to consider natural hazard risks.	Where:		
				The amendments sought by Southern Cross would apply a consistent approach to inundation areas	a. Compliance with the requirements of NH R4.1.b cannot be achieved		
				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).			
						Reject	No
Argosy Property No. 1	383.28	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports the direction of this rule to enable additions to buildings within a Flood Hazard	Retain NH-R4 (Additions to all buildings in the inundation area, the overland flowpaths, or the		
Limited		Natural Hazards / NH-		Overlay - Inundation Area as a permitted activity or restricted discretionary activity.	stream corridor) as notified.		
	404.00	R4				Reject	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.22	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports the direction of this rule to enable additions to buildings within a Flood Hazard Overlay -	Retain NH-R4 (Additions to all buildings in the inundation area, overland flowpaths or the stream		
Lillited		Natural Hazards / NH-		Inundation Area as a permitted activity where compliance with NH-R4.1 cannot be achieved.	corridor) as notified.	Reject	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.14	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports NH-R4 and in particular supports the Restricted Discretionary activity status for additions	Retain NH-R4 (Additions to all buildings in the inundation area, overland flowpaths or the stream	Neject	110
rabile rioperty Elilited	723.17	Natural Hazards / NH-	Support	to buildings in the Inundation Area where the permitted activity status is not achieved.	corridor) as notified.		
		R4		0		Reject	No
Wellington City Council	266.70	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Considers it necessary to fix a drafting error where both matters of discretion in NH-R5 (Additions to	Amend NH-R5.2 (Additions to a building for a hazard-sensitive activity within a Fault Overlay) as	-,	
		Natural Hazards / NH-		a building for a hazard-sensitive activity within a Fault Overlay) refer to potentially hazard sensitive	follows:		
		R5		activities.			
					()		
					Matters of discretion are:		
1							
					1. For additions to potentially hazard sensitive activities - the matters in NH-P11; and 2. For additions	A	V
Fire and Emorgen	273.82	Hazards and Risks /	Cupport !-	Supports this rule as it seeks to provide for additions to buildings for hazard-sensitive activities	to potentially hazard sensitive activities - the matters in NH-P10.	Accept	res
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	2/3.82	Natural Hazards / NH-	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	Supports NH-R5 (Additions to a building for a hazard-sensitive activity within a Fault Overlay) with		
INCAN TEGIGIIA		RS	part	facilities are considered a hazard-sensitive activity and, as such, seeks the addition of a permitted	unchament.		
				activity standard which allows additions to buildings within a Fault Overlay when there is a			
				functional and operational need to do so.		Reject	No
Fire and Emergency	273.83	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Supports this rule as it seeks to provide for additions to buildings for hazard-sensitive activities	Amend NH-R5 (Additions to a building for a hazard-sensitive activity within a Fault Overlay) as	,	
New Zealand		Natural Hazards / NH-		within a Fault Overlay as permitted or restricted discretionary activity. Notes that emergency service			
		R5		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	1. Activity status: Permitted		
				functional and operational need to do so.			
					Where:		
İ					d. The additions do not increase the Gross Floor Area of a Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activity in		
İ					Wellington Fault Overlay or the Ohariu Fault Overlay by more than 30m2-; or e. There is a functional and operational need for the activity in the Fault Overlay.	Reject	No
L		1	1	I .	e. There is a ranctional and operational need for the activity in the rault overlay.	neject	140

Toka Tü 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 residentia 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 (52000 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. Considers that due to the hazard and potential impacts presented by the Wellington fault, the	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-; and c. It can be demonstrated that the unit is more than 20 m away from the Wellington or Ohariu Faults. Amend NH-R6 (Construction of a residential unit or conversion of any non-residential building into a	Reject	No
		Natural Hazards / NH- R6		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.	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; +of iii. Emergency service facilities.	Reject	No
Toka Tǔ 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 with 10 0 m of RcI (I 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.	Terawhiti Fault Overlays) as follows: 1. Activity Status: Permitted Where: a. It can be demonstrated that the activity is more than 20 m away from the Shepherd's Gully or Terawhiti Fault: and b. The development does not involve the establishment of either: i. Educational facilities; ii. Health care facilities; or iii. Emergency service facilities; or iv. Hazardous facilities and Major Hazardous Facilities.	Agree	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; or vi. Emergency service facilities; and b. The activity is located more than 20 m away from either the Sheppard's Fault or Terawhiti Fault; and c. The development incorporates mitigation measures that ensure the risk from fault rupture to people and property is reduced or not increased. 2. Activity status: Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of NH-R7.1.a, b or c cannot be achieved.	Reject	No

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 23 of 38

	402 400	In 1 10:1 /	Ia	To	The company of the co		T
CentrePort Limited	402.108	Hazards and Risks /	Support in	Support subject to submission points on NH-P13 (Subdivision, use and development which will be	Retain NH-R8 (Operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified,		
		Natural Hazards / NH-	part	occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the operational port activities,	subject to amendments sought relating to NH-P13 (Subdivision, use and development which will be		
		R8		passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Wellington Fault Overlay) and NH-P14 (Subdivision,	occupied by members of the public, or employees associated with the operational port activities,		
				use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated	passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Wellington Fault Overlay) and NH-P14 (Subdivision,		
				with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Wellington Fault	use and development which will be occupied by members of the public, or employees associated		
				Overlay). Large parts of the Port are subject to Natural Hazards.	with the operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Wellington Fault		
					Overlay).	Reject	No
KiwiRail Holdings	408.96	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports the ability to undertake operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail	Retain NH-R8 (Operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.		
Limited		Natural Hazards / NH-		activities as a permitted activity.			
		R8				Reject	No
Precinct Properties	139.8	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports NH-R9 (Activities in the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay) as it provides for all activities except	Retain NH-R9 (Activities in the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay) as notified.		
New Zealand Limited		Natural Hazards / NH-		emergency service facilities in the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay to occur as a permitted activity.			
		R9				Accept	No
Fire and Emergency	273.86	Hazards and Risks /	Support in	Considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in the Liquefaction Hazard	Supports NH-R9 (Activities in the liquefaction hazard overlay) with amendment.		
New Zealand		Natural Hazards / NH-	part	Overlay. As such, FENZ seeks to remove the exclusion of emergency service facilities from the			
		R9		permitted activity rule in order to ensure efficient and effective emergency response times.		Reject	No
Fire and Emergency	273.87	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in the Liquefaction Hazard	Amend NH-R9 (Activities in the liquefaction hazard overlay) as follows:		
New Zealand		Natural Hazards / NH-		Overlay. As such, FENZ seeks to remove the exclusion of emergency service facilities from the			
		R9		permitted activity rule in order to ensure efficient and effective emergency response times.	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	383.29	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being permitted in the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay.	Retain NH-R9 (Activities in the liquefaction hazard overlay) as notified.	,	
Limited		Natural Hazards / NH-					
	1	R9				Accept	No
Ministry of Education	400.58	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports NH-R9, in particular the permitted activity status for the establishment of educational	Retain NH-R9 (Activities in the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay) as notified.		
,		Natural Hazards / NH-		facilities in the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay.			
		R9				Accept	No
Fabric Property Limited	425 15	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports NH-R9 as it provides for all activities except emergency service facilities in the Liquefaction	Retain NH-R9 (Activities in the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay) as notified.		
Tubile Froperty Elimited	123.13	Natural Hazards / NH-	Support	Hazard Overlay to occur as a permitted activity. This is appropriate and proportionate to the risk	The tall the big deliction rated overlay, as notified.		
		RO		level and ability to mitigate that risk.		Accept	No
Precinct Properties	139.9	Hazards and Risks /	Support in	Supports NH-R10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard	Retain NH-R10.1 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard	лесерг	110
New Zealand Limited	155.5	Natural Hazards / NH-	nart	Overlay), as it provides for Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities in the Inundation Area of the Flood	, ,		
ivew Zealand Limited		R10	part	Hazard Overlay as a Permitted activity where conditions around floor levels are met.	Overlay) as notined.		
		KIO		Triazard Overlay as a Fermitted activity where conditions around noor levels are met.			
						Reject	No
Precinct Properties	139.10	Hazards and Risks /	Support in	Supports the Restricted Discretionary status for	Retain NH-R10.2 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard	Reject	NO
New Zealand Limited	133.10	Natural Hazards / NH-	part	Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities that do not comply with	Overlay) as notified.		
ivew Zealand Limited		R10	part	the conditions of NH-R10.1.	Overlay) as notined.	Reject	No
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.21	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Considers that NH-R10 should be amended to clarify its wording. The wording used here conflicts	Amend NH-R10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard	Reject	NO
KIIIIU AICIIILECIS LIU	316.21		Amenu				
		Natural Hazards / NH-		with itself. Finished floor level cannot be at "the bottom of the floor joists or the base of the	Overlay) as follows:		
		R10		concrete floor slab".			
					A A C D GO A GO DO A		
					1. Activity Status: Permitted		
1					1. Activity Status: Permitted Where:		
					Where:		
					Where: a. When located within a Inundation Area of the Flood Hazard Overlay, the finished floor levels of		
					Where: a. When located within a 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		
					Where: a. When located within a 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, plus the height of including an allowance for freeboard, where the-		
					Where: a. When located within a 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, 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		
					Where: a. When located within a 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, plus the height of including an allowance for freeboard, where the-		
					Where: a. When located within a 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 <u>and an allowance for freeboard</u>. </u>	Accept	Yes
BP Oil New Zealand,	372.90	Hazards and Risks /	Support	NH-R10 is supported as it enables Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities in the Inundation Area of	Where: a. When located within a 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 <u>and an allowance for freeboard.</u> Retain NH-R10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard</u>	Accept	Yes
Mobil Oil New Zealand	372.90	Natural Hazards / NH-	Support	the Flood Hazard Overlay as a permitted activity where the finished floor levels of the building for	Where: a. When located within a 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 <u>and an allowance for freeboard</u>. </u>	Accept	Yes
Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy	372.90		Support	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	Where: a. When located within a 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 <u>and an allowance for freeboard.</u> Retain NH-R10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard</u>	Accept	Yes
Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel	372.90	Natural Hazards / NH-	Support	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)	Where: a. When located within a 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 <u>and an allowance for freeboard.</u> Retain NH-R10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard</u>	Accept	Yes
Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy	372.90	Natural Hazards / NH-	Support	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	Where: a. When located within a 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 <u>and an allowance for freeboard.</u> Retain NH-R10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard</u>	Accept	Yes
Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel	372.90	Natural Hazards / NH-	Support	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	Where: a. When located within a 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 <u>and an allowance for freeboard.</u> Retain NH-R10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard</u>	Accept	Yes
Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)		Natural Hazards / NH- R10	Support	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.	Where: a. When located within a 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, 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. Retain NH-R10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.	<u>Accept</u> Reject	Ves No
Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel	372.90 383.30	Natural Hazards / NH-	Support	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	Where: a. When located within a 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 <u>and an allowance for freeboard.</u> Retain NH-R10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard</u>		
Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)		Natural Hazards / NH- R10		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.	Where: a. When located within a 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, 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. Retain NH-R10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.		
Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies) Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.30	Natural Hazards / NH- R10 Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH- R10		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. 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.	Where: a. When located within a 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 <u>and an allowance for freeboard.</u> Retain NH-R10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified. Retain NH-R10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the flood hazard overlay) as notified.</u>		
Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies) Argosy Property No. 1		Natural Hazards / NH-R10 Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-		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. 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	Where: a. When located within a 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, 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. Retain NH-R10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified. Retain NH-R10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the flood hazard	Reject	
Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies) Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.30	Natural Hazards / NH- R10 Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH- R10	Support	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. 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.	Where: a. When located within a 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 <u>and an allowance for freeboard.</u> Retain NH-R10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified. Retain NH-R10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the flood hazard overlay) as notified.</u>	Reject	

	1			T	1	1	
Investore Property	405.31	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports the provisions setting permitted and restricted discretionary activity status. Considers that	Retain NH-R10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard		
Limited		Natural Hazards / NH-		this provides for an appropriate balance of risk management while retaining appropriate discretion	Overlay) as notified.		
		R10		to address natural hazard risks.			
				[Refer to original submission for full reason].		Reject	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.16	Hazards and Risks /	Support in	Supports NH-R10, as it provides for Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities in the Inundation Area of	Retain NH-R10.1 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard		
		Natural Hazards / NH-	part	the Flood Hazard Overlay as a Permitted activity where conditions around floor levels are met. The	Overlay) as notified.		
		R10		commercial activities carried out at Fabric's properties are potentially hazard sensitive activities.			
						Reject	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.17	Hazards and Risks /	Support in	Supports the Restricted Discretionary activity status for Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities that	Retain NH-R10.2 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard		
' '		Natural Hazards / NH-	part	do not comply with the conditions of NH-R10.1. The restricted discretionary activity status provides	Overlay) as notified.		
		R10	p = - 1	for an appropriate balance of risk management while retaining appropriate discretion to address			
				natural hazards.		Accept	No
Reading Wellington	441.1	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports permitting potentially sensitive activities in the Flood Inundation overlay with mitigation	Retain NH-R10 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard		
Properties Limited		Natural Hazards / NH-		(as outlined in NH-R10).	Overlay) as notified.		
1 Toperties Ellilited		R10		(as outlined in N1 N2O).	overlay) as notined.	Reject	No
Stride Investment	470.15	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports the Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities in the Inundation Area of the Flood Hazard	Retain NH-R10.1 (potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard	Neject	140
Management Limited	470.13	Natural Hazards / NH-	Support	Overlay being a Permitted Activity, as the commercial activities at the Johnsonville Town Centre are	Overlay) as notified.		
Management Limiteu		R10		potentially hazard sensitive activities.	Overlay) as notined.		
		KIU		potentially nazaru sensitive activities.		Reject	No
Chaide Incomens	470.46	Hannada and Diele /	Comment	Comments the Destricted Discounting of the state of the s	Detail All D10 2 (set estill beautier estilis estilis estilis estilis estilis estilis estille	Reject	NU
Stride Investment	470.16	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports the Restricted Discretionary Activity status for activities not complying with the conditions	Retain NH-R10.2 (potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard		
Management Limited		Natural Hazards / NH-		of NH-R10.1. (potentially hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard	Overlay) as notified.		
		R10		Overlay)		Accept	No
Fire and Emergency	273.88	Hazards and Risks /	Support in	Considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in the Flood Hazard Overlay. As	Supports NH-R11 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) with	1	
New Zealand		Natural Hazards / NH-	part	such, FENZ seeks to remove the exclusion of emergency service facilities from the permitted activity	amendment.		
		R11		rule in order to ensure efficient and effective emergency response times.		Reject	No
Fire and Emergency	273.89	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Considers they may have a functional or operational need to locate in the Flood Hazard Overlay. As	Amend NH-R11 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as		
New Zealand		Natural Hazards / NH-		such, FENZ seeks to remove the exclusion of emergency service facilities from the permitted activity	follows:		
		R11		rule in order to ensure efficient and effective emergency response times.			
					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		
					The risk to people and property is reduced or not increased-; and		
					There is a functional and operational need for the activity in the inundation area of the Flood		
					Hazard overlay	Reject	No
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.22	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Considers that NH-R11 should be amended to clarify its wording. The wording used here conflicts	Amend NH-R11 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as	Reject	140
Milliu Al Cliftects Etu	310.22	Natural Hazards / NH-	Amenu	with itself. Finished floor level cannot be at "the bottom of the floor joists or the base of the	follows:		
		R11		concrete floor slab".	Tollows.		
		KII		Concrete 11001 Stab .	4 Autilia Chatana Danistand		
					1. Activity Status: Permitted		
					Where:		
					a. When located within a Inundation Area of the Flood Hazard Overlay, the finished floor levels of		
	1				the building for the hazard sensitive activity is located above the 1% Flood Annual Exceedance	1	
	1				Probability level, <u>plus the height of including an allowance for freeboard, where the finished floor</u>	1	
	1				level is to the bottom of the floor joists or the base of the concrete floor slab and an allowance for	1	
	1				<u>freeboard</u> .	1	
						Accept	Yes
BP Oil New Zealand,	372.91	Hazards and Risks /	Support	NH-R11 is supported, as it enables Hazard Sensitive Activities in the Inundation Area of the Flood	Retain NH-R11 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as		
Mobil Oil New Zealand	I	Natural Hazards / NH-		Hazard Overlay as a restricted discretionary activity where the finished floor levels of the building for	notified.	1	
Limited and Z Energy	I	R11		the Hazard Sensitive Activity is located above the 1% Flood Annual Exceedance Probability Level.		1	
Limited (the Fuel				This rule is supported for the same reason as NH-R10.			
Companies)	I					Reject	No
Southern Cross	380.34	Hazards and Risks /	Support in	Supports hazard sensitive activities in inundation areas being restricted discretionary where the	Retain rule NH-R11.1 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay)		
Healthcare Limited		Natural Hazards / NH-	part	finished floor levels of the building are located above the 1% Flood Annual Exceedance Probability	as notified.	1	
	1	R11		level (including an allowance for freeboard, where the finished floor level is to the bottom of the		1	
	1			floor joists or the base of the concrete floor slab.)		Reject	No
Southern Cross	380.35	Hazards and Risks /	Oppose in	Seeks for the activity status for hazard sensitive activities in an inundation area that do not comply	Opposes Policy NH-R11.2 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard		
Healthcare Limited	330.33	Natural Hazards / NH-	part	with Rule NH-R11.1 be discretionary.	Overlay) in its current form and seeks amendment.	1	
		ivaturar riazdrus / IVH-	hair	with nate in initiative discretionary.	Overlay) in its current form and seeks amendment.	Ĭ	
		D11	1				
		R11		The activity status of non-complying may avaretet the side of leasting and activity			
		R11		The activity status of non-complying may overstate the risk of locating such activities in an			
		R11		inundation area. It is appropriate for a consent authority to use its full discretion to undertake an			
		R11				Reject	

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 25 of 38

E			T				
Southern Cross	380.36	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Seeks for the activity status for hazard sensitive activities in an inundation area that do not comply	Amend NH-R11.2 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as		
Healthcare Limited		Natural Hazards / NH-		with Rule NH-R11.1 be discretionary.	follows:		
		R11		The activity status of non-complying may everstate the rick of locating such activities in an	2. Activity Status: Discretionary Non-Complying		
				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	2. Activity Status: Discretionary Non-Complying Where:		
				assessment of the activity with the benefit of a consent application, and an assessment under s 104D			1
				of the Resource Management Act 1991 is not required.	and the requirements of restaural a calmot be achieved.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and	391.158	Hazards and Risks /	Oppose in	NH-R11 is opposed, as identified flooding inundation areas carry the lowest risk of natural hazard	Retain NH-R11 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) with		
Communities		Natural Hazards / NH-	part	potential and are more than capable of being mitigated.	amendment.		
		R11				Reject	No
Thorndon Residents'		Part 2 / Hazards and	Oppose	Thorndon is susceptible to flooding. This must be an urban planning consideration.	Disallow		
Association Inc		Risks / Natural Hazards					ļ
		/ General NH		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).			
				Stiedilj.			
				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].			
						Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and	391.159	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Considers that NH-R12 should be amended to have a permitted activity pathway. Identified flooding	Amend NH-R11.1 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) and		
Communities		Natural Hazards / NH- R11		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	its title as follows:		
		KII		development that achieves the 1% Flood Annual Exceedance Probability level, including allowance	Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay Area		
				for freeboard.	Trazard Sensitive activities in the indidation area of the riood flazard overlay <u>Area</u>		
				Tot receboard.	Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary Permitted		
					2.7 centry states. Restricted biserctionary <u>i-crimited</u>		
					Where:		
					a. When located within a Inundation Area of the Flood Hazard Overlay Area, 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'		Part 2 / Hazards and	Oppose	Thorndon is susceptible to flooding. This must be an urban planning consideration.	Disallow	neject	110
Association Inc		Risks / Natural Hazards					1
		/ General NH		Recent weather events have caused underground streams to daylight themselves in areas predicted			1
				by the planning map. Climate change is anticipated to increase the frequency and impact of deluges			1
				on Thorndon's catchments (Te Ahumairangi Hill and the Pipitea Stream).			
				Sucarry.			
				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.			
				ett.			
				[Refer to Further submission for included map].			
						Accept	No

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 26 of 38

Toka Tü Ake EQC	FS70.54	Part 2 / Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	Oppose 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 o 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. Greater Wellington oppose a permitted activity for hazard sensitive activities in the Flood Hazard		Accept	No
Regional Council	130 1170	Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11	оррозс	Overlay as it does not allow sufficient oversight of development in natural hazard areas.	Saladon, Secto dal III III Securico Silvoned.	Accept	No
Käinga Ora Homes and Communities		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 Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of NH-R11.1a cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: 1. The degree to which the impact from the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability flood is low due to either the: a) Implementation of mitigation measures b) The shallow depth of the flood waters within the building; or c) Type of activity undertaken within the building 2. The extent to which the risk to people and property is reduced or not increased.	Reject	No
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.10	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].		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	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).		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).	Amend NH-R11.2 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows: 2. Activity Status: Non-Complying Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of NH-R11.1.a cannot be achieved.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.41	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 49 Limited	405.34	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-	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.	Retain NH-R11.2 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) and seeks amendment.		
		R11		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).		Reject	No
	405.35	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Considers that the non-complying status where the restricted discretionary rule cannot be met is too		,	
Limited		Natural Hazards / NH- R11		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	follows: 2 Activity Status: Non Complying Discretionary		
				rule NH-R13).	Where:		
Toka Tū Ake EQC FS	FS70.42	Part 2 / Hazards and	Oppose	Potentially hazard sensitive activities, which include commercial activities, offices, and retail	a. Compliance with the requirements of NH-R12.1.a cannot be achieved. Disallow	Reject	No
TORATU ARE EQC	370.42	Risks / Natural Hazards	Оррозе	activities, within the inundation area of the flood hazard zone should remain non-compliant when	DISCHOW		
		/ NH-R12		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.		Accept	No
Fabric Property Limited 4:	425.18	Hazards and Risks /	Support in	Supports NH-R11.1 in part, as it provides for Hazard Sensitive Activities in the Inundation Area as a	Supports NH-R11.1 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay),		
		Natural Hazards / NH- R11	part	Restricted Discretionary activity where conditions around floor levels are met.	with amendment.		
						Reject	No
Fabric Property Limited 4:	425.19	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-	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-	Amend NH-R11.2 as follows:		
		R11		Complying. Considers this would be consistent with the approach taken to Hazard Sensitive Activities	1. Activity Status: Non Complying Discretionary		
				within the Overland Flowpaths (as provided in rule NH-R13).	When		
					Where:		
					Compliance with the requirements of NH-R11.1.a cannot		
Stride Investment 4	470.17	Hazards and Risks /	Support in	Supports in part NH-R11 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard	be achieved. Retain NH-R11 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as	Reject	No
Management Limited		Natural Hazards / NH-	part	Overlay), as it provides for Hazard Sensitive Activities in the Inundation Area as a Restricted	notified, with amendments.		
Stride Investment 4	470.18	R11 Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Discretionary. Seeks amendments to NH-R11.2 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood	Amend NH-R11.2 (Hazard sensitive activities in the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as	Reject	No
Management Limited	470.10	Natural Hazards / NH-	Amena	Hazard Overlay) to make the default activity status Discretionary within the Inundation Area for	follows:		
		R11		Hazard Sensitive Activities that do not comply with NH-R11.1, rather than Non-Complying.	4 Ashida Chakas Nan Canadain Dispating		
				Considers that this would be consistent with the approach taken to Hazard Sensitive Activities within	1. Activity Status: Non Complying Discretionary		
				the Overland Flowpaths (as provided in rule NH-R13).	Where:		
					a. Compliance with the requirements of NHIR11.1.a cannot be achieved	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC FS	FS70.81	Part 2 / Hazards and	Oppose	Hazard sensitive activities, which include emergency facilities, hospitals, major hazardous facilities	Disallow	-,	
		Risks / Natural Hazards / NH-R11		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.			
Precinct Properties 1:	139.11	Hazards and Risks /	Support in	Supports NH-R12 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the overland flow path of the Flood	Not specified.	Accept	No
New Zealand Limited	135.11	Natural Hazards / NH-	part	Hazard Overlay) in part, as it provides for Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities in the overland flow	Not specified.		
		R12		path overlay as a Restricted Discretionary activity where conditions around floor levels are met.		No selief execified	N-
Precinct Properties 1:	139.12	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Seeks amendments to NH-R12.2 to make the	Amend NH-R12.2 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the overland flowpath of the Flood Hazard	No relief specified.	NO
New Zealand Limited		Natural Hazards / NH-		default activity status Discretionary within the overland	Overlay) as follows:		
		R12		flow path for Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities that do not comply with NH-R12.1, rather than Non-Complying. This would	Activity Status: Non-Complying-Discretionary		
				be consistent with the approach taken to Hazard Sensitive	When		
				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))	Where:		
					Compliance with the requirements of NH-R12.1.a cannot be achieved.	Accept	Yes
Rimu Architects Ltd 3:	318.23	Hazards and Risks / Natural Hazards / NH- R12	Amend	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".	Amend NH-R12 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the overland flowpath of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as follows:		
		MIZ		LUINETE HUUI SIAD .	1. Activity Status: Permitted		
					Where:		
					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, <u>plus the height of including an allowance for freeboard, where the</u> finished floor level is to the bottom of the floor joists or the base of the concrete floor slab and an		
				1	and all all all all all all all all all al	l	I

				T	1	T	
Kāinga Ora Homes and	391.161	Hazards and Risks /		NH-R12 is supported for its general approach that impacts on hazard sensitive activities should be	Retain NH-R12 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the overland flowpath of the Flood Hazard		
Communities		Natural Hazards / NH-	part	mitigated in medium risk areas in accordance with NH-P2. On this basis rule NH-R12.2 needs to be	Overlay) with amendment.		
		R12		amended as overland flowpaths are identified as a medium risk area in the chapter introduction.		Accept	Yes
Kāinga Ora Homes and	391.162	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Considers that NH-R12 should be amended to have a discretionary activity status. Overland	Amend NH-R12.2 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the overland flowpath of the Flood Hazard	Ассері	163
Communities	331.102	Natural Hazards / NH-	Amena	flowpaths are identified as a medium risk area in the chapter introduction. Consequently, it is sought			
		R12		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.	Activity Status: Non-Complying Discretionary		
					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	Oppose	Hazard sensitive activities, which include emergency facilities, hospitals, major hazardous facilities	Disallow		
		Risks / Natural Hazards		andchildcare, within the overland flowpath area of the flood hazard overlay should remain non-			
		/ NH-R12		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.		Reject	No
Greater Wellington	FS84.79	Part 2 / Hazards and	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose the discretionary pathway suggested by the submitter as this	Disallow / Seeks that NH-R12 is retained as notified.	Reject	NO
Regional Council	F364.79	Risks / Natural Hazards	Oppose	undermines the risk-based approach adopted in the Proposed District Plan.	Disdilow / Seeks triat Nn-N12 is retained as notined.		
Regional Council		/ NH-R12		and crimines the risk based approach adopted in the Proposed District Flam.		Reject	No
Oyster Management	404.25	Hazards and Risks /	Oppose in	Supports restricted discretionary activity status for NH-R12.1, but considers that if RD status is not	Amend NH-R12 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the overland flowpath of the Flood Hazard	neject	140
Limited		Natural Hazards / NH-	part	achieved, the activity status should become Discretionary rather than NC.	Overlay) to:		
		R12					
					2. Activity status: Non-complying Discretionary		
					Where:		
					a. Compliance with the requirements of NH-R12.1.a cannot be achieved	Accept	Yes
Oyster Management	404.26	Hazards and Risks /	Support in	Supports restricted discretionary activity status for NH-R12.1, but considers that if RD status is not	Retain NH-R12.1 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the overland flowpath of the Flood Hazard		
Limited		Natural Hazards / NH-	part	achieved, the activity status should become Discretionary rather than NC.	Overlay) as notified.		
		R12				Accept	Yes
Oyster Management	404.27	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Supports restricted discretionary activity status for NH-R12.1, but considers that if RD status is not	Amend NH-R12 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the overland flowpath of the Flood Hazard		
Limited		Natural Hazards / NH-		achieved, the activity status should become Discretionary rather than NC.	Overlay) as follows:		
		R12			2. Activity status: Non-complying Discretionary		
					2. Activity status: Non-complying Discretionary Where:		
					a. Compliance with the requirements of NH-R12.1.a cannot be achieved	Accept	Yes
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.68	Part 2 / Hazards and	Oppose	Potentially hazard sensitive activities, which include commercial activities, offices, and retail	Disallow	Ассере	103
TONG TO THE EQU	1370.00	Risks / Natural Hazards	Оррозс	activities, within the overland flowpath area of the flood hazard overlay should remain non-	Sisterior Control of the Control of		
		/ NH-R12		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.		Reject	No
Stride Investment	470.19	Hazards and Risks /	Support in	Supports in part NH-R12 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the overland flowpath of the Flood			
Management Limited		Natural Hazards / NH-	part	Hazard Overlay) as it provides for Potentially	Overlay) as notified, with amendments.		
		R12		Hazard Sensitive Activities in the Overland Flowpath of the Flood Hazard Overlay as a Restricted		l	1
c	470.00		 	Discretionary activity where conditions around floor levels are met.		Accept	Yes
Stride Investment	470.20	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Seeks amendments to make the default activity status Discretionary within the Overland Flowpath	Amend NH-R12.2 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the overland flowpath of the Flood Hazard		
Management Limited		Natural Hazards / NH- R12		overlay for Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities that do not comply with NH-R12.1, rather than Nor	Overlay) as follows:		
		V17		Complying.	2. Activity Status: Non-Complying Discretionary		
				Considers that the risks from activities within an overland flowpath overlay can be appropriately	2. Activity Status. Non-complying <u>Discretionary</u>		
				assessed as a Discretionary Activity.	Where:		
				assessed as a significant producty.			
				Considers that a Discretionary status would also be consistent with the activity status for Hazard	a. Compliance with the requirements of NH⊠R12.1.a cannot be achieved		
				Sensitive Activities in the Overland Flowpath as set out in NH-R13.	ar compliance with the requirements of this section at the first section at the s	Accept	Yes
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.82	Part 2 / Hazards and	Oppose	Potentially hazard sensitive activities, which include commercial activities, offices, and retail	Disallow		1.03
		Risks / Natural Hazards	ррозс	activities, within the inundation area of the flood hazard zone should remain non-compliant when			
		/ NH-R12		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.			
						Reject	No

Carrette and Conser	380.37	Uses and Bislay	O	Contrades beautiful and in the contrades of the contrades	One and District of the Control of t		
Southern Cross	380.37	Hazards and Risks /	Oppose in part	Seeks that hazard sensitive activities within an overland flowpath are a restricted discretionary	Opposes NH-R13 (Hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard		
Healthcare Limited		Natural Hazards / NH- R13	part	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.	Overlay) in its current form and seeks amendment.		
		KIS		Subdivision, use and development based on the nazards posed.			
				It would be more appropriate for the Proposed Plan to take a consistent approach to assessing			
	1		1	hazard sensitive activities in overland flowpaths and inundation areas.			
				, and the second			
				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.			
						Reject	No
Southern Cross	380.38	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Seeks that hazard sensitive activities within an overland flowpath are a restricted discretionary	Amend NH-R13 (Hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard	Reject	NO
Healthcare Limited	300.30	Natural Hazards / NH-	,	activity. This would be more consistent with Policy NH-P1 to take a risk-based approach to	Overlay) as follows:		
		R13		subdivision, use and development based on the hazards posed.			
					1. Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary		
				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.			
	1		1				
	1		1	While we appreciate that the Council has identified overland flowpaths and inundation areas as			
	1		1	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			
	1		1	similar to people involved in hazard sensitive activities in an inundation area to hazard sensitive activities in an overland flowpath.			
	1		1	activities in an overland nowpath.			
	1		1			Reject	No
Ministry of Education	400.59	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports NH-R13 as it enables the establishment of educational facilities within the overland	Retain NH-R13 (Hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard		
,		Natural Hazards / NH-		flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlay as a Discretionary Activity. The submitter considers this to be			
		R13		appropriate.		Reject	No
	404.28	Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Considers that this rule should provide a tiered approach to activity status, specifically where	Amend NH-R13 (Hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard		
Limited		Natural Hazards / NH-		compliance with the floor level (as per NH-12.1.a)) is a RD activity.	Overlay) as follows:		
		R13					
					1. Activity status: Restricted discretionary		
					Where: a. Compliance with NH-R13.1.a is achieved.		
					a. compliance with WESTER'S delivered.		
					± 2. Activity status: Discretionary		
					Where:		
					a. Compliance with NH-R13.1.a is not achieved.		
					[Inferred decision requested].	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC		Part 2 / Hazards and	Oppose	Hazard sensitive activities, which include emergency facilities, hospitals, major hazardous facilities	Disallow		
		Risks / Natural Hazards		and childcare, within the overland flowpath area of the flood hazard overlay should remain			
		/ NH-R13		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.		Accept	No
Oyster Management	404.29	Hazards and Risks /	Oppose in	Considers that this rule should provide a tiered approach to activity status, specifically where	Amend NH-R13 (Hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard		
Limited		Natural Hazards / NH-	part	compliance with the floor level (as per NH-12.1.a)) is a RD activity.	Overlay) as follows:		
	1	R13	1				
	1		1		1. Activity status: Restricted discretionary		
					Where:		
	1		1		a. Compliance with NH-R13.1.a is achieved.		
	1		1		1. 2. Activity status: Discretionary		
	1		1		± 2. Activity status: Discretionary Where:		
					a. Compliance with NH-R13.1.a is not achieved.		
	1		1		[Inferred decision requested].	Reject	No
	405.36	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports the Discretionary activity status for Hazard	Retain NH-R13 (Hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard		
Limited	1	Natural Hazards / NH-	1	Sensitive Activities.	Overlay) as notified.		
	<u> </u>	R13	<u> </u>			Reject	No
	470.21	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports NH-R13 (Hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard	Retain NH-R13 (Hazard sensitive activities within the overland flowpaths of the Flood Hazard		
Management Limited		Natural Hazards / NH- R13		Overlay).	Overlay) as notified.	Reject	No
	l	LTD	l			Reject	INU

						T	
Ministry of Education	400.60	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports NH-R15 as the submitter considers that the non-complying activity status for hazard	Retain NH-R15 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities and hazard sensitive activities within the		
		Natural Hazards / NH-		sensitive activities within the stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlay is appropriate.	stream corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.	D-it	N-
Toka Tū Ake EQC	282.12	R15 Hazards and Risks /	Amend	Considers that residential units should be included as hazard sensitive activities within the	A TANIDAGAMA I NA MANA A TANIDAGAMA NA MANA MANA MANA MANA MANA MANA M	Reject	No
TOKA TU AKE EQC	282.12		Amena		Amend NH-R16-1 (Hazard sensitive activities (excluding a single residential unit) within the		
		Natural Hazards / NH- R16		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	Wellington Fault and Ohariu Fault Overlay) as follows:		
		KIO		developed within the fault avoidance zones (within 20 m of the fault race) of Recurrence Interval	Hazard sensitive activities (excluding a single residential unit) within the Wellington Fault and Ohariu		
				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	1. Activity status: Non-Complying		
				development within the Fault Overlays should be avoided within 20 m of the Wellington Fault, even	1. Activity status. Non complying		
				on an existing site.		Accept in part	Accept in part
Ministry of Education	400.61	Hazards and Risks /	Support	Supports NH-R16 as the submitter considers that non-complying activity status for hazard sensitive	Retain NH-R16 (Hazard sensitive activities (excluding a single residential unit) within the Wellington		
,		Natural Hazards / NH-		activities within the Wellington Fault and Ohariu Fault Overlay is appropriate.	Fault and Ohariu Fault Overlay) as notified.		
		R16		υ,,,,,,,		Reject	No
Greater Wellington	351.36	Interpretation Subpart /	Amend	Considers the term 'hard engineering' is defined in both the RPS and regional plan. Including a	Add a new definition for 'Hard Engineering Natural Hazards Mitigation Works' to align with operative		
Regional Council		Definitions / New		definition for hard engineering natural hazard mitigation works would align with the use of a specific	RPS and regional plan as follows:		
-		definition		definition of soft engineering hazard mitigation works.			
					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.	Accept in part	Yes
Wellington	FS36.11	Part 1/ Interpretation	Support	WIAL supports the inclusion of this definition, as derived from the Greater Wellington Regional	Allow		1
International Airport		Subpart / Definitions /		Policy Statement and Regional Plan. WIAL would be comfortable for any relief that seeks to address			1
Limited		New definition		the concerns raised in its primary submission with respect to the seawall located between Lyall Bay			
				and Moa Point to adopt this language.		Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and	391.31	Interpretation Subpart /	Amend	Considers that references to "Natural Hazard Overlays" should be removed and replaced by a newly	Seeks to add new definitions to identify flood hazards in the Plan, including a definition for "Natural		
Communities		Definitions / New		defined term 'Natural Hazard Areas". Natural Hazard Overlays should instead be included as non-	Hazard Areas".		
		definition		statutory, information-only mapping layer that sits outside the Proposed District Plan.			
						Reject	No
Wellington	FS36.14	Part 1/ Interpretation	Support	, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	Allow		
International Airport		Subpart / Definitions /		respect to the coastal hazard overlays that apply within the already built up area around Wellington			
Limited		New definition	_	International Airport.	"	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.47	Part 1 / Interpretation	Oppose	MfE discussion paper on National Planning Standards: Zones and Overlays supports the use of the	Disallow		
		Subpart / Definitions /		term 'overlay' to mean mapped areas which "introduce more restrictive built form controls than			
		New definition		apply to the underlaying 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 ar			
				important tool to limit subdivision and development within areas subject to natural hazard risk.			No
Control Don't Lineited	402.4	Internation Culturat (A		Cooling About and afficiency of Incommunity, and all incommitted	Accept	INO
CentrePort Limited	402.4	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New	Amena	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.		
		definition / New		the definition of Community Scale Natural Hazard Witigation Structures .		Accept in part	Yes
Greater Wellington	351.37	Interpretation Subpart /	Support	Considers that it is appropriate to define hazard mitigation structures within the District Plan,	Retain the Definition of 'Community Scale Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures' as notified.	Accept in part	103
Regional Council	331.37	Definitions /	Зарроге	including Greater Wellington facilities such as the Seton Nossiter flood detention area and the	Netalii tile Belliittoi oi Community Scale Natarai nazara Witagaton Stractures as notinea.		
negional council		COMMUNITY SCALE		Stebbings Valley Flood detention Dam. It is important to include in the definition those entities			
		NATURAL HAZARD		responsible for construction and maintain these structures, including Greater Wellington.			
		MITIGATION		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			
		STRUCTURES				Reject	No
CentrePort Limited	402.10		Support in	Supports 'Community Scale Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures' definition in part.	Retain the definition of 'Community Scale Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures' with amendments.		
-		Definitions /	part	,			
		COMMUNITY SCALE	ľ				
		NATURAL HAZARD					
		MITIGATION					1
		STRUCTURES				Accept in part	Yes
CentrePort Limited	402.11	Interpretation Subpart /	Amend	Considers that some community scale natural hazard mitigation works may be required particularly	Amend definition of 'Community Scale Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures' as follows:		
		Definitions /		where there is public access, as CentrePort holds considerable land adjoining the Coastal Marine			1
		COMMUNITY SCALE		Area. The agencies listed do not include CentrePort as being appropriate to carry out such works.	means natural hazard mitigation works that serve multiple properties and are constructed and		1
		NATURAL HAZARD			administered by the Crown, the Greater Wellington Regional Council, Wellington City Council,		1
		MITIGATION			CentrePort, or their nominated contractor or agent.		1
		STRUCTURES	<u> </u>			Accept in part	Yes
CentrePort Limited	402.12	Interpretation Subpart /	Amend	Considers that there is uncertainty as to the relationship between matters covered in the definition	Clarify the relationship between matters covered in the definition of 'Natural Hazard Mitigation		
		Definitions /		of Natural Hazard Mitigation Works and what is covered in the definition of Community Scale	Works' and 'Community Scale Natural Hazard Mitigation', in particular what is meant by community		1
		COMMUNITY SCALE		Natural Hazard Mitigation.	scale and what activities are excluded from this.		
		NATURAL HAZARD					
		MITIGATION					
		STRUCTURES				Accept in part	Yes
Greater Wellington	351.39	Interpretation Subpart /	Amend	Considers that an example would assist plan users. Proposed RPS Change 1 includes several	Seeks to amend the Definition of 'Green Infrastructure' to include an example, such as a constructed		
Designal Council	1	Definitions / GREEN	1	examples in the definition for nature-based solutions. One of these examples may be suitable to	wetland.	I	1
Regional Council		INFRASTRUCTURE		include		Reject	No

	1	T		T	T	T	1
New Zealand Motor	314.4	Interpretation Subpart /	Oppose	Considers that the definition of 'Hazard Sensitive Activity' should be clarified to outline the criteria	Clarify the definition of 'Hazard Sensitive Activity' to provide a set of criteria defining why and how		
Caravan Association		Definitions / HAZARD		which define why and how an un-named activity may be sensitive. The definition only provide a list	an un-named activity may be sensitive.		
		SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES		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.		Reject	No
New Zealand Motor	314.5	Interpretation Subpart /	Oppose in	Considers that the definition of hazard sensitive activity should not include 'Visitor accommodation'.	Amend the definition of 'Hazard Sensitive Activity' to remove the mention of visitor accommodation.		
Caravan Association		Definitions / HAZARD	part	A subcategory that excludes campgrounds from sensitive and hazard sensitive activities should be			
		SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES		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.		Reject	No
Dating or and Village	250.2	Internated or Culture 4	Comment	Community to the state of the s	Retain the definition of HAZARD SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES as notified.	Reject	NO
Retirement Villages	350.2	Interpretation Subpart /	Support	Supports the inclusion of retirement villages as a hazard sensitive activity.	Retain the definition of HAZARD SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES as notified.		
Association of New		Definitions / HAZARD SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES					
Zealand Incorporated		SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES					N-
Greater Wellington	351.40	Interpretation Cuk+ /	Amond	Considers it is appropriate to define this term in the DDD, to posit users in southing DDD and the second s	Amend the Definition of 'Hazard Sensitive Activities' to align with the definition in Proposed RPS	Accept	No
Regional Council	331.40	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HAZARD	Amend	Considers it is appropriate to define this term in the PDP, to assist users in applying Plan provisions.	·		
regional council		SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES			Change 1.		
	1	SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES				Reject	No
BP Oil New Zealand,	372.11	Interpretation Subpart /	Support in	The definition of Hazard Sensitive Activities is supported as it specifically includes Hazardous	Retain the Definition of 'Hazard Sensitive Activities' as notified.	neject	INU
Mobil Oil New Zealand	3/2.11	Definitions / HAZARD	part	Facilities and MHF which recognises the risk associated with the manufacture, use, storage,	Retail the Definition of Fidzard Sensitive Activities as notined.		
Limited and Z Energy		SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	part	transportation and disposal of hazardous substances and the potential of human and environmental			
Limited and 2 Energy		SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES		harm from natural hazards. It is however considered that Hazardous Facilities are not defined in the			
Companies)				PDP and clarification is sought on this matter.		Accept	No
Ministry of Education	400.7	Interpretation Subpart /	Support	Supports the inclusion of educational facilities in the definition of 'hazard sensitive activities' as it	Retain the definition of [Hazard Sensitive Activities] as notified.	Ассері	NO
ivillistry of Education	400.7	Definitions / HAZARD	Зиррогі	aims to protect educational facilities.	Retail the definition of prazard sensitive Activities) as notified.		
		SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES		anns to protect educational racinities.			
		SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES				Accept	No
CentrePort Limited	402.15	Interpretation Subpart /	Support	Support the intent of this definition.	Retain the definition of 'High Coastal Hazard Area' as notified.	Ассерт	140
centrer ort Elimited	402.13	Definitions / HIGH	Зирроге	Support the intent of this definition.	The definition of Fight coastal flazard Area as notified.		
		COASTAL HAZARD AREA					
		CONSTRUCTIONS				Accept	No
Greater Wellington	351.41	Interpretation Subpart /	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.		
Regional Council		Definitions / LESS		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			
		HAZARD SENSITIVE					
		ACTIVITIES				Reject	No
BP Oil New Zealand,	372.14	Interpretation Subpart /	Support in	Considers that the definition of Less Hazard Sensitive Activities includes accessory buildings used for	Retain the Definition of 'Less Hazard Sensitive Activities', with amendment.	,	
Mobil Oil New Zealand		Definitions / LESS	part	non-habitable purposes. It is unclear whether such accessory buildings can be related to a Hazardous			
Limited and Z Energy		HAZARD SENSITIVE	ľ	Facility, which is not currently defined, or a MHF, and clarification is sought on this matter.			
Limited (the Fuel		ACTIVITIES					
Companies)						Reject	No
BP Oil New Zealand,	372.15	Interpretation Subpart /	Amend	Considers that the definition of Less Hazard Sensitive Activities should be clarified, as it is unclear	Amend the Definition of 'Less Hazard Sensitive Activities' to clarify whether accessory buildings can		
Mobil Oil New Zealand	1	Definitions / LESS		whether accessory buildings can be related to a Hazardous Facility, which is not currently defined, or	be related to a Hazardous Facility.		
Limited and Z Energy	1	HAZARD SENSITIVE		a MHF, and clarification is sought on this matter.			
Limited (the Fuel	1	ACTIVITIES					
Companies)						Reject	No
Fire and Emergency	273.11	Interpretation Subpart /	Support	Supports the definition of "natural hazard" as it is consistent with S2 RMA	Retain the definition of "natural hazard" as notified.		
New Zealand		Definitions / NATURAL					
		HAZARD				Accept	No
Greater Wellington	351.42	Interpretation Subpart /	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.		
Regional Council		Definitions / NATURAL					
		HAZARD MITIGATION					
		WORKS				Accept	No
CentrePort Limited	402.17	Interpretation Subpart /	Support in	Supports 'Natural Hazard Mitigation Works' in part. Considers that there is uncertainty as to the	Retain the definition of 'Natural Hazard Mitigation Works' with amendments.		
		Definitions / NATURAL	part	relationship between matters covered in the definition of Natural Hazard Mitigation Works and what	t		
	1	HAZARD MITIGATION		is covered in the definition of Community Scale Natural Hazard Mitigation.			
		WORKS				Reject	No
CentrePort Limited	402.18	Interpretation Subpart /	Amend	Considers that there is uncertainty as to the relationship between matters covered in the definition	Clarify the relationship between matters covered in the definition of 'Natural Hazard Mitigation		
		Definitions / NATURAL		of Natural Hazard Mitigation Works and what is covered in the definition of Community Scale	Works' and 'Community Scale Natural Hazard Mitigation', Considers that there is uncertainty as to		
		HAZARD MITIGATION	1	Natural Hazard Mitigation.	the relationship between matters covered in the definition of Natural Hazard Mitigation Works and	I	
				Natural Hazard Witigation.			
		WORKS		Netter of the gation.	what is covered in the definition of Community Scale Natural Hazard Mitigation.	Accept in part	

				1	1	1	1
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.43	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / NATURAL	Support	Considers it is appropriate to define this term in the PDP, identifying the areas of the particular	Retain the Definition of 'Natural Hazard Overlays' as notified.		
Regional Council		HAZARD OVERLAYS		hazard, including flooding, to assist users in applying the relevant Plan provisions.			
		TIAZARD OVEREATS				Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and	391.36	Interpretation Subpart /	Oppose in	The inclusion of flood hazard mapping as part of the District Plan is opposed, despite the overall	Opposes the definition of 'Natural Hazard Overlays' as it stands and seeks amendment.		
Communities		Definitions / NATURAL	part	support for the risk-based approach to the management of natural hazards.	, ,		
		HAZARD OVERLAYS					
						Reject	No
Wellington	FS36.19	Part 1/Interpretation	Oppose	WIAL supports the further refinement of the natural hazard overlay and mapping in the Proposed	Disallow / Seeks that part of the submission be disallowed.		
International Airport		Subpart / Definitions /		Plan. WIAL however opposes the submission to the extent that this definition only deals with a			
Limited		NATURAL HAZARD OVERLAY		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.			
		OVERLAT		subsequent application of the natural nazaru provisions of the Proposed Plan.		Reject	No
Greater Wellington	FS84.54	Part 1 / Interpretation	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan	neject	110
Regional Council		Subpart / Definitions /		the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a nonstatutory GIS.	,		
		NATURAL HAZARD					
		OVERLAYS				Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and	391.37	Interpretation Subpart /	Amend	Considers that the definition of 'Natural Hazards Overlays' should be amended.	Amend the definition of 'Natural Hazard Overlays' as follows:		
Communities		Definitions / NATURAL					
		HAZARD OVERLAYS			NATURAL HAZARD OVERLAYS AREA		
					means the combined mapped extent within the District Plan of the following natural hazards:		
					b a. Liquefaction Hazards		
					c b. Fault Hazards		
					o i i dali i i dali di		
					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.	Reject	No
Wellington	FS36.20	Part 1/Interpretation	Oppose	WIAL supports the further refinement of the natural hazard overlay and mapping in the Proposed	Disallow / Seeks that part of the submission be disallowed.		
International Airport		Subpart / Definitions /		Plan. WIAL however opposes the submission to the extent that this definition only deals with a			
Limited		NATURAL HAZARD		selection of hazards, not coastal hazards such as tsunami risk. This creates ambiguity in the			
		OVERLAY		subsequent application of the natural hazard provisions of the Proposed Plan.		Accept	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.48	Part 1 / Interpretation	Oppose	MfE discussion paper on National Planning Standards: Zones and Overlays supports the use of the	Disallow	Ассері	INU
TORU TU ARC EQC	1370.40	Subpart / Definitions /	Оррозс	term 'overlay' to mean mapped areas which "introduce more restrictive built form controls than	District		
		NATURAL HAZARD		apply to the underlaying zone". As this is the purpose of the WCC proposed plan's Natural Hazard			
		OVERLAYS		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.			
						Accept	No
Greater Wellington	FS84.55	Part 1 / Interpretation	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan		
Regional Council		Subpart / Definitions /		the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a nonstatutory GIS.			
		NATURAL HAZARD OVERLAYS				Accept	No
Greater Wellington	351.44	Interpretation Subpart /	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.	Ассері	INU
Regional Council	331.44	Definitions /	Support	considers to appropriate to define this term in the For , to assist users in apprying Fight provisions.	The dain the Definition of A occidany Hazard Sensitive Activities as notified.		
		POTENTIALLY HAZARD					
		SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES				Reject	No
BP Oil New Zealand,	372.18	Interpretation Subpart /	Support	The definition of Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities is supported, as it includes commercial	Retain the Definition of 'Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities' as notified.		
Mobil Oil New Zealand		Definitions /		activities and retail activities (which includes Yard-Based Retail Activities and, therefore, service			
Limited and Z Energy		POTENTIALLY HAZARD		stations).		1	
Limited (the Fuel		SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES				Painet	NI-
Companies)	202.4	Interpretation Culti	Cupport	Curposts nationally boyand consisting nativities including offices and retail and the Thirty	Retain the definition of "Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities" as notified.	Reject	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	303.4	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions /	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	retain the deminition of Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities as notified.		
Linneu		POTENTIALLY HAZARD		which include employees but are not particularly sensitive (in comparison to, for example, childcare			
1		SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES		activities)		Reject	No
Oyster Management	404.98	Interpretation Subpart /	Support	Supports the definition of "potentially hazard sensitive activities".	Retain the definition of 'potentially sensitive activity' as notified.	,	
Limited		Definitions /	''			1	
		POTENTIALLY HAZARD		Considers this is appropriate and consistent with the other potentially hazard sensitive activities,		1	
		SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES		which are activities which include employees but are not particularly sensitive (compared to		1	
			<u> </u>	sensitive activities such as childcare activities).		Reject	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.1	Interpretation Subpart /	Support	Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities including offices and retail activities. This is	Retain definition of 'Potentially hazard sensitive activities' as notified.	1	
		Definitions / Potentially		appropriate and consistent with the other potentially hazard sensitive activities, which are activities			
		hazard sensitive activities		which include employees but are not particularly sensitive (in comparison to, for example, childcare activities).		Reject	No
Meridian Energy	228.12	Interpretation Subpart /	Support	Considers the definition accurately identifies land use activities that are sensitive to adverse amenity	Retain the definition of 'Sensitive Activity' as notified	neject	INU
Limited	220.12	Definitions / SENSITIVE	Sapport	effects including noise.	netalli the definition of Selistive Activity as notined.		
		ACTIVITY				Not addressed in this report	No
	-	•		•	•		•

Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.48	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SOFT ENGINEERING NATURAL	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.		
		HAZARD MITIGATION WORKS				Accept	No
Rod Halliday	25.3	Mapping / Mapping	Amend	Considers that the flood ponding and overland flow path zone at 28 Westchester Drive is inaccurate.	Seeks that the flood ponding and overland flow path zone at 28 Westchester Drive be deleted and re	Ассере	NO
		General / Mapping General		The presence of the Stebbings Dam upstream and concrete retaining wall structures holding up the road will prevent this hazard.	assessed.		
				[refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]		Reject	No
Glenside Progressive	FS4.10	Mapping / Mapping	Not	Submitter contends that ephemeral streams in the proposed development area have been	Not specified / Seeks that any development in this area takes place with a minimum of earthworks		
Association (GPA)		General / Mapping General	specified	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.	and that natural gullies are not filled in.		
				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]		Reject	No
Heidi Snelson	FS24.4	General / Mapping /	Oppose	The submitter seeks to reduce / remove / question previous flood ponding, flow path zone	Disallow / Seeks that the submission is disallowed to uphold floodponding and overflow path zone at	nejeut	INU
		Mapping General / Mapping General	-,,	assessments stating existing retention dam and retaining wall structures will mitigate against future risk.	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.		
				The detention dam is upstream of recent flooding and flow path damage across Westchester Drive	Protect the Churton Park Community and the key roading infrastructure of Westchester Drive from the continuing flooding hazards.		
				and on Reedy Block road - to become new access way to development.	Total the continuing modeling industries.		
				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)		Accept	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	282.1	Mapping / Mapping	Amend	Considers that the provisions for landslide hazard mitigation in the earthworks section of the PDP	Seeks that a landslide hazard overlay is included into planning maps. This overlay would be linked to		
		General / Mapping		are not sufficient, as	provisions that restrict development (through sensitive activities) implemented in high-risk areas.		
		General		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 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.		Reject	No
Greater Wellington	FS84.126	General / Mapping /	Support	Greater Wellington support the submitter's request for additional provisions to control development			
Regional Council		Mapping General / Mapping General		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	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		1
		.,,,		changes would have regard to Proposed RPS Plan Change 1, specifically Policy 51.	investigation to ensure slope failure hazards are appropriately managed.		
Tales To Ales FOC	202.2	Managina (Managina	Ad	Considers that the terminal are (Foult Harved Consider) about the considerate (1) 11 14 16 17	Control Abot annual in a few Microlla Hannah Constant II to show and Assistant Assista	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	282.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping	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	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.		1
		General		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			1
				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			1
				are at different widths on the map, which we assume reflects the certainty of the fault location.			1
n 114 1	200.4					Accept in part	Yes
David Karl	309.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping	Amend	Considers that Council required ground levels be raised by around a metre during the construction o a house on Trent Street. While not easy to check, it appears the current ground level of the house is			
		General		not reflected in the hazard zones.		Accept	Yes
Greater Wellington	351.27	Mapping / Mapping	Amend	Overlays shown in the PDP have been sourced from Wellington Water and do not provide a	Seeks that WCC continues to work with Greater Wellington to discuss the City's flood hazards in		
Regional Council		General / Mapping General		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.	relation to the proposed intensification.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.17	General / Mapping /	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC support natural hazard overlays based on current and accurate research. Continued	d Allow		
		Mapping General /		collaboration between agencies is important to keep hazard information up to date and consistent		l	<u>l.</u>
		Mapping General		across the region.		Reject	No

Greater Wellington	351.28	Mapping / Mapping	Amend	Overlays shown in the PDP have been sourced from Wellington Water and do not provide a	Seeks that WCC continues to work with Greater Wellington to discuss the City's flood hazards in	1	
Regional Council	331.20	General / Mapping	Amenu	complete picture of the flooding risks across the City. Additional discussion is required to complete	relation to the proposed intensification.		
negional council		General		the flood hazard information available to users of the Plan.	relation to the proposed intensineation.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.18	General / Mapping /	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC support natural hazard overlays based on current and accurate research. Continued	Allow	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	
		Mapping General /		collaboration between agencies is important to keep hazard information up to date and consistent			
		Mapping General		across the region.		Reject	No
Greater Wellington	351.29	Mapping / Mapping	Oppose in	Considers it is important to identify areas subject to flooding hazard in the Rural area, as well as in	Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.		
Regional Council		General / Mapping	part	the Residential and other zones. Currently the PDP does not provide any information on flooding			
		General		hazards across the whole Rural zone. These areas will be subject to flooding and this should be shown on the Plan.		Reject	No
Greater Wellington	351.30	Mapping / Mapping	Amend	Considers it is important to identify areas subject to flooding hazard in the Rural area, as well as in	Seeks to Include identified overlays in the Rural Zone, based on the regional flood hazard mapping	Reject	INU
Regional Council	331.30	General / Mapping	Amena	the Residential and other zones. Currently the PDP does not provide any information on flooding	provided:		
		General		hazards across the whole Rural zone. These areas will be subject to flooding and this should be	Regional Exposure Assessment 1% AEP RCP8.5 2101-2120 (arcgis.com)		
				shown on the Plan.			
					[Refer to original submission]	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.19	General / Mapping /	Support	Natural hazard overlays are important in rural areas as well as urban and residential zones. Rural	Allow		
		Mapping General /		communities can be severely affected by flooding and this information is important for land use			
Käinga Ora Homes and	391.19	Mapping General	0	planning and public information. The inclusion of flood hazard mapping as part of the District Plan is opposed. Including Flood Hazard	Remove the Flood Hazard overlay from planning maps.	Reject	No
Communities	391.19	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping	Oppose in part	overlays in the District Plan ignores the dynamic nature of flood hazards and will create unnecessary	Remove the Flood Hazard overlay from planning maps.		
Communicies		General	part	additional cost and uncertainty for landowners and land developers.		Reject	No
Mt Victoria Historical	FS39.5	Mapping / Mapping	Oppose	The Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct is based on the heritage of the suburb's development and	Disallow	-7	
Society Inc		General / Mapping		it is also essential to the identity of the city			
		General				Accept	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.44	General / Mapping /	Oppose	Accurate and risk-based regulatory hazard maps are an important tool in the WCC Proposed District	Disallow		
		Mapping General /		Plan to limit subdivision and development within areas subject to natural hazard risk. Removing part			
		Mapping General		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			No
Greater Wellington	FS84.51	General / Mapping /	Oppose	risk. Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from	Disallow / Socks that all flood hazard mans are included in the Proposed District Plan	Accept	NO
Regional Council	1304.31	Mapping General /	Oppose	the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a nonstatutory GIS.	bisanow / Seeks that an nood hazard maps are included in the Proposed bistrict rian		
		Mapping General		,		Accept	No
Metlifecare Limited	FS87.2	General / Mapping /	Support	Supports the removal of the Flood Hazard overlay from planning maps on the basis that they create	Allow	·	
		Mapping General /		unnecessary additional cost and uncertainty for landowners and land developers. The overlay should			
		Mapping Genera		be identified on a non-statutory map that is publicly available to provide flexibility to ensure that			
				these maps are continually updated.		Reject	No
Stride Investment	FS107.38	General / Mapping /	Support	Stride supports deleting the Flood Hazard Overlays from the Proposed Plan for the reasons provided	Allow		
Management Limited		Mapping General / Mapping General		by the primary submitter, and to ensure a practical approach is taken to flood risk management.		Reject	No
Investore Property	FS108.38	General / Mapping /	Support	Investore supports deleting the Flood Hazard Overlays from the Proposed Plan for the reasons	Allow	Reject	NO
Limited		Mapping General /		provided by the primary submitter, and to ensure a practical approach is taken to flood risk			
		Mapping General		management.		Reject	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa	FS138.74	General / Mapping /	Oppose	The submitter opposes flood hazard overlays and seeks for flood hazard overlays to be removed	Disallow		
Rangatira		Mapping General /		from the plan. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose the removal of flood hazard overlays because			
		Mapping General		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.		Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and	201 20	Mapping / Mapping	Amend	Considers that the Flood Hazard Overlay should not be included in the District Plan maps and should	Seeks that data from the Flood Hazard overlay is included in non-statutory GIS maps that are publicly	Accept	NO
Communities	391.20	General / Mapping	Amenu	instead be included in non-statutory GIS maps that are publicly available. The Auckland Unitary Plan			
Communicies		General		("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.			
				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.			
				ini a regai serise.		Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.45	General / Mapping /	Oppose	Removing the regulatory nature of flood hazard maps reduces the ability of the plan to spatially limit	Disallow	,	
		Mapping General /	.,,	inappropriate development in areas at risk from flood hazard, and allows for inconsistent application			
		Mapping General		of rules to minimize flood hazard risk.		Accept	No
Greater Wellington	FS84.52	General / Mapping /	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan		
Regional Council		Mapping General /		the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a nonstatutory GIS.			
		Mapping General				Accept	No

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 35 of 38

T- D5 T	FC420 7F	Carant / Managina /	0	The substitute and the substitute of the substit	Disallow		1
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.75	General / Mapping / 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	Disallow		
Kangatha		Mapping General		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.			
						Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and	391.21	Mapping / Mapping	Support in	The mapping of other, non-flooding natural hazards to be incorporated into the District Plan is	Retain Natural Hazard mapping of risks unrelated to flooding.		
Communities		General / Mapping General	part	supported, such as Liquefaction and Fault Hazards, as these hazards are less subject to change.		Accept	No
Wellington	406.19	Mapping / Mapping	Amend	Opposes Liquefaction Hazard Overlay to the extent that they cover the Airport Zone.	Amend the extent of the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay to remove it from the extent of the Airport	Ассері	NO
International Airport		General / Mapping			Zone.		
Ltd		General		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	[Inferred Decision Requested]		
				liquefaction and flood hazard inundation cannot occur on site for operational reasons.			
						Reject	No
Guardians of the Bays	FS44.181	Mapping / Mapping	Oppose	Considers that parts of Wellington airport are made up of 1950s reclaimed land from sea therefore	Disallow / Retain the airport zone in the liquefaction hazard overlay.		
Inc		General / Mapping		should be part of the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay.			
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.83	General / Mapping /	0	The liquefaction hazard overlay in the Proposed District plan is based on the High and Very High	Disallow	Accept	No
TOKA TU AKE EQC	F570.83	Mapping General /	Oppose	liquefaction susceptibility areas in Griffin et al (2020)6. These zones are based on cone petrometer	DISAHOW		
		Mapping General		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		Accept	No
David Karl	309.2	Mapping / AllOverlays /	Amend	the submission does not provide examples of this. Considers that whanau's homes should not be unnecessarily impacted by inaccurate modelling.	Seeks that hazard zoning be based on the best information available.	Accept	No
David Rail	303.2	Overlays General	Amena	Further development should also not occur in areas that it should not. There is emotional pain and	Seeks that hazard zoning be based on the best information available.		
		,		significant costs linked to Council holding information that is not publicly available and then			
				requiring costly changes to building plans before providing approval.			
ali s i	442.6						
Oliver Sangster	112.6	Mapping / AllOverlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Opposes flood hazard - Inundation overlay applying to 22B Glenside road. Considers the mapping inaccurate as it does not	Remove the Flood Hazard - Inundation overlay from 22B Glenside Road.		
		11000 Tiazara Overlay		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.		Accept	Yes
Singvest Group Limited	129.1	Mapping / AllOverlays /	Oppose	Opposes 154 Victoria Street being included in the Flood Hazard (Inundation) overlay	Remove 154 Victoria from the Flood Hazard (Inundation) overlay		
		Flood Hazard Overlay					
Michael Thomas	219.1	Mapping / AllOverlays /	Amond	Considers that 18 Campbell Street is significantly higher than the adjoining property 16A Campbell	Amend the extent of the flood hazard inundation overlay to exclude 18 Campbell Street.	Reject	No
Wilchael Hiomas	213.1	Flood Hazard Overlay	Amenu	Street and any water would flow there.	Afficial the extent of the nood nazaru mundation overlay to exclude 18 campbell street.		
		,					
				18 Campbell Street has a retaining wall along it's western fence that would provide a barrier to			
				flooding.			
				[Refer to original submission for full reason, including pictures]		Reject	No
Kimberley Vermaey	348.1	Mapping / AllOverlays /	Amend	Considers that buildings in the Flood Hazard Overlay with water depths less than 0.5m should not	Seeks that buildings with flood water depth of less than 0.5m in the Flood Hazard Overlay not	Reject	NO
,		Flood Hazard Overlay		require resource consents, subject to minimum floor levels. For buildings with floodwater depths	require resource consents.		
				0.5m or greater, resource consent should be needed as proposed, with displacement effects			
			_	considered.		Reject	No
Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.10	Mapping / AllOverlays / Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Opposes the flood hazard overlay - inundation mapping for 82 Hanson Street.	a) Remove the flood hazard overlay - inundation mapping for 82 Hanson Street. b) Seeks that further investigation is undertaken for the application of the flood hazard (inundation)		
Healthcare Limited		Flood Hazard Overlay		Considers that the overland flowpath and inundation areas shown in the maps run over the existing	overlay around existing buildings. [Inferred decision requested].		
				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.		Reject	No
Southern Cross	380.11	Mapping / AllOverlays /	Oppose	Opposes the flood hazard overlay - overland flow path mapping for 82 Hanson Street.	a) Remove the flood hazard overlay - overland flow path mapping for 82 Hanson Street.		
Healthcare Limited		Flood Hazard Overlay			 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	380.12	Mapping / AllOverlays /	Oppose	Opposes the flood hazard overlay - inundation mapping for 84 Hanson Street.	a) Remove the flood hazard overlay - inundation mapping for 84 Hanson Street.	,	1
Healthcare Limited		Flood Hazard Overlay		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	b) Seeks that further investigation is undertaken for the application of the flood hazard (inundation)		
				Considers that the overland flowpath and inundation areas shown in the maps run over the existing	overlay around existing buildings. [Inferred decision requested].		
				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.		Reject	No
Southern Cross	380.13	Mapping / AllOverlays /	Oppose	Opposes the flood hazard overlay - overland flow path mapping for 84 Hanson Street.	a) Remove the flood hazard overlay - overland flow path mapping for 84 Hanson Street.		
Healthcare Limited		Flood Hazard Overlay	1		b) Seeks that further investigation is undertaken for the application of the overland flow path		
					overlay around existing buildings. [Inferred decision requested].	Reject	

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 36 of 38

	1						T
Southern Cross	380.14	Mapping / AllOverlays /	Oppose	Opposes the flood hazard overlay - inundation mapping for 86 Hanson Street.	a) Remove the flood hazard overlay - inundation mapping for 86 Hanson Street.		
Healthcare Limited		Flood Hazard Overlay			b) Seeks that further investigation is undertaken for the application of the flood hazard (inundation)		
İ				Considers that the overland flowpath and inundation areas shown in the maps run over the existing	overlay around existing buildings. [Inferred decision requested].		
				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.		Reject	No
Southern Cross	380.15	Mapping / AllOverlays /	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.		
Healthcare Limited		Flood Hazard Overlay			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	380.16	Mapping / AllOverlays /	Oppose	Opposes the flood hazard overlay - inundation mapping for 88 Hanson Street.	a) Remove the flood hazard overlay - inundation mapping for 88 Hanson Street.		
Healthcare Limited		Flood Hazard Overlay			b) Seeks that further investigation is undertaken for the application of the flood hazard (inundation)		
				Considers that the overland flowpath and inundation areas shown in the maps run over the existing	overlay around existing buildings. [Inferred decision requested].		
				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.		Reject	No
Southern Cross	380.17	Mapping / AllOverlays /	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.		
Healthcare Limited		Flood Hazard Overlay			b) Seeks that further investigation is undertaken for the application of the overland flow path		
	L				overlay around existing buildings. [Inferred decision requested].	Reject	NO
Southern Cross	380.18		Oppose	Opposes the flood hazard overlay - inundation mapping for 90 Hanson Street.	a) Remove the flood hazard overlay - inundation mapping for 90 Hanson Street.		
Healthcare Limited		Flood Hazard Overlay			b) Seeks that further investigation is undertaken for the application of the flood hazard (inundation)		
				Considers that the overland flowpath and inundation areas shown in the maps run over the existing	overlay around existing buildings. [Interred decision requested].		
				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			l.,
				on the land in and around the existing buildings.		Reject	No
Southern Cross	380.19	Mapping / AllOverlays /	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.		
Healthcare Limited		Flood Hazard Overlay			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	391.30	Mapping / AllOverlays /	Oppose	The inclusion of flood hazard mapping as part of the District Plan is opposed, despite the risk-based	Delete the Natural Hazard Overlay from the District Plan and instead hold this information in non-		
Communities		Flood Hazard Overlay		approach to the management of natural hazards being generally supported. Including Flood Hazard	statutory GIS maps.		
İ				overlays in the District Plan ignores the dynamic nature of flood hazards and will create unnecessary			l.,
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.46	0 1/44 : /48	0	additional cost and uncertainty for landowners and land developers.	e: II	Reject	No
TOKA TU AKE EQC	FS/0.46	General / Mapping / All	Oppose	Accurate and risk-based regulatory hazard maps are an important tool in the WCC Proposed District			
		Overlays / Flood Hazard Overlay		Plan to limit subdivision and development within areas subject to natural hazard risk. Removing part			
		Hazard Overlay		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 floor		Accept	No
Greater Wellington	FS84.53	General / Mapping /	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from	Disallow / Socks that all flood hazard mans are included in the Dronocod District Dlan	Ассері	INU
Regional Council	F304.55	AllOverlays / Flood	Oppose	the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a nonstatutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all 11000 hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan		
Regional Council		Hazard Overlay		the Proposed District Plan and histead be field in a horistatutory dis.		Accept	No
Stride Investment	FS107.39	General / Mapping / All	Cupport	Stride supports deleting the Flood Hazard Overlays from the Proposed Plan for the reasons provided	Allow	Ассере	NO
Management Limited	. 5107.35	Overlays / Flood Hazard	Support	by the primary submitter, and to ensure a practical approach is taken to flood risk management.			
ivianagement cimited		Overlay / Flood Hazard		by the primary submitter, and to ensure a practical approach is taken to mood fisk indiagement.		Reject	No
Investore Property	FS108.39	General / Mapping / All	Support	Investore supports deleting the Flood Hazard Overlays from the Proposed Plan for the reasons	Allow	neject	1.0
Limited	. 5100.35	Overlays / Flood Hazard	Support	provided by the primary submitter, and to ensure a practical approach is taken to flood risk			
Limiteu		Overlays / Flood Hazard		management.		Reject	No
Wellington	406.25	Mapping / AllOverlays /	Oppose	Submitter is required to manage and drain surface water ponding to avoid giving rise to adverse	Delete all Flood Hazard Overlays from the Airport Zone.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1
International Airport	100.23	Flood Hazard Overlay	оррозс	effects on aeronautical safety.	Selecte dil 11000 Trattara Overlay's Horit Cite / Iliport Zone.		
Itd		,					
1				Accordingly, Submitter manages surface water on site to ensure ponding does not arise.			
1				0 //			
İ				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.		Reject	No
Guardians of the Bays	FS44.184	Mapping / Mapping	Oppose	Considers that a vast catchment of Strathmore feeds through Wellington Airport and it should be	Disallow / Retain the airport zone in the flood hazard overlay.		1
Inc		General / Mapping	.,	part of the Flood Hazard overlay			
		General				Accept	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.85	General / Mapping / All	Oppose	The flood inundation overlay is based on probability maps by Wellington Water of likely ponding	Disallow		
TOKA TU AKE FUL	1. 27 0.03		- ppose	areas in the event of a flood. It does not take into account likely postevent remediation of flooding			
TORA TU AKÉ EQC		Overlays / Flood Hazard					
TOKA TU AKÉ EQC		Overlays / Flood Hazard Overlay		effects. If geotechnical engineering has been done to mitigate flood inundation risk, the risk may be			
TOKA TU AKE EUC		7 1		, ,			
TOKA TU AKE EQC		7 1		effects. If geotechnical engineering has been done to mitigate flood inundation risk, the risk may be		Accept	No

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 37 of 38

v: 10 111 11	5570.74	2 12 / 6 12:1:1	lo.		la: u		1
KiwiRail Holdings	FS72.74	Part 2 / General District	Oppose	Opposes the deletion of policy direction requiring acoustic treatment and mechanical ventilation for	Disallow		
Limited		wide Matters / Noise /		noise sensitive activities.			
		NOISE-P4					
				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.			
						This point will be addressed in Hearin	ng Stream 7
Wellington	406.26		Oppose in	Submitter is required to manage liquefaction risk to ensure the Airport can continue to operate	Delete all Liquefaction Hazard Overlays from the Airport Zone.		
International Airport		Liquefaction Hazard	part	following as seismic event.			
Ltd		Overlay					
				Opposes the mapping of 'liquefaction hazard overlay' mapped within the Airport Zone.			
				[See paragraph 4.86 for full reason]		Reject	No
Guardians of the Bays	FS44.182	General / Mapping / All	Oppose	Considers that parts of Wellington airport are made up of 1950s reclaimed land from sea therefore	Disallow / Retain the airport zone in the liquefaction hazard overlay.		
Inc		Overlays / Liquefaction		should be part of the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay.			
		Hazard Overlay					
						Accept	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.86	General / Mapping / All	Oppose	The liquefaction hazard overlay in the Proposed District Plan is based on the High and Very High	Disallow		
		Overlays / Liquefaction		liquefaction susceptibility areas in Griffin et al (2020). These zones are based on cone petrometer			
		Hazard Overlay		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.		Accept	No
Mary-Anne O'Rourke	195.1	Other / Other / Other	Not	Considers that there is a valid risk in the future from ratepayers, who are unable to attain house	Not specified.		
			specified	insurances for council consented houses that have been built in known flood and tsunami prone			
				areas, taking future class actions against the Council.		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		
1	1	1			existing and proposed buildings to ensure that sufficient resources are likely to be available in the		
1	1	1			event of a major earthquake.	Reject	No

Wellington City Proposed District Plan

Hearing Stream 5 - Coastal Hazards

Appendix B - Recommended Responses to Submissions and Further Submissions

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers 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.		
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:	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.3	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 tsunami are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hilkaurangi 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.		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.		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
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

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 1 of 38

Oyster Management Limited	404.33	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General	Oppose in part	Considers there is significant existing investment in Wellington CBD that is subject to coastal hazard overlays, which is not recognised in the Introduction.	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
		CE		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.			
				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.			
				[Refer to original submission for full reason].			
Oyster Management Limited	404.34	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General	Amend	Considers there is significant existing investment in Wellington CBD that is subject to coastal hazard overlays, which is not recognised in the Introduction.	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
		CE		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.	inc orco.		
				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.			
				[Refer to original submission for full reason].			
Oyster Management Limited	404.35	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General	Amend	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.	Amend Coastal Hazard Overlay table in CE - Introduction as follows: Tsunami - 1:100 year scenario inundation extent: High Medium	Reject	No
		CE		Considers that the hazard overlays are wide ranging in terms of risk and feasible approaches to	 Tsunami - 1:500 year scenario inundation extent: Medium <u>Low</u>		
				mitigate that risk.	Tsunami - 1:1000 year scenario inundation extent: Low		
				By including all the Inundation and Tsunami overlays together, the Proposed Plan applies the same	13didili 27200 year sechario manadan extent com		
				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.			
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.70	Part 2 / General District	Oppose	The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunami	Disallow	Accept	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.70	wide Matters / Coastal	Oppose	are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikaurangi subduction zone or		Accept	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.70		Oppose	are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikaurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate1. It is not appropriate to reduce the hazard ranking		Accept	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.70	wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General	Oppose	are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikaurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate1. 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		Accept	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.70	wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General	Oppose	are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikaurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate1. It is not appropriate to reduce the hazard ranking to medium. Land use planning options must be considered, particularly when combined with other		Accept	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC Wellington	FS70.70 406.291	wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General	Oppose	are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikaurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate1. 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		Accept	No
Wellington International Airport		wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE General District wide Matters / Coastal		are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikaurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate1. 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 tsunami given the high consequence of a tsunami occurring.	Seeks that coastal hazard overlays are amended to focus only on coastal inundation hazards.		
Wellington		wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General		are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikaurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate1. 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 tsunami given the high consequence of a tsunami occurring. 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	Seeks that coastal hazard overlays are amended to focus only on coastal inundation hazards.		
Wellington International Airport		wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE General District wide Matters / Coastal		are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikaurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate1. 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 tsunami given the high consequence of a tsunami occurring. 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. 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	Seeks that coastal hazard overlays are amended to focus only on coastal inundation hazards.		
Wellington International Airport		wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General		are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikaurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate1. 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 tsunami given the high consequence of a tsunami occurring. 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. 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	Seeks that coastal hazard overlays are amended to focus only on coastal inundation hazards.		
Wellington International Airport		wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General		are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikaurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate1. 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 tsunami given the high consequence of a tsunami occurring. 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. 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	Seeks that coastal hazard overlays are amended to focus only on coastal inundation hazards.		
Wellington International Airport		wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General		are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikaurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate1. 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 tsunami given the high consequence of a tsunami occurring. 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. 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	Seeks that coastal hazard overlays are amended to focus only on coastal inundation hazards.		
Wellington International Airport		wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General		are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikaurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate1. 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 tsunami given the high consequence of a tsunami occurring. 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. 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	Seeks that coastal hazard overlays are amended to focus only on coastal inundation hazards.		
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.291	wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Amend	are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikaurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate1. 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 tsunami given the high consequence of a tsunami occurring. 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. 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. [See original submission for full reason]	Seeks that coastal hazard overlays are amended to focus only on coastal inundation hazards.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport		wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE Part 2 / General District		are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikaurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate1. 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 tsunami given the high consequence of a tsunami occurring. 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. 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. [See original submission for full reason] While the trigger of a tsunami cannot be mitigated, the consequences can be reduced through good	Seeks that coastal hazard overlays are amended to focus only on coastal inundation hazards.		
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.291	wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Amend	are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikaurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate1. 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 tsunami given the high consequence of a tsunami occurring. 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. 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. [See original submission for full reason]	Seeks that coastal hazard overlays are amended to focus only on coastal inundation hazards. Disallow	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.291	wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal	Amend	are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikaurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate1. 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 tsunami given the high consequence of a tsunami occurring. 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. 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. [See original submission for full reason] 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 calculations are reduced through sould be successful to result in the calculations are reduced to result in the successful the results of the result of the results are successful.	Seeks that coastal hazard overlays are amended to focus only on coastal inundation hazards. Disallow	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.291	wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General	Amend	are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikaurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate1. 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 tsunami given the high consequence of a tsunami occurring. 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. 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. [See original submission for full reason] 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 mt sunamit to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes. Land use planning and emergency	Seeks that coastal hazard overlays are amended to focus only on coastal inundation hazards. Disallow	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.291	wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Amend	are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikaurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate1. 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 tsunami given the high consequence of a tsunami occurring. 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. 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. [See original submission for full reason] 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 calculations are reduced through sould be successful to result in the successful the result of the result	Seeks that coastal hazard overlays are amended to focus only on coastal inundation hazards. Disallow	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd Toka Tū Ake EQC	406.291 FS70.93	wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Amend	are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikaurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate1. 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 tsunami given the high consequence of a tsunami occurring. 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. 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. [See original submission for full reason] 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 complimentary. The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunami are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikurangi subduction zone or	Seeks that coastal hazard overlays are amended to focus only on coastal inundation hazards. Disallow	Reject	No No
Wellington International Airport Ltd Toka Tū Ake EQC	406.291 FS70.93	wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Amend	are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikaurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate1. 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 tsunami given the high consequence of a tsunami occurring. 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. 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. [See original submission for full reason] 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 complimentary. The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunami are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikurangi subduction zone or local fault) there	Seeks that coastal hazard overlays are amended to focus only on coastal inundation hazards. Disallow	Reject	No No
Wellington International Airport Ltd Toka Tū Ake EQC	406.291 FS70.93	wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Amend	are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikaurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate1. 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 tsunami given the high consequence of a tsunami occurring. 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. 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. [See original submission for full reason] 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 complimentary. The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunami are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikurangi subduction zone or local fault) there	Seeks that coastal hazard overlays are amended to focus only on coastal inundation hazards. Disallow	Reject	No No
Wellington International Airport Ltd Toka Tū Ake EQC	406.291 FS70.93	wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Amend	are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikaurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate1. 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 tsunami given the high consequence of a tsunami occurring. 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. 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. [See original submission for full reason] 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 or 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 complimentary. The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunami are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikurangi subduction zone or local fault) th	Seeks that coastal hazard overlays are amended to focus only on coastal inundation hazards. Disallow	Reject	No No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.291 FS70.93	wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	Amend	are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikaurangi subduction zone or local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate1. 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 tsunami given the high consequence of a tsunami occurring. 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. 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. [See original submission for full reason] 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 complimentary. The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunami are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikurangi subduction zone or local fault) there	Seeks that coastal hazard overlays are amended to focus only on coastal inundation hazards. Disallow	Reject	No No

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 2 of 38

Wellington International Airport Ltd Fabric Property Limited	406.292	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE General District wide	Amend Oppose in	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. 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. [See original submission for full reason] There is significant existing investment in the Wellington CBD which is subject to the coastal hazards	Greenfield developments.	Reject	No
		Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE	part	overlays, and it is important that the risks from coastal hazards are appropriately addressed. 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.	there is significant existing investment in the Wellington CBD and an adaptation and protection approach is needed to manage coastal hazards in this area. Amend the Coastal Hazard Overlay Hazard Ranking table as follows: Tsunami – 1:100 year scenario inundation extent = High Medium	REJECT	NO
Toka Tü 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 tsunami are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikurangi subduction zone 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	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 Introudction 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	Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / New CE	Amend	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. 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]	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. Add new rule in Coastal Environment chapter as follows: CE — R24A Hard engineering measures in the high coastal hazard area for regionally significant infrastructure 1. Activity Status: Permitted	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd Guardians of the Bays Inc	406.293 FS44.67	Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / New CE Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / New CE	Amend Oppose	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. 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] 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.	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. Add new rule in Coastal Environment chapter as follows: CE — R24A Hard engineering measures in the high coastal hazard area for regionally significant infrastructure 1. Activity Status: Permitted Disallow	Reject	Yes
Wellington International Airport Ltd Guardians of the Bays Inc Te Rünanga o Toa Rangatira	406.293 F544.67 488.57	Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / New CE Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / New CE General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / New CE	Amend Oppose Amend	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. 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] 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. 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.	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. Add new rule in Coastal Environment chapter as follows: CE – R24A Hard engineering measures in the high coastal hazard area for regionally significant infrastructure 1. Activity Status: Permitted Disallow Add new objective in the Coastal Environment chapter as follows: Reduce the susceptibility of significant cultural property, infrastructure and associated communities from damage by coastal hazards.	Reject	Yes No
Wellington International Airport Ltd Guardians of the Bays Inc Te Rūnanga o Toa	406.293 FS44.67	Matters / Coastal Environment / General CE General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / New CE Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / New CE General District wide Matters / Coastal	Amend Oppose	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. 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] 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. Considers that the Coastal Environment chapter could specifically recognise and protect significant	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. Add new rule in Coastal Environment chapter as follows: CE — R24A Hard engineering measures in the high coastal hazard area for regionally significant infrastructure 1. Activity Status: Permitted Disallow Add new objective in the Coastal Environment chapter as follows: Reduce the susceptibility of significant cultural property, infrastructure and associated communities.	Reject	Yes

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 3 of 38

	1	I /	1-		1	Γ	I
Wellington	FS36.90	Part 2 / General District	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the	Disallow	Accept	No
International Airport		wide Matters / Coastal		extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter.			
Limited		Environment / CE-O5		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;			
Greater Wellington	351.201	General District wide	Amend	Considers amendments appropriate to bring the policy in line with the Objectives 19 and 20 and	Seeks to amend wording of CE-O5 (Risk from coastal hazards):	Accept in part	Yes
Regional Council		Matters / Coastal		Policies 51 and 52 in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Subdivision, use and development in the Coastal Hazard Overlays minimises reduces or does not		
		Environment / CE-O5			increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure.		
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.34	Part 2 / General District	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC proposed RPS	Allow	Accept	No
		wide Matters / Coastal		Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the			
		Environment / CE-O5		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	t		
				increase'.			
WCC Environmental	377.225	General District wide	Support	Supports as the objective will benefit the coastal environment.	Retain CE-O5 (Risk from coastal hazards) as notified.	Reject	No
Reference Group		Matters / Coastal					
		Environment / CE-O5					
Argosy Property No. 1	383.75	General District wide	Support	Supports the objective in that it enables subdivision, use and development in Coastal Hazard	Retain CE-O5 (Risk from coastal hazards) as notified.	Reject	No
Limited		Matters / Coastal		overlays that does not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure	,	· .	
	1	Environment / CE-O5					
Kāinga Ora Homes and	391.246	General District wide	Support in	Objective CE-O5 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Supports Objective CE-O5 (Risk from coastal hazards) with amendment.	Reject	No
Communities		Matters / Coastal	part		The state of the s	-,	
communicies		Environment / CE-O5	puit				
Kāinga Ora Homes and	391 2/17	General District wide	Amend	Considers that CE-O5 should be amended to better identify the effects of new subdivision, use and	Amend Objective CE-O5 (Risk from coastal hazards) as follows:	Reject	No
Communities	331.247	Matters / Coastal	Amenu	development may have on the existing environment. It is sought the word "new" is added to this	Amend Objective CE-03 (Risk Hotil coastal nazards) as follows.	Reject	NO
Communities		Environment / CE-O5		objective to recognise the additional impact that only new subdivision, use and development has on	New Couldivision, use and development in the Coastal Hazard Overlays reduces as does not		
		Environment / CE-OS					
0	404.36	Comment District wilds	Comment	the existing environment.	increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure.	Delegat	NI-
Oyster Management	404.36	General District wide	Support	Supports this objective to the extent that it enables subdivision, use, and development in the Coasta	Retain CE-O5 (RISKS from coastal nazards) as notified.	Reject	No
Limited		Matters / Coastal		Hazard overlays that does not increase the risk to people, property, or infrastructure.			
		Environment / CE-O5					
Investore Property	405.41	General District wide	Support	Supports the objective.	Retain CE-O5 (Risk from coastal hazards) as notified.	Reject	No
Limited		Matters / Coastal					
		Environment / CE-O5					
Wellington	406.300	General District wide	Oppose	Opposes CE-O5.	Opposes CE-O5 (Risk from coastal hazards) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
International Airport		Matters / Coastal					
Ltd		Environment / CE-O5		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]			
Airways Corporation of	FS105.2	Part 1 / Interpretation	Support	This submission point is consistent with Airways' operations and its core functions.	Allow	Accept	No
New Zealand Limited		Subpart / Definitions /					
		AIRPORT PURPOSES					
Wellington	406.301	General District wide	Oppose	Opposes CE-O5.	Amend CE-O5 (Risk from coastal hazards) as follows:	Reject	No
International Airport		Matters / Coastal					
Ltd		Environment / CE-O5		Considers that the risks from natural hazards should be avoided where they are intolerable. This	CE-O5 Risk from coastal hazards		
				concept should be brought into this policy and acknowledges that people, activities, property and			
				infrastructure have varying levels of coastal hazard tolerance.	Subdivision, use and development in the Coastal Hazard Overlays do not create an intolerable level		
					of reduces or does not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure.		
				[See paragraph 4.46 to 4.49 and 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	=		
Fabric Property Limited	425 33	General District wide	Support	Supports CE-05 as notified.	Retain CE-O5 (Risk from coastal hazards) as notified.	Reject	No
. abe i roperty cillited	.23.33	Matters / Coastal	Sapport	Supports de do do notined.	netam ee oo max nom coastarnazaras) as notinea.	neject	
	1	Environment / CE-O5					
Te Rūnanga o Toa	488.62	General District wide	Cunnort i-	Supports the chapter as it has good provisions which incorporate the protection of the coastal	Retain CE-O5 (Risk from coastal hazards) as notified, subject to amendments in subsequent	Painct	No
	400.02		Support in part			Reject	INO
Rangatira		Matters / Coastal	hatt	environment and protection from Coastal Hazards.	submission points		
Court Birlinghour	F2 F	Environment / CE-O5	0	Occasion to Constitutional analysis based on Tananai community The Tay 11 11 11 11 12 12	Man and affect	No soliof on orifical	N-
Grant Birkinshaw	52.5	General District wide	Oppose	Opposes the Coastal Hazard overlay based on Tsunami occurrences. The Tsunami baseline is for CD	Not specified.	No relief specified	No
		Matters / Coastal		evacuation procedures and as such is not appropriate in a legal document.			
	ļ	Environment / CE-O6					
Royal Forest and Bird	345.299	General District wide	Support in	Considers this objective should not only refer to increased risk to people, property and infrastructure	Amend CE-O6 (Natural systems and features):	Reject	No
		Matters / Coastal	part	and should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and			
Protection Society				biodiversity values that must be protected.	Natural systems and features that reduce the susceptibility of people, property, and infrastructure,		1
Protection Society		Environment / CE-O6		biodiversity values that must be protected.			
Protection Society		Environment / CE-O6		biodiversity values that must be protected.	natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values from damage by coastal hazards are created, maintained or enhanced.		

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 4 of 38

Limited with Service Control (Control Control	Wellington	FS36.91	Dort 2 / Conoral District	Onnece	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the	Disallow	Assent	No
Service March 1997 (2004) The California recommend of the Programs of the California recommend of the Service March 1997 (2004) The California recommend of	•	F536.91		Oppose	· · ·	Disallow	Accept	No
L. The Counted for severe counter to the open with the contribution of the Composed from the counter of the Cou								
published by the property to large until the section of the country of the property file. It is support on the designation of the CODE without the country of the CODE without the country of the country of the CODE without the CODE without the country of the CODE without the C	Limitea		Environment / CE-O6					
3. The Implication common for the Programs From The Displace of the Control of the Programs From The Displace of the Control of the Programs From The Displace of the Control of the Con					, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			
As a copying to add any focus on these protections that concent entering the workshop the workshop in the protection of the ECCS, which is a protection of the ECCS, which is a copying to the protection of the ECCS, which is a copying to the protection of the ECCS, which is a copying to the protection of the ECCS, which is a copying to the protection of the ECCS, which is a copying to the protection of the ECCS, which is a copying to the protection of the ECCS, which is a copying to the protection of the ECCS, which is a copying to the protection of the ECCS, which is a copying to the protection of the ECCS, which is a copying to the protection of the ECCS, which is a copying to the protection of the ECCS, which is a copying to the protection of the ECCS, which is a copying to the protection of the ECCS, which is a copying to the protection of the ECCS, which is a copying to the protection of the ECCS, which is a copying to the protection of the ECCS, which is a copying to the protection of the ECCS, which is a copying to the protection of the ECCS, which is a copying to the ECCS, which is a copying								
whethingsome parts of the Water Security development parts of the Water Security development of the Water Se								
Secret Strategy and Secret States with Fragment Control Secret Strategy and Secret States with Fragment Control Secret States and Secret S								
Market source and projects for the functions and appropriate (1905) More than the country of the								
General Positive Water (Agreed Council Marketon Council M								
Integrated Control Interview of Control In	Greater Wellington	351.202	General District wide	Support		Retain CE-O6 (Natural systems and features) as notified.	Reject	No
Section Conformation (Co.C.) Section Discrete Number (Co.C.) Sec							.,	
National Anticological Control								
Tablasage of Tabla	WCC Environmental	377.226	General District wide	Support	Supports as the objective will benefit the coastal environment.	Retain CE-O6 (Natural systems and features) as notified.	Reject	No
To Alliange a Took Marker (Control (Control) Marker (Cont	Reference Group		Matters / Coastal					
Matters / Coastal Pour Process of Annual Pour I Coastal Pour Process of Annual Pour I Coastal Pour Process of Annual Pour I Coastal Pour Process of Annual Pour I Coastal Pour I Process of Annual Pour I Coastal Pour I Process of Annual Pour I Coastal Pour I Process of Annual Pour I Coastal Pour I Process of Annual Pour I			Environment / CE-O6					
Note Number 1 (7.6.05 5.0.27 is supported, as aligner operations should not increase the risk to people, properly and inflient. Matters / Coastal Matters / Coastal (1.6.2.2) in the state of the coastal first or increased make to people, properly and inflient. Matters / Coastal (1.6.2.2) in the coastal first or increased make to people, properly and inflient. Matters / Coastal (1.6.2.2) in the coastal first or increased make to people, properly and inflient. Matters / Coastal (1.6.2.2) in the coastal first or increased make to people, properly and inflient. Matters / Coastal (1.6.2.2) in the coastal first or increased make to people, properly and inflient. Matters / Coastal (1.6.2.2) in the coastal first or increased make to people, properly and inflient. Matters / Coastal (1.6.2.2) in the state of the coastal first or increased make to people, properly and inflient. Matters / Coastal (1.6.2.2) in the state of the coastal first or increased make to people, properly and inflient. Matters / Coastal (1.6.2.2) in the state of the coastal first or increased make to people, properly and inflient. Matters / Coastal (1.6.2.2) in the state of the coastal first or increased make to people, properly and all subtonions, development and use of land cooperly for properly, and an all subtonions, development and to all subtonions, development and to all subtonions, development and to all subtonions, development and to all subtonions, development and to all subtonions, development and to all subtonions, development and to all subtonions, development and to all subtonions, development and to all subtonions, development and to all subtonions, development and to all subtonions, development and to all subtonions and to all subtonions and to all subtonions and to all subtonions and to all subtonions and to all subtonions and to all subtonions and to all subtonions and to all subtonions and to all subtonions and to all subtonions and to all subtonions and to all subtonions and to all subtonions and to all subtonions and to all subto	Te Rūnanga o Toa	488.63	General District wide	Support in	Supports the chapter as it has good provisions which incorporate the protection of the coastal	Retain CE-O6 (Natural systems and features) as notified, subject to amendments in subsequent	Reject	No
Social District vide Materials Coastal Information (7.6.107) Coast	Rangatira		Matters / Coastal	part	environment and protection from Coastal Hazards.	submission points		
Matters / Castal Waters / Cast			Environment / CE-O6					
Reviewment CE 7 No.	Yvonne Weeber	340.23	General District wide	Support	CE-O7 is supported, as airport operations should not increase the risk to people, property and		Reject	No
Reyal Forest and Brotin Value Matter / Costal Invironment / CE-07 Wellington					infrastructure.	activities) as notified.		
Approx. operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities are provided for, while about-every values that must be protected. Wellington Wellington Limited Approx. operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities are provided for, while about-every values that must be protected. Wellington Limited Approx. operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities are provided for, while about-every values that must be protected. Wellington Limited Approx. operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities are provided for, while about-every values that must be protected. Wellington Limited Approx. operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities are provided for, while allowed provided to the extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns relief by Wilkly with respect to this Opport of the control of the contro								
Environment / CE-07 Solid provision and part activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities are provided for, which also certain flat solidoxinis, development and use of all activities on the interest to cope they Agree, property, auditorises, passenger port facilities and rail activities on the interest to cope they are increasistent with the concerns raised by WML opposes all of the interest flow and all activities on the interest to the chapter for the sentent than that passenger port facilities and rail activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) and consideration operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) and consideration operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) and consideration operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities). ### CE-07 Popose ### Po	'	345.300				Amend CE-O7 (Airport, operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities):	Reject	No
side resurring that subdivision, development as use of limit occupied by Approx, operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities of the increase the nat to people, property, auditorities of the increase the nat to people, property, auditorities of the increase the nat to people, property, auditorities of the increase that they are increasisted by WAL with respect to this chapter. It is consistent that they are increased by WAL with respect to this chapter. It is consistent that they are increased that they are increased by WAL with respect to this chapter. It is consistent that they are increased that they are increased by WAL with respect to this chapter. It is consistent that they are increased that they are increased by WAL with respect to this chapter. It is consistent that they are increased and provide on the fundamental and provide on the fundamental provides. It is consistent that they are increased that they are increased by WAL with respect to the Reposed Plan. It is consistent that they are increased that they are increased by WAL with respect to the Reposed Plan. It is consistent that they are increased that they are increased by WAL with respect to the Reposed Plan. It is consistent that they are increased by WAL with respect to the Reposed Plan. It is consistent that they are increased th	Protection Society			part				
Wellington Unified Alport Unified Al			Environment / CE-O7		biodiversity values that must be protected.			
Wellington Wellington								
Nellington International Alzyort Limited Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-07 Accept wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-07 CentrePort Limited ACCEPT								
with Matters / Coastal Environment / E-07 United WC Environment 2 From From State						infrastructure, natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.		
with Matters / Coastal Environment / E-07 United WC Environment 2 From From State	147 H	5525 02	n 12/6 In: 1:			lo: II		**
Notably: 1. The Costate Environment / GE-07 Notably: 2. The Chapter as noted its objective with a reliably modified; 2. The Chapter as noted its objective with a reliably modified; 3. The Chapter as noted its objective with a reliably modified; 2. The Chapter as noted its objective with a reliably modified; 3. The Chapter as noted its objective with a reliable point on the NZCFS, including blove that control only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying roor provisions; but a cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying roor provisions; but and the number of the NZCFS, including blove that the number of the NZCFS, including blove that the number of the NZCFS, including blove that the number of the NZCFS, including blove that number of the NZCFS, including blove that number of the NZCFS, including blove that number of the NZCFS, including blove that number of the NZCFS, including blove that number of the NZCFS, including blove that number of the NZCFS, including blove that number of the NZCFS, including blove that number of the NZCFS, including blove that number of the NZCFS, including blove that number of the NZCFS, including blove that number of the NZCFS, including blove that number of the NZCFS, including blove that number of the NZCFS, including blove that number of the NZCFS, including blove that number of the NZCFS, including those that number of the NZCFS, including blove that number of the NZCFS, including those that number of the NZCFS, including with number of the NZCFS, including with number of the NZCFS, including with number of the NZCFS, including with number of the NZCFS, including with number of the NZCFS, including with number of the NZCFS, including with number of the NZCFS, including with number of the NZCFS, including with number of the NZCFS, including with number of the NZCFS, including with number of the NZCFS, including with number of the NZCFS, including with number of the NZCFS, including with number of the NZCFS, including with		FS36.92		Oppose		Disallow	Accept	NO
2. 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, displicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan. This chapter should only fous on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying rose provisions; and, 3. The chapter should only fous on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying rose provisions; and, 3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognize and grovide for the functional and operational needs of Infristructure; Support Support Support as the objective will benefit the coastal environment. Environment / CE-O? CentrePort Limited 402.115 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O? Environment / CE-O? Weilington International Airport Lid Weilington Weilington Provision of the Proposed Plan. The Coastal Provision in the Infristructure chapter, the Natural Hazards is the Coastal Environment. For CentrePort Intelligent and Environment. For CentrePort Intelligent Provision in the Infristructure chapter, the Natural Hazards provisions are consolidated in the same place or stronger cross-referencing is provided. Weilington International Airport Lid Weilington Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O? Environment / CE-	· ·							
applying to large urban areas of the bistrict which are highly modified; 2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within detect 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 NZCEP, including those that recognise and provisions that recognise and provide for the functional and operational and esperational and esperational and esperational and esperational and esperational and perational and esperational and esperational and esperational and esperational and esperational and esperational and esperational and esperational and perational and esperational and perational and esperational esperational esperational esperational esperational esperational esperational esperational esperational esperational esperational esperational esperational esperational esperational esperational esperational esperational esperational es	Limited		Environment / CE-O/					
2. The chapter as notified, duplicates controls found within their 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 MZCPS, including those that recognite and provide for the functional and operational needs of Infrastructure: WCC Environmental Reference Group Re								
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 NZEPS, including those that recognise and provision that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure: WCC Environmental Reference Group Reference Group Reference Group Reference Group Reference Group Reference Group Reference Group Reference Group Reference Group Reference Rorium Addition (E-O7) Reference Rorium Reference Rorium Addition (E-O7) Reference Rorium Reference Rorium Addition (E-O7) Reference Rorium Reference Rorium Addition (E-O7) Reference Rorium Reference Rorium Reference Rorium Addition (E-O7) Reference Rorium Reference Rorium Reference Rorium Addition (E-O7) Reference Rorium Reference Rorium Reference Rorium Addition (E-O7) Reference Rorium Reference Rorium Reference Rorium Addition (E-O7) Reference Rorium Reference R								
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; WCC Environment J. Coastal Envir								
3. The chapter does not adequately give effect to a provide for the nuctional and operational needs of infrastructure; WCC Environment Jack Coastal Environment / CE-O7 CentrePort Limited 40.2.115 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 CentrePort Limited 40.3.125 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 CentrePort Limited 40.3.125 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 CentrePort Limited 40.3.125 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 CentrePort Limited 40.3.22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 CentrePort Limited 50.3.32 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Wellington 40.6.3.02 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Wellington 40.6.3.02 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Wellington 40.6.3.03 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Wellington 40.6.3.03 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Wellington 40.6.3.03 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Wellington 40.6.3.03 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Wellington 40.6.3.03 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Wellington 40.6.3.03 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Wellington 40.6.3.03 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Wellington 40.6.3.03 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Wellington 40.6.3.03 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Wellington 40.6.3.03 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Wellington 40.6.3.03 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Wellington 40.6.3.03 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Wellington 40.6.3.03 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Wellington 40.6.3.03 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Wellington 40.6.3.03 General Dis								
WCE. Environmental ST.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2								
Reference Group Reference Grou								
Reference Group Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Centre Port Limited 402.115 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Environment / CE-O7 Wellington International Airport Ltd Wellington Inter	WCC Environmental	277 227	Ganaral District wide	Support		Potain CE O7 (Airport, operational port activities, passanger port facilities and rail activities) as	Reject	No
CentrePort Limited 402.115 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-07 Support in Supp		377.227		Зарроге	Supports as the objective will benefit the coastal environment.		neject	140
EntrePort Limited 402.115 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Wellington International Airport Ltd 406.302 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Wellington International Airport Ltd 406.303 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Wellington International Airport Ltd Watters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Enviro	Neterence Group					nothicu.		
Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7	CentrePort Limited	402.115		Support in	Supports objective, but opposes the structure of the plan managing Natural Hazards as it is	Seeks that all Natural Hazards provisions are consolidated in the same place or stronger cross-	Reject	No
Environment / CE-O7 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. Wellington International Airport Ltd Wellington International Airport Ltd Wellington International Airport Ltd Wellington International Airport Ltd Wellington International Airport Ltd Wellington International Airport Ltd Wellington International Airport Ltd Wellington International Airport Ltd Wellington International Airport Ltd Wellington International Airport Ltd Wellington International Airport Ltd Wellington International Airport Ltd Wellington International Airport Ltd Wellington International Airport Ltd Wellington International Airport Ltd Wellington International Airport Ltd Wellington International Airport Ltd Wellington International Airport Ltd Watters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Wellington International Airport Ltd Watters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Wellington International Airport Ltd Wellington International Airport Ltd Watters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Wellington International Airport Ltd Watters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Sees a mendment. Consideration of these activities intolerable, taking into consideration operational and functional constraints associated with identified activities. Amend CE-O7 (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 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 on to reate an intolerable level of increase the risk to people, proper				part			,	
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 stumination and summ								
Wellington It defends the properties of the sectivi						ılı		
Wellington International Airport Ltd 406.302 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Fenerational Airport Ltd Signature of the Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Fenerational Airport Ltd Signature of the Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Fenerational Airport Ltd Signature of the Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Fenerational Airport Ltd Signature of the Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Fenerational Airport Ltd Signature of the Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Fenerational Airport Ltd Signature of the Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Fenerational Constraints associated with identified activities. Including within areas exposed to natural hazard risk. This objective needs to appropriately recognise this, and consistent with the directive contained within Associated with identified activities. Fenerational Airport Ltd Signature of the Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Fenerational Constraints associated with identified activities. Fenerational Airport Signature of the Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Fenerational Constraints associated with identified activities. Fenerational Airport Signature of the Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Fenerational Constraints associated with identified activities. Fenerational Airport Signature of the Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Fenerational Constraints associated with identified activities. Fenerational Constraints associated with identified activities of the Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Fenerational Constraints associated with identified activities. Fenerational Constraints associated with identified activities of the Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Fenerational Constraints associated with identified activities. Fenerational Constraints associated with identified activities of the Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Fenerational Constraints associated with identified activities. Fenerational Constraints associated with identified activities of the Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Fenerational Constraints associated with identified activities. Fenerational Constraints w								
International Airport Ltd								
International Airport Ltd	Wellington	406.302	General District wide	Oppose		Opposes CE-O7 (Airport, operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) and	Reject	No
Ltd Environment / CE-O7				l			-	
SRCC-O2, avoid areas where the risks are intolerable, taking into consideration operational and functional constraints associated with identified activities. Wellington International Airport Ltd Wellington Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Wellington International Airport Ltd Wellington Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Wellington	Ltd		Environment / CE-O7					
Wellington 406.303 General District wide International Airport Ltd Wellington Ltd Watters / Coastal Environment / CE-07 General District wide Limited Watters / Coastal Environment / CE-07 February September 1 September 2 Support September 2 Suppo			1					
Wellington 406.303 General District wide International Airport Ltd Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-07 Mat			<u> </u>	<u></u>				<u>[</u>
Ltd Environment / CE-O7 Section 2 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. Airport, operational port activities 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 create an intolerable level of increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure. KiwiRail Holdings 408.99 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 infrastructure. Supports the objective to provide for operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail 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 are provided for, while also ensuring that subdivision, development and use of land occupied by Airport, operational port activities and rail activities are provided for, while also ensuring that subdivision, development and use of land occupied by Airport, operational port activities and rail activities are provided for, while also ensuring that subdivision, development and use of land occupied by Airport, operational port activities and rail activities are provided for, while also ensuring that subdivision, development and use of land occupied by Airport, operational port activities and rail activities are provided for, while also ensuring that subdivision, development and use of land occupied by Airport, operational port activities and rail activities are provided for, while also ensuring that subdivision, development and use of land occupied by Airport, operational port activities and rail activities are provided for, while also ensuring that subdivision, development and use of land occupied by Airport,	Wellington	406.303	General District wide	Amend		Amend CE-07 (Airport, operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as	Reject	No
Ltd Environment / CE-O7 Section 2 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. Airport, operational port activities 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 create an intolerable level of increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure. KiwiRail Holdings 408.99 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 infrastructure. Supports the objective to provide for operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail 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 are provided for, while also ensuring that subdivision, development and use of land occupied by Airport, operational port activities and rail activities are provided for, while also ensuring that subdivision, development and use of land occupied by Airport, operational port activities and rail activities are provided for, while also ensuring that subdivision, development and use of land occupied by Airport, operational port activities and rail activities are provided for, while also ensuring that subdivision, development and use of land occupied by Airport, operational port activities and rail activities are provided for, while also ensuring that subdivision, development and use of land occupied by Airport, operational port activities and rail activities are provided for, while also ensuring that subdivision, development and use of land occupied by Airport, operational port activities and rail activities are provided for, while also ensuring that subdivision, development and use of land occupied by Airport,	International Airport				govern the location of these activities, including within areas exposed to natural hazard risk. This	follows:		
functional constraints associated with identified activities. functional constraints associated with identified activities.			Environment / CE-O7					
activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities do not <u>create an intolerable level of increase the</u> risk to people, property, and infrastructure. KiwiRail Holdings Limited 408.99 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-07 Environment / CE-07 Infrastructure. Activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities do not <u>create an intolerable level of increase the</u> risk to people, property, and infrastructure. Reject No notified.			İ		SRCC-O2, avoid areas where the risks are intolerable, taking into consideration operational and	Airport, operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities are provided for, while		
KiwiRail Holdings 408.99 General District wide Limited Holdings Limited Environment / CE-O7 Environment / CE-O7 Supports the objective to provide for operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities and rail activities and rail activities and rail activities and rail activities and rail activities and rail activities and rail			1		functional constraints associated with identified activities.			
KiwiRail Holdings 408.99 General District wide Limited Waters / Coastal Environment / CE-O7 Supports the objective to provide for operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail Activities, passenger port facilities and rail Activities, passenger port facilities and rail Activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities			İ					
Limited Matters / Coastal activities while ensuring these activities do not increase the risk to people, property and Environment / CE-O7 infrastructure.								
Environment / CE-07 infrastructure.		408.99		Support			Reject	No
	Limited					notified.		
Guardians of the Bays 1452.20 General District wide Support Su								
	Guardians of the Bays	452.20	General District wide	Support	Supports this objective. Considers that Airport operations should not increase the risk to people,	Retain CE-O7 (Airport, operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as	Reject	No
Matters / Coastal property and infrastructure. notified.					property and infrastructure.	notified.		
Environment / CE-07								
Te Rûnanga o Toa 488.64 General District wide Supports in Supports the chapter as it has good provisions which incorporate the protection of the coastal Retain CE-O7 (Airport, operational port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as Reject No		488.64					Reject	No
Rangatira Matters / Coastal part environment and protection from Coastal Hazards. notified, subject to amendments in subsequent submission points	Rangatira			part	environment and protection from Coastal Hazards.	notified, subject to amendments in subsequent submission points		
Environment / CE-07			Environment / CE-07					

Precinct Properties							
	139.19	General District wide	Support in	Supports CE-O8 (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
New Zealand Limited		Matters / Coastal	part				
		Environment / CE-O8					
Royal Forest and Bird	345.301	General District wide	Support in	Considers this objective should not only refer to increased risk to people, property and infrastructure	Amend CE-O8 (City Centre Zone):	Reject	No
Protection Society		Matters / Coastal	part	and should be amended to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and		*	
r rotection society		Environment / CE-O8	purc	biodiversity values that must be protected.	Provide for a range of activities that maintain the vibrancy and vitality of the City Centre Zone, while		
		LIIVIIOIIIIEIIL / CL-O8		blodiversity values that must be protected.			
					also ensuring that subdivision, development and use in these areas do not increase the risk to		
					people, property, and infrastructure, natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.		
Wellington	FS36.93	Part 2 / General District	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the	Disallow	Accept	No
International Airport		wide Matters / Coastal		extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter.			
Limited		Environment / CE-O8		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,			
				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;			
WCC Environmental	377.228	General District wide	Support	Supports as the objective will benefit the coastal environment.	Retain CE-O8 (City Centre Zone) as notified.	Reject	No
Reference Group		Matters / Coastal					
		Environment / CE-O8	<u> </u>				
Argosy Property No. 1	383.76	General District wide	Support	Supports the direction of this objective to provide for a range of activities that maintain the vibrancy	Retain CE-O8 (City Centre Zone) as notified.	Reject	No
Limited		Matters / Coastal		and vitality of the City Centre zone, while also ensuring that subdivision, development and use in			
		Environment / CE-O8		these areas do not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure.			
				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			
Kāinga Ora Homes and	391.248	General District wide	Support in	Objective CE-O8 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Supports Objective CE-O8 (City Centre Zone) with amendment.	Reject	No
Communities		Matters / Coastal	part				
		Environment / CE-O8					
Kāinga Ora Homes and	391.249	General District wide	Amend	Considers that CE-O5 should be amended to better identify the effects of new subdivision, use and	Amend Objective CE-08 (City Centre Zone) as follows:	Reject	No
Communities		Matters / Coastal		development may have on the existing environment. It is sought the word "new" is added to this			
		Environment / CE-O8		objective recognise the additional impact that only new subdivision, use and development has on	Provide for a range of activities that maintain the vibrancy and vitality of the City Centre Zone, while		
				the existing environment.	also ensuring that new subdivision, development and use in these areas do not increase the risk to		
					people, property, and infrastructure.		
Oyster Management	404.37	General District wide	Support	Supports the direction of this objective to provide for a range of activities that maintain the vibrancy	Retain CE-O8 (City Centre Zone) as notified.	Reject	No
Limited		Matters / Coastal		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			
		Environment / CE-O8		these areas do not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure.			
				Considers this is because this objective recognises the economic and social benefits of the significant			
				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			
				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			
				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			
				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			
				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			
		Environment / CE-08		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.			
Fabric Property Limited	425.34	Environment / CE-08 General District wide	Support in	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. Fabric supports CE-O8 to the extent that it is enabling of development in the city centre. This reflects		Reject	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.34	Environment / CE-08	Support in part	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.		Reject	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.34	Environment / CE-08 General District wide		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. Fabric supports CE-O8 to the extent that it is enabling of development in the city centre. This reflects		Reject	No
Fabric Property Limited Te Rünanga o Toa	425.34 488.65	Environment / CE-08 General District wide Matters / Coastal		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. Fabric supports CE-O8 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		Reject Reject	No No
Te Rūnanga o Toa		Environment / CE-08 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08 General District wide	part	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. 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. Supports the chapter as it has good provisions which incorporate the protection of the coastal	Retain CE-O8 (City Centre Zone) as notified.		
		General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08 General District wide Matters / Coastal	part Support in	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. 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.	Retain CE-O8 (City Centre Zone) as notified.		
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.65	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08	part Support in part	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. Fabric supports CE-O8 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. 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. Retain CE-08 (City centre zone) as notified, subject to amendments in subsequent submission points	Reject	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa		General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08	part Support in	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. 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. Supports the chapter as it has good provisions which incorporate the protection of the coastal environment and protection from Coastal Hazards. CE-09 is supported as it enables green infrastructure as the primary method being used to reduce	Retain CE-O8 (City Centre Zone) as notified. Retain CE-O8 (City centre zone) as notified, subject to amendments in subsequent submission points Retain Objective CE-O9 (Measures to reduce damage from sea level rise and coastal erosion) as		
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.65	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08 General District wide Matters / Coastal Matters / Coastal	part Support in part	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. 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. Supports the chapter as it has good provisions which incorporate the protection of the coastal environment and protection from Coastal Hazards. 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	Retain CE-08 (City Centre Zone) as notified. Retain CE-08 (City centre zone) as notified, subject to amendments in subsequent submission points	Reject	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.65	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08	part Support in part	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. Fabric supports CE-O8 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. Supports the chapter as it has good provisions which incorporate the protection of the coastal environment and protection from Coastal Hazards. CE-O9 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	Retain CE-O8 (City Centre Zone) as notified. Retain CE-O8 (City centre zone) as notified, subject to amendments in subsequent submission points Retain Objective CE-O9 (Measures to reduce damage from sea level rise and coastal erosion) as	Reject	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Yvonne Weeber	488.65 340.24	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-09	part Support in part Support	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. 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. Supports the chapter as it has good provisions which incorporate the protection of the coastal environment and protection from Coastal Hazards. 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 CE-O8 (City Centre Zone) as notified. Retain CE-O8 (City centre zone) as notified, subject to amendments in subsequent submission points Retain Objective CE-O9 (Measures to reduce damage from sea level rise and coastal erosion) as notified.	Reject	No No
Te Rünanga o Toa Rangatira Yvonne Weeber Greater Wellington	488.65	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-09 General District wide	part Support in part	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. 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. Supports the chapter as it has good provisions which incorporate the protection of the coastal environment and protection from Coastal Hazards. 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. Considers that for consistency with Policy 52 in Proposed RPS Change 1. Green infrastructure has	Retain CE-08 (City Centre Zone) as notified. Retain CE-08 (City centre zone) as notified, subject to amendments in subsequent submission points Retain Objective CE-09 (Measures to reduce damage from sea level rise and coastal erosion) as notified. Amend CE-09 (Measures to reduce damage from sea level rise and coastal erosion) to include non-	Reject	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Yvonne Weeber	488.65 340.24	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-09 General District wide Matters / Coastal	part Support in part Support	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. Fabric supports CE-O8 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. Supports the chapter as it has good provisions which incorporate the protection of the coastal environment and protection from Coastal Hazards. CE-O9 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 CE-O8 (City Centre Zone) as notified. Retain CE-O8 (City centre zone) as notified, subject to amendments in subsequent submission points Retain Objective CE-O9 (Measures to reduce damage from sea level rise and coastal erosion) as notified.	Reject	No No
Te Rünanga o Toa Rangatira Yvonne Weeber Greater Wellington	488.65 340.24	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-09 General District wide	part Support in part Support	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. Fabric supports CE-O8 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. Supports the chapter as it has good provisions which incorporate the protection of the coastal environment and protection from Coastal Hazards. CE-O9 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. 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	Retain CE-08 (City Centre Zone) as notified. Retain CE-08 (City centre zone) as notified, subject to amendments in subsequent submission points Retain Objective CE-09 (Measures to reduce damage from sea level rise and coastal erosion) as notified. Amend CE-09 (Measures to reduce damage from sea level rise and coastal erosion) to include non-	Reject	No No
Te Rünanga o Toa Rangatira Yvonne Weeber Greater Wellington	488.65 340.24	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-09 General District wide Matters / Coastal	part Support in part Support	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. Fabric supports CE-O8 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. Supports the chapter as it has good provisions which incorporate the protection of the coastal environment and protection from Coastal Hazards. CE-O9 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 CE-08 (City Centre Zone) as notified. Retain CE-08 (City centre zone) as notified, subject to amendments in subsequent submission points Retain Objective CE-09 (Measures to reduce damage from sea level rise and coastal erosion) as notified. Amend CE-09 (Measures to reduce damage from sea level rise and coastal erosion) to include non-	Reject	No No
Te Rünanga o Toa Rangatira Yvonne Weeber Greater Wellington	488.65 340.24	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-09 General District wide Matters / Coastal	part Support in part Support Amend	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. 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. Supports the chapter as it has good provisions which incorporate the protection of the coastal environment and protection from Coastal Hazards. 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. 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.	Retain CE-08 (City Centre Zone) as notified. Retain CE-08 (City centre zone) as notified, subject to amendments in subsequent submission points Retain Objective CE-09 (Measures to reduce damage from sea level rise and coastal erosion) as notified. Amend CE-09 (Measures to reduce damage from sea level rise and coastal erosion) to include non-	Reject	No No
Te Rünanga o Toa Rangatira Yvonne Weeber Greater Wellington Regional Council	488.65 340.24 351.203	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-08 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-09 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-09	part Support in part Support	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. Fabric supports CE-O8 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. Supports the chapter as it has good provisions which incorporate the protection of the coastal environment and protection from Coastal Hazards. CE-O9 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. 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	Retain CE-08 (City Centre Zone) as notified. Retain CE-08 (City centre zone) as notified, subject to amendments in subsequent submission points Retain Objective CE-09 (Measures to reduce damage from sea level rise and coastal erosion) as notified. Amend CE-09 (Measures to reduce damage from sea level rise and coastal erosion) to include non-structural, soft engineering or matauranga Maori approaches.	Reject Accept Reject	No No

T- D5 T	488.66	Comment District wilds	Comment in	C	Date: 05 00 (Management and an advantage of the second and	I	Int-
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.00	General District wide Matters / Coastal	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-O9 (Measures to reduce damage from sea level rise and coastal erosion) as notified, subject to amendments in subsequent submission points	Accept	NO
\aligatiia		Environment / CE-O9	part	environment and protection from coastal Hazards.	subject to amendments in subsequent submission points		
vonne Weeber	340.33	General District wide	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain CE-P11 (Identification of coastal hazards) as notified.	Accept	No
voinic vvccbci	340.33	Matters / Coastal	Support	the specific reason given beyond accision requested refer to original submissions.	The tall the TII (Identification of coastal flazards) as notified.	Ассере	140
		Environment / CE-P11					
Royal Forest and Bird	345.313	General District wide	Support in	Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect	Amend CE-P11 (Identification of coastal hazards):	Reject	No
Protection Society		Matters / Coastal	part	of use and development and coastal hazards. As noted above, these provisions should be amended	, ,	*	
		Environment / CE-P11		to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be	Identify coastal hazards within the District Plan and take a risk-based approach to the management		
				protected	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, natural character, natural landscape, and		
					<u>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.		
Wellington	FS36.99	Part 2 / General District	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the	Disallow	Accept	No
International Airport		wide Matters / Coastal		extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter.			
Limited		Environment / CE-P11		Notably:			
				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;			
Greater Wellington	351.210	General District wide	Support	Considers this approach is appropriate.	Retain CE-P11 (Identification of coastal hazards) as notified.	Accept	No
Regional Council	331.210	Matters / Coastal	Support	considers this approach is appropriate.	The tall the TII (identification of coastal flazards) as notified.	Ассере	140
riegional council		Environment / CE-P11					
WCC Environmental	377.240	General District wide	Support	CE-P11 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P11 (Identification of coastal hazards) as notified.	Accept	No
Reference Group		Matters / Coastal		,		,	
		Environment / CE-P11					
Argosy Property No. 1	383.77	General District wide	Support in	Supports this policy in so far that the risk-based approach needs to consider the impact, likelihood	Retain CE-P11 (Identification of coastal hazards) as notified.	Accept	No
Limited		Matters / Coastal	part	and consequences of different coastal hazard events. The Proposed Plan clearly identifies the risk of			
		Environment / CE-P11		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			
Kāinga Ora Homes and	391.250	General District wide	Support	CE-P11 is generally supported.	Retain CE-P11 (Identification of coastal hazards) as notified.	Accept	No
Communities		Matters / Coastal					
0	404.38	Environment / CE-P11	Commont in	Commande Abric and the Abric and Abric Abric Abric and the Abric and Abric and Abric and Abric and Abric and Abric and Abric and Abric and Abric and Abric and Abric and Abric and Abric and Abric and Abric and Abric and Abric and Abric and Abric and Abrica and Abric	Date: CE DAA (Identification of control becomes) an artificial	A	No
Oyster Management Limited	404.38	General District wide Matters / Coastal	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.	Accept	NO
Lilliteu		Environment / CE-P11	part	likeliilood, and consequences of different coastal flazards.			
Wellington	406.316	General District wide	Oppose	Opposes this policy.	Opposes CE-P11 (Identification of coastal hazards) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
International Airport	100.510	Matters / Coastal	Оррозс	opposes and poney.	opposes de l'11 (lactionation di coasta nazaras) una secto uniciamenti.	neject	
Ltd		Environment / CE-P11		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.			
Wellington	406.317	General District wide	Amend	to the effects of coastal hazards.	Either delete, or amend CE-P11 (Identification of coastal hazards) as follows:	Reject	No
International Airport	406.317	Matters / Coastal	Amend	to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason] Opposes this policy.	,	Reject	No
	406.317		Amend	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	Reject	No
International Airport	406.317	Matters / Coastal	Amend	to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason] 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	Seeks that CE-P11 (Identification of coastal hazards) is amended to only apply to the coastal	Reject	No
International Airport	406.317	Matters / Coastal	Amend	to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason] Opposes this policy. The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to	Seeks that CE-P11 (Identification of coastal hazards) is amended to only apply to the coastal	Reject	No
International Airport	406.317	Matters / Coastal	Amend	to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason] 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.	Seeks that CE-P11 (Identification of coastal hazards) is amended to only apply to the coastal	Reject	No
International Airport Ltd		Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P11		to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason] 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]	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.		
International Airport	406.317 FS70.95	Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P11 Part 2 / General District		to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason] 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] The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunami	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 No
International Airport Ltd		Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P11 Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal		to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason] 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] The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunami are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikurangi subduction zone or	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.		
International Airport Ltd		Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P11 Part 2 / General District		to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason] 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] The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunami 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 evacuate1. Land use planning options must be considered,	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.		
International Airport Ltd		Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P11 Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal		to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason] 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] The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunami 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 evacuate1. Land use planning options must be considered, particularly when combined with other hazards along the coast (e.g. sea level rise, storm surge,	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.		
International Airport Ltd		Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P11 Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal		to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason] 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] The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunami 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 evacuate1. 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	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.		
International Airport Ltd		Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P11 Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal		to the effects of coastal hazards. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason] 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] The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunami 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 evacuate1. Land use planning options must be considered, particularly when combined with other hazards along the coast (e.g. sea level rise, storm surge,	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.		

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 7 of 38

Wellington City Council	266.112	General District wide Matters / Coastal	Amend	Considers the policy isn't clear and needs minor changes.	Amend CE-P12 (Levels of risk) as follows:	Accept	Yes
		Environment / CE-P12			Ensure subdivision, use and development reduces the risk to people, property, and infrastructure by:		
					1. Enable <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;		
					()		
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
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.314	General District wide Matters / Coastal	Support in	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	Amend CE-P12 (Levels of risk):	Reject	No
. Total of the state of the sta		Environment / CE-P12	part	to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected	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, natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values 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.		
Wellington International Airport	FS36.100	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal	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.	Disallow	Accept	No
Limited		Environment / CE-P12		Notably:			
				The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified;			
				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;			
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.211	General District wide Matters / Coastal	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	Seeks to amend CE-P12 (levels of risk) as follows:	Accept in part	No
		Environment / CE-P12		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	Subdivision, use and development <u>minimises</u> reduces the risk to people, property and infrastructure by:		
				risk in the design and planning of the development.	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 minimise the risk to people, property and infrastructure.		
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.35	Part 2 / General District	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC proposed RPS	Allow	Accept in part	No
		wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12		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'.			
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
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.78	General District wide Matters / Coastal	Oppose	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	Amend CE-P12 (Levels of risk) as follows:	Reject	No
Limiteu		Environment / CE-P12		apply to approximately half of the CBD. It is considered that this policy does not appropriately	Subdivision, use and development reduces the risk to people, property, and infrastructure by:		
				recognise this context and existing built environment. Considers Policy CE-12.2 would also require mitigation for subdivision, use and development in the	1. Enable subdivision, use and development that have either low occupancy, risk, or replacement		
				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	value within the low, medium and high hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays; 2. Requiring mitigation for subdivision, use and development to reduce or not increase that		
				appropriate to require mitigation for tsunami risk based on the likelihood of an event occurring, and	addresses the impacts from the relevant coastal hazards to people, property, and infrastructure in		
				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.	the low, and medium <u>and high hazard</u> areas 3. Avoiding subdivision, use and development in the high hazard area <u>of the Coastal Inundation</u>		
				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	Overlay unless there is an 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		
				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.	people, property, and infrastructure		
				The second secon			

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 8 of 38

Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.4	Part 2 / General District	lo.		le: "	I	Two
TOKA TU AKE EQC	FS/0.4	wide Matters / Coastal	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		Accept	No
		Environment / CE-P12		risk. Additionally, mitigation of risks from tsunami is possible with land use planning and building			
		Environment / CE 112		design, and tsunami risk should not be deleted from the policy.			
Kāinga Ora Homes and	391.251	General District wide	Support in	CE-P12 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain CE-P12 (Levels of risk) with amendment.	Reject	No
Communities		Matters / Coastal	part				
		Environment / CE-P12					
Kāinga Ora Homes and	391.252	General District wide	Amend	Considers that CE-P12 should be amended so that the policy enables mitigation of hazard risk in high	Amend CE-P12 (Levels of risk) as follows:	Reject	No
Communities		Matters / Coastal		hazard areas.			
		Environment / CE-P12			New Subdivision, use and development reduces does not increase the risk to people, property, and		
					infrastructure by:		
					4 Facility and district and development the boundary of the second secon		
					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		
					3. Avoiding subdivision, use and development in the high hazard area unless there is an 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.		
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.63	Part 2 / General District	Oppose	The category of high hazard area is afforded to those areas where the level of risk from natural	Disallow	Accept	No
		wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12		hazard is such that mitigation is not sufficient to bring risk to a tolerable level. Many natural hazard			
		Environment / CE-P12		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 quote i.e. not increasing risks.			
				,			
Ministry of Education	400.63	General District wide	Support	Supports CE-P12 as the submitter may at times need to locate educational facilities in these areas to	Retain CE-P12 (Levels of risk) as notified.	Reject	No
		Matters / Coastal		meet the needs of existing communities. The submitter notes that where required, development of			
		Environment / CE-P12		these facilities would incorporate mitigation measures to reduce the risks to people, property and			
				infrastructure.			
Oyster Management	404.39	General District wide	Amend	Opposes CE-P12.1.Considers this policy is very restrictive in only enabling low occupancy, risk or	Amend CE-P12 (Levels of risk) as follows:	Reject	No
Limited		Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12		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	Cubdivision, use and development reduces the risk to people, property, and infrastructure but		
		Environment / CE-P12		environment.	Subdivision, use and development reduces the risk to people, property, and infrastructure by.		
				environment.	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;		
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.71	Part 2 / General District	Oppose	The category of high hazard area is afforded to those areas where the level of risk from natural	Disallow	Accept	No
		wide Matters / Coastal		hazard is such that mitigation is not sufficient to bring risk to a tolerable level. Many natural hazard			
		Environment / CE-P12		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.			
				isuch avoidance of subdivision and development in these areas is appropriate.			
Oyster Management	404.40	General District wide	Oppose	Opposes CE-P12.1.Considers this policy is very restrictive in only enabling low occupancy, risk or	Delete CE-P12.1 (Levels of risk) in its entirety.	Reject	No
Limited		Matters / Coastal	l	replacement value development within the Coastal Hazard Overlays, as it applies to approximately			
		Environment / CE-P12		half of the CBD. Considers this policy does not appropriately recognise this context and existing built			
				environment.			
0	404.41	Consent District	A '	Considers that Delias CF 42.2 would require within 11. C. 1. P. 1.	Annual CF 43 3 / surle of risk) as follows:	Dailant	N-
Oyster Management Limited	404.41	General District wide Matters / Coastal	Amend	Considers that Policy CE-12.2 would require mitigation for subdivision, use and development in the	Amend CE-12.2 (Levels of risk) as follows:	Reject	No
Linneu		Environment / CE-P12		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	Requiring mitigation for subdivision, use and development to reduce or not increase that		
		Liviloninent / CL-P12		the likelihood of an event occurring, and the inability to mitigate this type of event.	addresses the impacts from the relevant coastal hazards to people, property, and infrastructure in		
				g, and and analytic integrate and appear are	the low, and medium, and high hazard areas;		
				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.			
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.72	Part 2 / General District	Oppose	The category of high hazard area is afforded to those areas where the level of risk from natural	Disallow	Accept	No
		wide Matters / Coastal		hazard is such that mitigation is not sufficient to bring risk to a tolerable level. Coastal hazard risk is			
		Environment / CE-P12		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.			

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 9 of 38

				·			
Oyster Management	404.42	General District wide	Amend	Considers Policy CE12.3 is similarly restrictive and equally fails to recognise that a significant portion	Amend CE-12.3 (Levels of risk) as follows:	Reject	No
Limited		Matters / Coastal		of the CBD is subject to High Hazard Areas under the Coastal Hazard Overlays. As noted above, the			
		Environment / CE-P12		Proposed Plan fails to recognise that there is already significant investment in the CBD. It is also	3. Avoiding subdivision, use and development in the high hazard area of the Coastal Inundation		
				inappropriate for this policy to apply to tsunami risk.	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 or does not		
					increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure.		
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.73	Part 2 / General District	Oppose	Coastal hazard risk is going to increase in the near future with the impact of climate change and sea	Disallow	Accept	No
		wide Matters / Coastal		level rise, and high occupancy developments in high risk areas will expose more people to increasing			
		Environmet / CE-P12		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.			
Wellington	406.318	General District wide	Oppose	Opposes this policy.	Opposes CE-P12 (Levels of risk) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
International Airport	400.516	Matters / Coastal	Oppose	Opposes this policy.	Opposes CE-P12 (Levels of Fisk) and seeks amendment.	Reject	NO
Ltd		Environment / CE-P12		The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to			
Ltu		LIIVIIOIIIIEIIL/ CL-F12		recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance			
				to the effects of coastal hazards.			
				to the effects of coastar hazards.			
				[See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]			
Wellington	406.319	General District wide	Amend	Opposes this policy.	Either delete or amend CE-P12 (Levels of risk) as follows:	Reject	No
International Airport	100.515	Matters / Coastal	7 1111 C110	opposes and poney.	Elitic delete of differin de 1.22 (cereis of risk) as follows:	neject	
Ltd		Environment / CE-P12		The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to	Seeks that CE-P12 (Levels of risk) is amended to only apply to the coastal inundation hazard areas		
				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]			
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.96	Part 2 / General District	Oppose	The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunami	Disallow	Accept	No
		wide Matters / Coastal		are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikurangi subduction zone or			
		Environment / CE-P12		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.			
Fabric Property Limited	425.36	General District wide	Oppose	Considers that CE-P12.1 is very restrictive to enable only low occupancy, risk or replacement value	Opposes CE-P12 (Levels of risk) as notified and seeks amendments.	Reject	No
		Matters / Coastal		development within the Coastal Hazard Overlays. The Coastal Hazard Overlays apply to			
		Environment / CE-P12		approximately half of the CBD. It is considered that this policy is not an appropriate control in this			
				context and existing built environment.			
				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.			
	İ	1		impacts from coasta nazarus, father than to reduce or not increase the risk.			
	İ	1		Policy CE10.3 is similarly restrictive and equally fails to recognise that a significant portion of the CBD			
	İ	1		is subject to High Hazard Areas under the Coastal Hazard Overlays. This policy fails to recognise that			
	İ	1		there is already significant investment in the CBD, and is inconsistent with CE-O8, which is to provide			
		1		for activities in the City Centre Zone which do not increase the risk to people, property or			
	İ	1		infrastructure. It is also inappropriate for this policy to apply to tsunami risk.			
				merchanism band, and band, and and an arrangement			
	İ	1					
		•			•		

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 10 of 38

51:5	405.07		la	In the state of page 1.	I. 105 pag (t. 1. 6 ; 1) . 6 !!	In	
Fabric Property Limited	425.37	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12	Oppose	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. 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 susmain 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. 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.	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.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.14	Part 2 / General District	Oppose	Coastal hazard risk is going to increase in the near future with the impact of climate change and sea		Accept	No
		wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P12		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.			
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	345.315	General District wide	Support in	Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect	Amend CE-P13 (Less hazard sensitive activities) to also address risks posed to natural character,	Reject	No
Protection Society		Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P13	part	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	natural landscape, and biodiversity values.		
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.101	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P13	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	351.212	General District wide	Support	Considers this approach is appropriate.	Retain CE-P13 (Less hazard sensitive activities) as notified.	Accept	No
Regional Council		Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P13				·	
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
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	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	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	Environment / CE-P14 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Support in part	enable the continued use of the existing building. 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

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 11 of 38

Wellington International Airport Limited WCC Environmental Reference Group Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	377.243 383.79	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14 Feneral District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Support in part	WMAL 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; CE-P14 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial. 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	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. 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.	Reject Accept in part	No No Yes
				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.			
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.	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 Coastal Inundation Overlay, where:	Accept in part	Yes
Toka Tü 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.		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.	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 Coastal Inundation Overlay, where: 1. They enable the continued use same level of hazard sensitivity of the existing use of the building; 2. The risk from the coastal hazard is low due to either:	Accept in part	Yes
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.74	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / 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.	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
Wellington	406.321	Conoral District wide	Amend	[See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	Fither delete or amond CE D14 (Additions to buildings for notantially based consisting activities and	Dojast	No
weiington International Airport Ltd	406.321	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P14	Amena	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.	neject	NO .
Toka Tŭ 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 (Additionsto 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	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	Environment / CE-P15 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 nortected.	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
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	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	Retain CE-P15 (Subdivision and hazard sensitive activities within the low coastal hazard areas) as notified.	Reject	No

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 13 of 38

	1405 222	6 (8:	10	To the state of th	To grow (s. 1)		I.
Wellington	406.322	General District wide	Oppose	Opposes this policy.	Opposes CE-P15 (Subdivision and hazard sensitive activities within the low coastal hazard areas) and	Reject	No
International Airport		Matters / Coastal			seeks amendment.		
Ltd		Environment / CE-P15		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.			
				to the effects of coastal nazards.			
				[See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]			
Wellington	406.323	General District wide	Amend	Opposes this policy.	Either delete, or amend CE-P15 (Subdivision and hazard sensitive activities within the low coastal	Reject	No
International Airport	400.525	Matters / Coastal	Amena	оррозез инз ронеу.	hazard areas) as follows:	neject	No
Ltd		Environment / CE-P15		The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to	natara di cas) as folions.		
					Seeks that CE-P15 (Subdivision and hazard sensitive activities within the low coastal hazard areas) is		
				to the effects of coastal hazards.	amended to only apply to the coastal inundation hazard areas and recognise the concept of		
					tolerability.		
				[See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]			
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.98	Part 2 / General District	Oppose	The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunami	Disallow	Accept	No
		wide Matters / Coastal		are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikurangi subduction zone or		-	
		Environment / CE-P15		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.			
Precinct Properties	139.21	General District wide	Support	Supports CE-P16 as it provides for potentially hazard-sensitive activities in the medium coastal	Retain CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas) as	Reject	No
New Zealand Limited		Matters / Coastal		hazard areas.	notified.		
		Environment / CE-P16					
Yvonne Weeber	340.38	General District wide	Support in	CE-P16 is generally supported, however it is unclear where the low, medium and high coastal hazard	Not specified.	No relief specified	No
		Matters / Coastal	part	areas are on the map.			
		Environment / CE-P16					
Royal Forest and Bird	345.318	General District wide	Support in	Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect	1 , , ,	Reject	No
Protection Society		Matters / Coastal	part	of use and development and coastal hazards. As noted above, these provisions should be amended	also address risks posed to natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.		
		Environment / CE-P16		to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be			
				protected			
Wellington	FS36.104	Part 2 / General District	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the	Disallow	Accept	No
International Airport		wide Matters / Coastal		extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter.			
Limited		Environment / CE-P16		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			
Greater Wellington				that recognice and provide for the functional and exerctional peads of infrastructure			1
	351 214	General District wide	Amend	that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	Amend CF.P16 (Potentially hazard consitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas) as	Accent	Ves
	351.214	General District wide	Amend	Considers that amendments are necessary to have regard to the RPS Objectives 19 and 20 and	Amend CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas) as	Accept	Yes
Regional Council	351.214	Matters / Coastal	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	Amend CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas) as follows:	Accept	Yes
	351.214		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	follows:	Accept	Yes
	351.214	Matters / Coastal	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	follows: Provide for potentially hazard-sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas, or any	Accept	Yes
	351.214	Matters / Coastal	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	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	Accept	Yes
	351.214	Matters / Coastal	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	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:	Accept	Yes
	351.214	Matters / Coastal	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	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 minimise reduce or do not-	Accept	Yes
	351.214	Matters / Coastal	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	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:	Accept	Yes
	351.214 F570.36	Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16		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.	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 minimise reduce or do not-		Yes
Regional Council		Matters / Coastal	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. Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC proposed RPS	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 minimise reduce or do not increase the risk to people and property from the coastal hazard; and Allow	Accept	
Regional Council		Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16 Part 2 / General District		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. Toka Tü Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the	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 minimise reduce or do not increase the risk to people and property from the coastal hazard; and Allow		
Regional Council		Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16 Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal		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. Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC 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	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 minimise reduce or do not increase the risk to people and property from the coastal hazard; and Allow		
Regional Council		Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16 Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal		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. Toka Tü Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the	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 minimise reduce or do not increase the risk to people and property from the coastal hazard; and Allow		
Regional Council		Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16 Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal		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. Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC 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 only the standard reduce' and 'reduce' or do not only the standard reduce' and 'reduce' and 'reduce' or do not only the standard reduce' and 'reduce' and 'reduce' or do not standard to levels as low as reasonably practical than 'reduce' and 'reduce' or do not standard to levels as low as reasonably practical than 'reduce' and 'reduce' or do not standard to levels as low as reasonably practical than 'reduce' and 'reduce' or do not standard to levels as low as reasonably practical than 'reduce' and 'reduce or do not standard to the standard to the standard transparent approaches.	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 minimise reduce or do not increase the risk to people and property from the coastal hazard; and Allow		
Regional Council Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.36	Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16 Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Support	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. Toka Tü Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC 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'.	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 minimise reduce or do not increase the risk to people and property from the coastal hazard; and Allow	Accept	Yes
Regional Council Toka Tū Ake EQC WCC Environmental	FS70.36	Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16 Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16 General District wide	Support	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. Toka Tü Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC 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'.	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 minimise reduce-or do not increase the risk to people and property from the coastal hazard; and Allow Retain CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas) as	Accept	Yes
Regional Council Toka Tū Ake EQC WCC Environmental	FS70.36 377.245	Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16 Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16 General District wide Matters / Coastal	Support	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. Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC 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'. CE-P16 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	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 minimise reduce-or do not increase the risk to people and property from the coastal hazard; and Allow Retain CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas) as	Accept	Yes
Regional Council Toka Tū Ake EQC WCC Environmental Reference Group	FS70.36 377.245	Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16 Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Support	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. Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC 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'. CE-P16 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	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 minimise reduce or do not increase the risk to people and property from the coastal hazard; and Allow Retain CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas) as notified.	Accept	Yes No
Regional Council Toka Tū Ake EQC WCC Environmental Reference Group Argosy Property No. 1	FS70.36 377.245	Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16 Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16 General District wide	Support Support	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. Toka Tü Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC 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'. CE-P16 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	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 minimise reduce or do not increase the risk to people and property from the coastal hazard; and Allow Retain CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas) as notified. Retain CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas) as	Accept	Yes No

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 14 of 38

Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.82	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P16	Amend	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.	Amend CE-P16 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard areas): 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 or 2. 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	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.	Disallow	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.255	General District wide Matters / Coastal	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	Environment / CE-P16 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 \underline{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	FS70.75	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / 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.		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.	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	[See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason] 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 Tü 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 tsunami 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
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	Amend	Considers the policy isn't clear.	Amend CE-P17 (Hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas) as follows:	Accept	Voc
weilington City Council	266.114	Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P17	Amena	Considers the policy isn't clear.	Only allow 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: ()	Ассері	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
International Airport Limited	FS36.105	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
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

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 16 of 38

				I	Tank the state of		T
Wellington International Airport	406.327	General District wide Matters / Coastal	Amend	Opposes this policy.	Either delete, or amend CE-P17 (Hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas) as follows:	Reject	No
Ltd		Environment / CE-P17		The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to	TOTIOWS.		
Liu		Environment / CE 1 17		recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance	Seeks that CE-P17 (Hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard areas) is amended to		
				to the effects of coastal hazards.	only apply to the coastal inundation hazard areas and recognise the concept of tolerability.		
				[See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]			
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.100	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal	Oppose	The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunami are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikurangi subduction zone or	Disallow	Accept	No
		Environment / CE-P17		local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate. Land use planning options must be considered,			
		Environment, ce i i		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.			
Precinct Properties	139.22	General District wide	Amend	Considers that the use of the term "avoid" is unnecessarily onerous and suggests that the	Amend CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high	Reject	No
New Zealand Limited	159.22	Matters / Coastal	Amenu	establishment of Hazard-Sensitive Activities and Potentially-Hazard-Sensitive Activities within the	coastal hazard area) as follows:	Reject	NO
Trew Ecoloria Elimitea		Environment / CE-P18		High Coastal Hazard Areas should not occur at all.	Constant Mazara di Cay de Tonories.		
				•	Avoid Only allow Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high		
				The requested amendment would provide appropriate policy	coastal hazard area or any subdivision where the building platform for a potentially hazard sensitive		
				support to the Restricted Discretionary status in rule CE-R20.	activity or hazard sensitive activity will be within the high coastal hazard area where it can be		
					demonstrated that:		
				The Restricted Discretionary status is enabling of activities, potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive	1. The activity, building or subdivision has an operational or functional need to locate within the high		
				activities in high coastal hazard areas within the City Centre	coastal hazard area and locating outside of these high coastal hazard areas is not a practicable		
				Zone and this needs to be recognised with appropriate wording	option;		
				in the supporting policy.	2. The activity, building, or subdivision incorporates measures that demonstrate that reduce or do		
					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.		
Wellington City Council	266.115	General District wide	Amend	Considers the policy isn't clear and requires a consequential change to remove the capital 'H'.	Amend CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high	Accept	Yes
		Matters / Coastal			coastal hazard area) as follows:		
		Environment / CE-P18					
					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, except where it can be		
					demonstrated that: ()		
Fire and Emergency	273.140	General District wide	Support	Supports the policy as it allows hazard sensitive activities within the high coastal hazard area where	Retain (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal	Accept	Yes
New Zealand		Matters / Coastal		the activity has an operational or functional need to locate within the high coastal hazard area and	hazard area), with amendment.		
		Environment / CE-P18		locating outside of these areas is not a practicable option. However, FENZ considers the wording of			
Fire and Emorgona	273.141	General District wide	Amend	CE-P18 is unclear and seeks an amendment to address this. Supports the policy as it allows hazard sensitive activities within the high coastal hazard area where	Amend CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high	Accept	Yes
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	2/3.141	Matters / Coastal	Amena	the activity has an operational or functional need to locate within the high coastal hazard area and	Amend CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially nazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area) as follows:	Accept	162
zealana		Environment / CE-P18		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.	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		
	1				hazard sensitive activity will be within the high coastal hazard area where unless it can be		1
					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> </u>
Dawid Wojasz	295.5	General District wide	Oppose in	Considers that the coastal hazard overlays put much of the CBD in an a high or medium hazard area,	Opposes application of High, Medium and Low Coastal Hazard overlay within the City Centre and	Reject	No
		Matters / Coastal	part	limiting development within the central city. Density in the Central city should be encouraged, and	seeks amendment.		
	1	Environment / CE-P18	l	the hazard can be dealt with as an engineering issue.			
				If the City Centre is not exempt from the overlay then point one in CE-P18 should be removed or			

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 17 of 38

Daniel Walana	205.6	Consul Biotolet mide	A	Consider that the control has a second control of the CRD in the control of the case of the control of the case of	Code About CE DAD (Harmon and State of	Delegat	In-
Dawid Wojasz	295.6	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Amend	Considers that the coastal hazard overlays put much of the CBD in an 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) If the City Centre is not exempt from the overlay then point one in CE-P18 should be removed or amended.	Seeks that CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the high coastal hazard area) is amended 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 has an operational or functional need to locate within the high coastal hazard area is not a practicable-option; 12. The activity, building, or subdivision incorporates measures that demonstrate that reduce or not increase the risk to people, and property from the coastal hazard;	Reject	No
					2. 3- There is the ability to access safe evacuation routes for occupants of the building from the coastal hazard; and 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.		
Dawid Wojasz	295.7	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Amend	Considers that the coastal hazard overlays put much of the CBD in an 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)	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.	Reject	No
Yvonne Weeber	340.40	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Support in part	CE-P18 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	345.320	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	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-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.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.106	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	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	351.216	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 GRWC 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'.		Accept	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.	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

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 18 of 38

V=: O U	204 257	Consul District wide	Commont in	CC DAG is wortfally assessed and an assessed asset is assessed.	Date: CE DAD (Users) and the strict of the s	D-:+	In-
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
Käinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.258	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Amend		coastal hazard area) as follows: 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 or hazard sensitive activity or hazard sensitive activity or hazard sensitive activity or 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 areas is not a practicable option; or is within an existing urban area; 2. The activity, building, or subdivision incorporates measures that demonstrate that it reduces or does not increase the risk to people, and property from the coastal hazard;	Reject	No
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 Haigh Ceoastal hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities or any subdivision where the building platform for a potentially hazard sensitive activity or hazard sensitive activity or bazard sensitive activity or hazard sensitive activity, building or subdivision has an operational or functional need to locate within the high eCoastal Hhazard 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 eCoastal Hhazard area 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 Haigh Ceoastal hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the Haigh Ceoastal hazard area lunudation Overlay or any subdivision where the building platform for a potentially hazard sensitive activity or hazard sensitive activity or hazard sensitive activity building or subdivision has an operational or functional need to locate within the high Ceoastal Hazard area lunudation Overlay and locating outside of these high Ceoastal Hazard area-lunudation 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; 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 Tü Ake EQC	FS70.76	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / 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 coastaltsunami 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).		Accept	No

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 19 of 38

1							
Fabric Property Limited	425.40	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18	Oppose in part	Seeks amendment of CE-P18 to change the word "avoid" to "only allow where". 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.	Opposes CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities) in part and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
				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.			
Fabric Property Limited	425.41	General District wide	Amend	Seeks amendment of CE-P18 to change the word "avoid" to "only allow where".	Amend CE-P18 (Hazard sensitive activities) as follows:	Reject	No
		Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P18		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.	Avoid Only allow Hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities in the 2. The activity, building, or subdivision incorporates measures that demonstrate that reduce or do not increase the risk to people, and property from the coastal hazard;		
				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.			
Wellington City Council	266.116	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P19	Amend	Considers the policy needs minor amendments for consistency with the rest of the chapter/plan.	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 facilitie4s and rail activities in the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows:	Accept	Yes
					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		
					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.		
Yvonne Weeber	340.41	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P19	Support in part	CE-P19 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	345.321	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P19	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-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.	Reject	No
Wellington	FS36.107	Part 2 / General District	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the	Disallow	Accept	No
International Airport Limited Greater Wellington	351.217	wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P19	Support	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; Considers this approach is appropriate.	Retain CE-P19 (Subdivision, use and development which will not be occupied by members of the	Accept	No
Regional Council		Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P19			public, or employees associated with the Airport, operation port Activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified.		
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	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

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 20 of 38

				T	T		
Wellington	406.328	General District wide	Oppose	Opposes this policy.	Opposes CE-P19 (Subdivision, use and development which will not be occupied by members of the	Reject	No
International Airport		Matters / Coastal			public, or employees associated with the Airport, operation port Activities, passenger port facilities		
Ltd		Environment / CE-P19		The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to	and rail activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays) and seeks amendment.		
				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]			
Wellington	406.329	General District wide	Amend	Opposes this policy.	Either delete, or amend CE-P19 (Subdivision, use and development which will not be occupied by	Reject	No
International Airport		Matters / Coastal			members of the public, or employees associated with the Airport, operation port Activities,	Ť	
Ltd		Environment / CE-P19		The concept of tolerability also needs to be brought into the policy, as per Objective SRCC-O2, to	passenger port facilities and rail activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as follows:		
		•		recognise that different activities, people, property and infrastructure will have a different tolerance			
				to the effects of coastal hazards.	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		
				[See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	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.		
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.101	Part 2 / General District	Oppose	The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunami	Disallow	Accept	No
		wide Matters / Coastal		are a very high impact hazard, and for a locally sourced event (e.g. Hikurangi subduction zone or		,	
		Environment / CE-P19		local fault) there will be limited time to evacuate. Land use planning options must be considered,			
		Environment, ce 125		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.			
				Service managed at the month natural nazaras.			
KiwiRail Holdings	408.100	General District wide	Support	Supports policy that enables subdivision, development and use associated within the operational	Retain CE-P19 (Subdivision, use and development which will not be occupied by members of the	Accept	No
Limited		Matters / Coastal	эрроп	port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Coastal Hazards Overlay.	public, or employees associated with the Airport, operation port Activities, passenger port facilities		
Limited		Environment / CE-P19		port activities, passenger port racinities and rain activities within the coastal nazarus Overlay.	and rail activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified.		
Guardians of the Bays	452.25	General District wide	Not	Submitter is 'neutral' on provision. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.	No relief specified	No
Guardians of the bays	432.23	Matters / Coastal	specified	Submitter is fleutral on provision. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.	No relier specified	NO
		Environment / CE-P19	specified				
Yvonne Weeber	340.42	General District wide	Support in	CE-P20 is generally supported, however it is unclear where the low, medium and high coastal hazard	Not exacified	No relief specified	No
TVOITIE WEEDEI	340.42	Matters / Coastal	part	areas are on the map.	Not specified.	No reliei specified	NO
		Environment / CE-P20	part	lateas are on the map.			
Royal Forest and Bird	345.322	General District wide	Support in	Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect	Amend CE-P20 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public,	Reject	No
Protection Society	3 13.3EE	Matters / Coastal	part	of use and development and coastal hazards. As noted above, these provisions should be amended	or employees associated with the Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail	nejeet	
1 Totaction Society		Environment / CE-P20	part	to also acknowledge the natural character, natural landscape and biodiversity values that must be	activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays) to also address risks posed to natural character, natural		
		LIIVIIOIIIIEIIL / CL-F20		protected	landscape, and biodiversity values.		
Wellington	FS36.108	Part 2 / General District	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the	Disallow	Accept	No
International Airport	1 330.108	wide Matters / Coastal	Оррозе	extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter.	Disallow	Ассері	NO
Limited		Environment / CE-P20		Notably:			
Lilliteu		LIIVIIOIIIIEIIL / CL-F20		The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives			
				applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified;			
				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,			
				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;			
Greater Wellington	351.218	General District wide	Amend	Considers that amendments are necessary to have regard to the RPS Objectives 19 and 20 and	Amond CE D20 (Subdivision, use and development which will be accorded by mambers of the multi-	Accept	Yes
Regional Council	331.210	Matters / Coastal	Aillellu	Policies 51 and 52. Minimise is defined as "as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)" and is in line	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	мссері	162
negional council							
		Environment / CE-P20		with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as	activities in the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as follows:		
				practicable but is a clearer signal than reduce or do not increase, to actively look to bring down the	Management of the second secon		
		1	1	risk in the	Manage subdivision, development and use associated with the Airport, operation port activities,		
				design and planning of the development.	passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Coastal Hazard Overlays where they involve the		
				design and planning of the development.			
				acost and paining of the acteophicia.	construction of new buildings which will be occupied by members of the public, or over 10		
				active parameters and active parameters and			
				occasion paraming of the determinant	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:		
					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 minimise do not increase the risk		
					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:		
	500000				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 minimise do not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure; and		
Toka Tü Ake EQC	FS70.38	Part 2 / General District	Support	Toka Tü Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC proposed RPS	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 minimise do not increase the risk	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.38	wide Matters / Coastal	Support	Toka Tü Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout 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 minimise do not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure; and	Reject	No
Toka Tü Ake EQC	FS70.38		Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC 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	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 minimise do not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure; and Allow	Reject	No
Toka Tü Ake EQC	FS70.38	wide Matters / Coastal	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC 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 no'	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 minimise do not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure; and Allow	Reject	No
		wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P20		Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC 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'.	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 minimise do not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure; and Allow		
WCC Environmental	FS70.38 377.249	wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P20 General District wide	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC 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 no'	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 minimise do not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure; and Allow Retain CE-P20 (Subdivision, use and development which will be occupied by members of the public,	Reject	No No
		wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P20		Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC 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'.	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 minimise do not increase the risk to people, property, and infrastructure; and Allow		

		T	r_			I=	T
	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
	FS70.102	wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P20		The risk of a 1:100 year tsunami risk is classed as high despite being low probability because tsunami 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		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
International Airport Limited	FS36.109	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P21		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	351.219	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.	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, o r employees or the creation of vacant allotments	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

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 22 of 38

C	FS84.84	Part 2 / General District	0	Construction to the deletion of CC D24 and the construction of D25	Disallant / Cooler that CC DOM is not in all an actified	A t	In-
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.84	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	Supports the policy in that it enables development in the coastal hazard overlays in the City Centre in some instances. 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.	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: 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, o r employees or the creation of vacant allotments."	Reject	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.42	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P21	Support in part	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.	Retain Policy CE-P21 (Subdivision), with amendment.	Reject	No
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, or employees 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		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 minimise reduce or not increase—the risk to people, and property; and	Accept	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.39	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22	Support	Toka Tû Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GRWC 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'.		Accept	No

		T		Inc	The state of the s		le.
WCC Environmental	377.251	General District wide	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	Reject	No
Reference Group		Matters / Coastal			members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified.		
		Environment / CE-P22					
Argosy Property No. 1	383.87	General District wide	Amend	Supports this provision to the extent that it recognises that development in the coastal hazard	Amend CE-P22 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will be occupied by	Reject	No
Limited	505.07	Matters / Coastal	runciia	overlays in the City Centre zone is appropriate in some instances. This is important because the CBD	members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays):	neject	
Limited					members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays):		
		Environment / CE-P22		is a social and economic hub of Wellington and it is important to recognise the existing investment in	վ		
				the CBD.However, as noted above, it is difficult to provide mitigation measures in relation to tsunam	Manage subdivision, development and use within the City Centre Zone and within all of the Coastal		
				risk, because of the remoteness of tsunami risk, so it is appropriate to require safe evacuation routes	Hazard Overlays, where they involve the construction of new buildings which will be occupied by		
				1 ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' '	members of the public, employees or result in the creation of a vacant allotment by ensuring that		
				to address tsunami risk.			
					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.		
					Inazaru.		
Kāinga Ora Homes and	391.260	General District wide	Support	CE-P22 is supported as notified.	Retain CE-P22 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will be occupied by	Reject	No
Communities		Matters / Coastal			members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified.		
		Environment / CE-P22					
5 4 i - i - t f F - l t	400.60		Comment	Company of P22 and an analysis of the submitted and idea that when a distribution of a like and a submitted and in the submitted and in	Detail CF D22 (Cubdicipies are and development in the City Control Zero which will be accorded by	D-it	NI-
Ministry of Education	400.68	General District wide	Support	Supports CE-P22 as proposed. The submitter considers that where educational facilities are required		Reject	No
		Matters / Coastal		in these areas, appropriate mitigation measures and evacuation plans should be implemented to	members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified.		
		Environment / CE-P22		ensure the safety of staff, students and the community.			1
Oyster Management	404.100	General District wide	Support in	Supports the policy to the extent it recognises development in coastal hazard overlays in the City	Retain CE-P22 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will be occupied by	Reject	No
, .	.54.100					neject	l
Limited		Matters / Coastal	part	Centre is appropriate in some instances, given it is the social and economic hub of Wellington and	members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) with amendments.	1	İ
		Environment / CE-P22		there is significant existing investment in the CBD.			
Oyster Management	404.101	General District wide	Amend	Supports the policy to the extent it recognises development in coastal hazard overlays in the City	Amend CE-P22 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will be occupied by	Reject	No
Limited		Matters / Coastal		Centre is appropriate in some instances, given it is the social and economic hub of Wellington and	members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays):	1	
		Environment / CE-P22		there is significant existing investment in the CBD. However, considers it is difficult to provide	The second state of the second state of the second	1	İ
		Environment / CE-P22					
				mitigation measures in relation to tsunami risk, because of the remoteness of tsunami risk, so it is	Manage subdivision, development and use within the City Centre Zone and within all of the Coastal		
				appropriate to require safe evacuation routes to address tsunami risk.	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		
					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		
					I notes of		
T T- FOO	F670 77	Part 2 / General District	0		la: II	Reject	
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.77	Part 2 / General District		While the trigger of a tsunami cannot be mitigated, the consequences can be reduced through good	Disallow		No
			Оррозс	0.0		Reject	
		wide Matters / Coastal	Оррозс	design, evacuation planning and communication of the risk. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is		Reject	
		wide Matters / Coastal	оррозс			neject	
			Оррозс	expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of Wellington within 10 minutes. It is		neject	
		wide Matters / Coastal	оррозс	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		Reject	
		wide Matters / Coastal	Оррозс	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		Reject	
		wide Matters / Coastal	оррозс	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		Reject	
Reading Wellington		wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / CE-P22		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).	Retain CE-P22 (Subdivision, use and development in the City Centre Zone which will be occupied by	Reject	No
Reading Wellington	441.2	wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / CE-P22 General District wide	Support	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). Supports CE-P22 as it clearly allows for development and use of sites within the City Centre Zone and	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		
Reading Wellington Properties Limited		wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal		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).	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.		
Properties Limited	441.2	wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22	Support	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). 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.	members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified.	Reject	No
		wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal		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). Supports CE-P22 as it clearly allows for development and use of sites within the City Centre Zone and			
Properties Limited	441.2	wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22	Support	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). 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.	members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified.	Reject	No
Properties Limited	441.2	wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal	Support	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). 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. 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	members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified.	Reject	No
Properties Limited Yvonne Weeber	441.2 340.43	wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23	Support Support	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 spafe tsunami evacuation routes (refer to GNS guidance on land use planning which incorporates tsunami modelling). 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. 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.	members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified. Retain CE-P23 (Natural systems and features) as notified.	Reject Accept	No No
Properties Limited Yvonne Weeber Royal Forest and Bird	441.2	wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 General District wide	Support Support Support in	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). 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. 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. Considers the policy should address the risks posed to people, property and infrastructure in respect	members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified. Retain CE-P23 (Natural systems and features) as notified.	Reject	No
Properties Limited Yvonne Weeber	441.2 340.43	wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23	Support Support	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 spafe tsunami evacuation routes (refer to GNS guidance on land use planning which incorporates tsunami modelling). 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. 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.	members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified. Retain CE-P23 (Natural systems and features) as notified.	Reject Accept	No No
Properties Limited Yvonne Weeber Royal Forest and Bird	441.2 340.43	wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 General District wide Matters / Coastal	Support Support Support in	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). 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. 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. 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	members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified. Retain CE-P23 (Natural systems and features) as notified. Amend CE-P23 (Natural systems and features):	Reject Accept	No No
Properties Limited Yvonne Weeber Royal Forest and Bird	441.2 340.43	wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 General District wide	Support Support Support in	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 spafe tsunami evacuation routes (refer to GNS guidance on land use planning which incorporates tsunami modelling). 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. 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. 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	members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified. Retain CE-P23 (Natural systems and features) as notified. Amend CE-P23 (Natural systems and features): Protect, restore, and enhance natural systems and features where they will reduce the existing risk	Reject Accept	No No
Properties Limited Yvonne Weeber Royal Forest and Bird	441.2 340.43	wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 General District wide Matters / Coastal	Support Support Support in	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). 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. 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. 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	members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified. Retain CE-P23 (Natural systems and features) as notified. 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, natural character, natural	Reject Accept	No No
Properties Limited Yvonne Weeber Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	441.2 340.43 345.325	wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 Environment / CE-P23	Support Support Support in part	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). 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. 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. 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	members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified. Retain CE-P23 (Natural systems and features) as notified. 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, natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.	Reject Accept Reject	No No
Properties Limited Yvonne Weeber Royal Forest and Bird	441.2 340.43	wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 General District wide Matters / Coastal	Support Support Support in part	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 spafe tsunami evacuation routes (refer to GNS guidance on land use planning which incorporates tsunami modelling). 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. 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. 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	members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified. Retain CE-P23 (Natural systems and features) as notified. 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, natural character, natural	Reject Accept	No No
Properties Limited Yvonne Weeber Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	441.2 340.43 345.325	wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 Environment / CE-P23	Support Support Support in part	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). 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. 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. 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	members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified. Retain CE-P23 (Natural systems and features) as notified. 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, natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.	Reject Accept Reject	No No
Properties Limited Yvonne Weeber Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Wellington International Airport	441.2 340.43 345.325	wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal	Support Support Support in part	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). 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. 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. 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 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.	members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified. Retain CE-P23 (Natural systems and features) as notified. 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, natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.	Reject Accept Reject	No No
Properties Limited Yvonne Weeber Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Wellington	441.2 340.43 345.325	wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 Part 2 / General District	Support Support Support in part	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). 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. 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. 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 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:	members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified. Retain CE-P23 (Natural systems and features) as notified. 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, natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.	Reject Accept Reject	No No
Properties Limited Yvonne Weeber Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Wellington International Airport	441.2 340.43 345.325	wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal	Support Support Support in part	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 spafe tsunami evacuation routes (refer to GNS guidance on land use planning which incorporates tsunami modelling). 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. 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. 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 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	members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified. Retain CE-P23 (Natural systems and features) as notified. 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, natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.	Reject Accept Reject	No No
Properties Limited Yvonne Weeber Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Wellington International Airport	441.2 340.43 345.325	wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal	Support Support Support in part	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). 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. 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. 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 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:	members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified. Retain CE-P23 (Natural systems and features) as notified. 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, natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.	Reject Accept Reject	No No
Properties Limited Yvonne Weeber Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Wellington International Airport	441.2 340.43 345.325	wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal	Support Support Support in part	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). 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. 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. 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 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;	members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified. Retain CE-P23 (Natural systems and features) as notified. 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, natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.	Reject Accept Reject	No No
Properties Limited Yvonne Weeber Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Wellington International Airport	441.2 340.43 345.325	wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal	Support Support Support in part	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). 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. 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. 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 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.	members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified. Retain CE-P23 (Natural systems and features) as notified. 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, natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.	Reject Accept Reject	No No
Properties Limited Yvonne Weeber Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Wellington International Airport	441.2 340.43 345.325	wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal	Support Support Support in part	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 spafe tsunami evacuation routes (refer to GNS guidance on land use planning which incorporates tsunami modelling). 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. 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. 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 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	members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified. Retain CE-P23 (Natural systems and features) as notified. 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, natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.	Reject Accept Reject	No No
Properties Limited Yvonne Weeber Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Wellington International Airport	441.2 340.43 345.325	wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal	Support Support Support in part	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). 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. 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. 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 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,	members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified. Retain CE-P23 (Natural systems and features) as notified. 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, natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.	Reject Accept Reject	No No
Properties Limited Yvonne Weeber Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Wellington International Airport	441.2 340.43 345.325	wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal	Support Support Support in part	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 spafe tsunami evacuation routes (refer to GNS guidance on land use planning which incorporates tsunami modelling). 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. 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. 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 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	members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified. Retain CE-P23 (Natural systems and features) as notified. 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, natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.	Reject Accept Reject	No No
Properties Limited Yvonne Weeber Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Wellington International Airport	441.2 340.43 345.325	wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal	Support Support Support in part	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). 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. 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. 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 WMAL 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	members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified. Retain CE-P23 (Natural systems and features) as notified. 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, natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.	Reject Accept Reject	No No
Properties Limited Yvonne Weeber Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Wellington International Airport Limited	441.2 340.43 345.325 FS36.111	wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23	Support Support in part Oppose	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 spafe tsunami evacuation routes (refer to GNS guidance on land use planning which incorporates tsunami modelling). 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. 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. 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 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 and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified. Retain CE-P23 (Natural systems and features) as notified. 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, natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values. Disallow	Reject Accept Reject Accept	No No No
Properties Limited Yvonne Weeber Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Wellington International Airport Limited Greater Wellington	441.2 340.43 345.325	wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 General District wide	Support Support Support in part	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). 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. 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. 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 WMAL 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	members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified. Retain CE-P23 (Natural systems and features) as notified. 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, natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.	Reject Accept Reject	No No
Properties Limited Yvonne Weeber Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Wellington International Airport Limited	441.2 340.43 345.325 FS36.111	wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23	Support Support in part Oppose	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 spafe tsunami evacuation routes (refer to GNS guidance on land use planning which incorporates tsunami modelling). 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. 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. 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 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 and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified. Retain CE-P23 (Natural systems and features) as notified. 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, natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values. Disallow	Reject Accept Reject Accept	No No No
Properties Limited Yvonne Weeber Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Wellington International Airport Limited Greater Wellington	441.2 340.43 345.325 FS36.111	wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 General District wide	Support Support in part Oppose	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 spafe tsunami evacuation routes (refer to GNS guidance on land use planning which incorporates tsunami modelling). 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. 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. 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 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 and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified. Retain CE-P23 (Natural systems and features) as notified. 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, natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values. Disallow	Reject Accept Reject Accept	No No No
Properties Limited Yvonne Weeber Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Wellington International Airport Limited Greater Wellington Regional Council	441.2 340.43 345.325 FS36.111	wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23	Support Support in part Oppose Support	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 spafe tsunami evacuation routes (refer to GNS guidance on land use planning which incorporates tsunami modelling). 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. 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. 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 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 as of adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure; Considers this approach is appropriate.	members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified. Retain CE-P23 (Natural systems and features) as notified. 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, natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values. Disallow Retain CE-P23 (Natural systems and features) as notified.	Reject Accept Reject Accept	No No No No No
Properties Limited Yvonne Weeber Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Wellington International Airport Limited Greater Wellington Regional Council WCC Environmental	441.2 340.43 345.325 FS36.111	wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23	Support Support in part Oppose	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 spafe tsunami evacuation routes (refer to GNS guidance on land use planning which incorporates tsunami modelling). 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. 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. 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 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 and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;	members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified. Retain CE-P23 (Natural systems and features) as notified. 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, natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values. Disallow	Reject Accept Reject Accept	No No No
Properties Limited Yvonne Weeber Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Wellington International Airport Limited Greater Wellington Regional Council	441.2 340.43 345.325 FS36.111	wide Matters / Coastal Environmet / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P22 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P23	Support Support in part Oppose Support	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 spafe tsunami evacuation routes (refer to GNS guidance on land use planning which incorporates tsunami modelling). 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. 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. 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 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 as of adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure; Considers this approach is appropriate.	members of the public and within the Coastal Hazards Overlays) as notified. Retain CE-P23 (Natural systems and features) as notified. 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, natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values. Disallow Retain CE-P23 (Natural systems and features) as notified.	Reject Accept Reject Accept	No No No No No

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 24 of 38

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	Amend	Considers the policy needs minor wording change.	Amend CE-P24 (Coastal hazard mitigation works involving green infrastructure) as follows:	Accept	Yes
		Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P24			Enable green infrastructure undertaken by a Crown entity or their nominated contractors or agents within the identified Coastal Hazard Overlay where this they will reduce the risk from coastal hazards to people, property and infrastructure.		
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, natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values.	Reject	No
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		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
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

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 25 of 38

Wellington	FS36.114	Part 2 / General District	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the	Disallow	Accept	No
International Airport		wide Matters / Coastal		extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter.			
Limited		Environment / CE-P26		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;			
Greater Wellington	351.224	General District wide	Amend	Considers that amendments are required to have regard to Policy 52 in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Amend CE-P26 (Hard engineering measures) to include non-structural, soft engineering or	Reject	No
Regional Council		Matters / Coastal		Green infrastructure has been defined in the WCC PDP with a strong focus on engineering systems	mātauranga Māori approaches.		
		Environment / CE-P26		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.			
WCC Environmental	377.255	General District wide	Support	CE-P26 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Retain CE-P26 (Hard engineering measures) as notified.	Reject	No
Reference Group		Matters / Coastal					
		Environment / CE-P26					
Wellington	406.332	General District wide	Oppose	The directive nature of this policy, coupled with the conjunction "and" sets an unduly onerous	Opposes CE-P26 (Hard engineering measures) and seeks amendment.	Accept in part	Yes
International Airport		Matters / Coastal		threshold for hard engineering measures which protect regionally significant infrastructure. It also			
Ltd		Environment / CE-P26	1	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.			
Wellington	406.333	General District wide	Amend	The directive nature of this policy, coupled with the conjunction "and" sets an unduly onerous	Either delete, or amend CE-P26 (Hard engineering measures) as follows:	Accept in part	Yes
Wellington	406.333	General District wide Matters / Coastal	Amend	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	Either delete, or amend CE-P26 (Hard engineering measures) as follows:	Accept in part	Yes
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.333	Matters / Coastal	Amend	threshold for hard engineering measures which protect regionally significant infrastructure. It also		Accept in part	Yes
International Airport	406.333		Amend	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		Accept in part	Yes
International Airport	406.333	Matters / Coastal	Amend	threshold for hard engineering measures which protect regionally significant infrastructure. It also	Only allow for <u>new</u> hard engineering measures for the reduction of the risk from coastal hazards	Accept in part	Yes
International Airport	406.333	Matters / Coastal	Amend	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'.	Only allow for <u>new</u> hard engineering measures for the reduction of the risk from coastal hazards where:	Accept in part	Yes
International Airport	406.333	Matters / Coastal	Amend	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	Only allow for <u>new</u> hard engineering measures for the reduction of the risk from coastal hazards where: 1. The engineering measures are needed to protect existing nationally and regionally significant	Accept in part	Yes
International Airport	406.333	Matters / Coastal	Amend	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'.	Only allow for new hard engineering measures for the reduction of the risk from coastal hazards where: 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; or	Accept in part	Yes
International Airport	406.333	Matters / Coastal	Amend	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.	Only allow for <u>new</u> hard engineering measures for the reduction of the risk from coastal hazards where: 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>	Accept in part	Yes
International Airport	406.333	Matters / Coastal	Amend	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	Only allow for <u>new</u> hard engineering measures for the reduction of the risk from coastal hazards where: 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	Accept in part	Yes
International Airport	406.333	Matters / Coastal	Amend	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.	Only allow for <u>new</u> hard engineering measures for the reduction of the risk from coastal hazards where: 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	Accept in part	Yes
International Airport	406.333	Matters / Coastal	Amend	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	Only allow for <u>new</u> hard engineering measures for the reduction of the risk from coastal hazards where: 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>	Accept in part	Yes
International Airport	406.333	Matters / Coastal	Amend	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	Only allow for <u>new</u> hard engineering measures for the reduction of the risk from coastal hazards where: 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	Accept in part	Yes
International Airport	406.333	Matters / Coastal	Amend	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	Only allow for <u>new</u> hard engineering measures for the reduction of the risk from coastal hazards where: 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>	Accept in part	Yes
International Airport	406.333	Matters / Coastal	Amend	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	Only allow for <u>new</u> hard engineering measures for the reduction of the risk from coastal hazards where: 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;	Accept in part	Yes
International Airport	406.333	Matters / Coastal	Amend	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	Only allow for <u>new</u> hard engineering measures for the reduction of the risk from coastal hazards where: 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; and <u>or</u>	Accept in part	Yes
International Airport	406.333	Matters / Coastal	Amend	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	Only allow for <u>new</u> hard engineering measures for the reduction of the risk from coastal hazards where: 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; and <u>or</u> 6. Significant natural features and systems and any adverse effects are avoided; remedied or	Accept in part	Yes
International Airport	406.333	Matters / Coastal	Amend	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	Only allow for new hard engineering measures for the reduction of the risk from coastal hazards where: 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; or 2. There is an immediate risk to life or private property from the coastal hazard; or 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; or 4. It avoids the modification or alteration of natural features and systems in a way that would compromise their function as natural defences; or 5. Hard engineering structures are designed to minimise adverse effects on the coastal environment; and or 6. Significant natural features and systems and any adverse effects are avoided; remedied or mitigated; or	Accept in part	Yes
International Airport	406.333	Matters / Coastal	Amend	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	Only allow for <u>new</u> hard engineering measures for the reduction of the risk from coastal hazards where: 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>andor</u> 6. Significant natural features and systems and any adverse effects are avoided; remedied or minitigated; or 7.6. It can be demonstrated that green infrastructure measures would not provide an appropriate	Accept in part	Yes
International Airport	406.333	Matters / Coastal	Amend	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	Only allow for new hard engineering measures for the reduction of the risk from coastal hazards where: 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; or 2. There is an immediate risk to life or private property from the coastal hazard; or 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; or 4. It avoids the modification or alteration of natural features and systems in a way that would compromise their function as natural defences; or 5. Hard engineering structures are designed to minimise adverse effects on the coastal environment; and or 6. Significant natural features and systems and any adverse effects are avoided; remedied or mitigated; or	Accept in part	Yes
International Airport Ltd		Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26		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.	Only allow for new hard engineering measures for the reduction of the risk from coastal hazards where: 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; or 2. There is an immediate risk to life or private property from the coastal hazard; or 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; or 4. It avoids the modification or alteration of natural features and systems in a way that would compromise their function as natural defences; or 5. Hard engineering structures are designed to minimise adverse effects on the coastal environment; and or 6. Significant natural features and systems and any adverse effects are avoided; remedied or mitigated; or 7.6. It can be demonstrated that green infrastructure measures would not provide an appropriate level of protection in relation to the significance of the risk.		
International Airport Ltd KiwiRail Holdings	406.333	Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26	Amend Support	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. Supports policy which recognises that, in some instances, hard engineering measures within the	Only allow for new hard engineering measures for the reduction of the risk from coastal hazards where: 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; or. 2. There is an immediate risk to life or private property from the coastal hazard; or. 3. The construction of the hard engineering measures will not create an intolerable increase the risk from Coastal Hazards on adjacent properties that are not protected by the hard engineering measures; or. 4. It avoids the modification or alteration of natural features and systems in a way that would compromise their function as natural defences; or. 5. Hard engineering structures are designed to minimise adverse effects on the coastal environment; andor. 6. Significant natural features and systems and any adverse effects are avoided; remedied or minitigated; or 7.6. It can be demonstrated that green infrastructure measures would not provide an appropriate	Accept in part	Yes
International Airport Ltd		Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26		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. 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	Only allow for new hard engineering measures for the reduction of the risk from coastal hazards where: 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; or 2. There is an immediate risk to life or private property from the coastal hazard; or 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; or 4. It avoids the modification or alteration of natural features and systems in a way that would compromise their function as natural defences; or 5. Hard engineering structures are designed to minimise adverse effects on the coastal environment; and or 6. Significant natural features and systems and any adverse effects are avoided; remedied or mitigated; or 7.6. It can be demonstrated that green infrastructure measures would not provide an appropriate level of protection in relation to the significance of the risk.		
International Airport Ltd KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.102	Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26	Support	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. 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.	Only allow for new hard engineering measures for the reduction of the risk from coastal hazards where: 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; or 2. There is an immediate risk to life or private property from the coastal hazard; or 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; or 4. It avoids the modification or alteration of natural features and systems in a way that would compromise their function as natural defences; or 5. Hard engineering structures are designed to minimise adverse effects on the coastal environment; and or 6. Significant natural features and systems and any adverse effects are avoided; remedied or mitigated; or 7.6. It can be demonstrated that green infrastructure measures would not provide an appropriate level of protection in relation to the significance of the risk. Retain CE-P26 (Hard engineering measures) as notified.	Reject	No
International Airport Ltd KiwiRail Holdings		Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26 General District wide		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. 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. CE-R16 is generally supported, but it is unclear where the Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal	Only allow for new hard engineering measures for the reduction of the risk from coastal hazards where: 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; or 2. There is an immediate risk to life or private property from the coastal hazard; or 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; or 4. It avoids the modification or alteration of natural features and systems in a way that would compromise their function as natural defences; or 5. Hard engineering structures are designed to minimise adverse effects on the coastal environment; and or 6. Significant natural features and systems and any adverse effects are avoided; remedied or mitigated; or 7.6. It can be demonstrated that green infrastructure measures would not provide an appropriate level of protection in relation to the significance of the risk.		
International Airport Ltd KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.102	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26 General District wide Matters / Coastal	Support	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. 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. 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	Only allow for new hard engineering measures for the reduction of the risk from coastal hazards where: 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; or 2. There is an immediate risk to life or private property from the coastal hazard; or 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; or 4. It avoids the modification or alteration of natural features and systems in a way that would compromise their function as natural defences; or 5. Hard engineering structures are designed to minimise adverse effects on the coastal environment; and or 6. Significant natural features and systems and any adverse effects are avoided; remedied or mitigated; or 7.6. It can be demonstrated that green infrastructure measures would not provide an appropriate level of protection in relation to the significance of the risk. Retain CE-P26 (Hard engineering measures) as notified.	Reject	No
International Airport Ltd KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.102	Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26 General District wide	Support	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. 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. 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	Only allow for new hard engineering measures for the reduction of the risk from coastal hazards where: 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; or 2. There is an immediate risk to life or private property from the coastal hazard; or 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; or 4. It avoids the modification or alteration of natural features and systems in a way that would compromise their function as natural defences; or 5. Hard engineering structures are designed to minimise adverse effects on the coastal environment; and or 6. Significant natural features and systems and any adverse effects are avoided; remedied or mitigated; or 7.6. It can be demonstrated that green infrastructure measures would not provide an appropriate level of protection in relation to the significance of the risk. Retain CE-P26 (Hard engineering measures) as notified.	Reject	No
International Airport Ltd KiwiRail Holdings Limited Yvonne Weeber	408.102	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R16	Support Support	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. 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. 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.	Only allow for new hard engineering measures for the reduction of the risk from coastal hazards where: 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; or. 2. There is an immediate risk to life or private property from the coastal hazard; or. 3. The construction of the hard engineering measures will not create an intolerable increase the risk from Coastal Hazards on adjacent properties that are not protected by the hard engineering measures; or. 4. It avoids the modification or alteration of natural features and systems in a way that would compromise their function as natural defences; or. 5. Hard engineering structures are designed to minimise adverse effects on the coastal environment; and or. 6. Significant natural features and systems and any adverse effects are avoided; remedied or mitigated; or 7.6. It can be demonstrated that green infrastructure measures would not provide an appropriate level of protection in relation to the significance of the risk. Retain CE-P26 (Hard engineering measures) as notified.	Reject	No No
International Airport Ltd KiwiRail Holdings Limited Yvonne Weeber Royal Forest and Bird	408.102	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R16 General District wide	Support	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. 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. CER-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. Considers the provisions of this chapter should also acknowledge the natural character, natural	Only allow for new hard engineering measures for the reduction of the risk from coastal hazards where: 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; or. 2. There is an immediate risk to life or private property from the coastal hazard; or. 3. The construction of the hard engineering measures will not create an intolerable increase the risk from Coastal Hazards on adjacent properties that are not protected by the hard engineering measures; or. 4. It avoids the modification or alteration of natural features and systems in a way that would compromise their function as natural defences; or. 5. Hard engineering structures are designed to minimise adverse effects on the coastal environment; andor. 6. Significant natural features and systems and any adverse effects are avoided; remedied or mitigated; or 7.6. It can be demonstrated that green infrastructure measures would not provide an appropriate level of protection in relation to the significance of the risk. Retain CE-P26 (Hard engineering measures) as notified. Amend CE-R16 (Less hazard sensitive activities within all the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.	Reject	No
International Airport Ltd KiwiRail Holdings Limited Yvonne Weeber	408.102	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R16 General District wide Matters / Coastal	Support Support	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. 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. 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. 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	Only allow for new hard engineering measures for the reduction of the risk from coastal hazards where: 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; or 2. There is an immediate risk to life or private property from the coastal hazard; or 3. The construction of the hard engineering measures will not create an intolerable increase the risk from Coastal Hazards on adjacent properties that are not protected by the hard engineering measures; or 4. It avoids the modification or alteration of natural features and systems in a way that would compromise their function as natural defences; or 5. Hard engineering structures are designed to minimise adverse effects on the coastal environment, and or 6. Significant natural features and systems and any adverse effects are avoided; remedied or mitigated; or 7.6. It can be demonstrated that green infrastructure measures would not provide an appropriate level of protection in relation to the significance of the risk. Retain CE-P26 (Hard engineering measures) as notified. Amend CE-R16 (Less hazard sensitive activities within all the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.	Reject	No No
International Airport Ltd KiwiRail Holdings Limited Yvonne Weeber Royal Forest and Bird	408.102	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R16 General District wide	Support Support	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. 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. 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. 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	Only allow for new hard engineering measures for the reduction of the risk from coastal hazards where: 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; or. 2. There is an immediate risk to life or private property from the coastal hazard; or. 3. The construction of the hard engineering measures will not create an intolerable increase the risk from Coastal Hazards on adjacent properties that are not protected by the hard engineering measures; or. 4. It avoids the modification or alteration of natural features and systems in a way that would compromise their function as natural defences; or. 5. Hard engineering structures are designed to minimise adverse effects on the coastal environment; andor. 6. Significant natural features and systems and any adverse effects are avoided; remedied or mitigated; or 7.6. It can be demonstrated that green infrastructure measures would not provide an appropriate level of protection in relation to the significance of the risk. Retain CE-P26 (Hard engineering measures) as notified. Amend CE-R16 (Less hazard sensitive activities within all the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.	Reject	No No
International Airport Ltd KiwiRail Holdings Limited Yvonne Weeber Royal Forest and Bird	408.102	General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-P26 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R16 General District wide Matters / Coastal	Support Support	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. 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. 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. 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	Only allow for new hard engineering measures for the reduction of the risk from coastal hazards where: 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; or 2. There is an immediate risk to life or private property from the coastal hazard; or 3. The construction of the hard engineering measures will not create an intolerable increase the risk from Coastal Hazards on adjacent properties that are not protected by the hard engineering measures; or 4. It avoids the modification or alteration of natural features and systems in a way that would compromise their function as natural defences; or 5. Hard engineering structures are designed to minimise adverse effects on the coastal environment, and or 6. Significant natural features and systems and any adverse effects are avoided; remedied or mitigated; or 7.6. It can be demonstrated that green infrastructure measures would not provide an appropriate level of protection in relation to the significance of the risk. Retain CE-P26 (Hard engineering measures) as notified. Amend CE-R16 (Less hazard sensitive activities within all the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.	Reject	No No

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 26 of 38

Wellington	FS36.125	Part 2 / General District	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the	Disallow	Accept	No
International Airport		wide Matters / Coastal		extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter.			
Limited		Environment / CE-R16		Notably:			
				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;			
WCC Environmental	377.271	General District wide	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
Reference Group		Matters / Coastal					
		Environment / CE-R16					
Investore Property	405.43	General District wide	Support	Supports the policy as it provides for potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal	Retain CE-R16 (Less hazard sensitive activities within all the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.	Accept	No
Limited		Matters / Coastal		hazard areas. Fabric notes is difficult to provide mitigation measures in relation to tsunami risk,			
		Environment / CE-R16		because of the remoteness of tsunami risk, so it is appropriate to require safe evacuation routes to			
				address tsunami risk.			
Wellington	406.340	General District wide	Oppose	Considers that to avoid unnecessary duplication in the Proposed Plan, this chapter should focus on	Delete CE-R16 (Less hazard sensitive activities within all the Coastal Hazard Overlays) in it's entirety.	Reject	No
International Airport		Matters / Coastal		those additional consent requirements necessary to manage effects within the coastal hazard			
Ltd		Environment / CE-R16		overlays that cannot be adequately dealt with by the underlying zone rules.			
	1			[See paragraphs 4.30 to 4.31 and 4.48 of original submission for full reason]			
Yvonne Weeber	340.61	General District wide	Support	CE-R17 is generally supported, but it is unclear where the Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal	Retain CE-R17 (Green infrastructure for the purposes of coastal hazard mitigation works undertaken	Accept	No
		Matters / Coastal		Hazard Area and the High Coastal Hazard Area are in the coastal environment. These terms do not	by a Crown entity or their nominated contractor or agent within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as	,	
		Environment / CE-R17		appear on the Wellington City Proposed District Plan maps. Submission may be amended in the	notified.		
				future.			
Royal Forest and Bird	345.349	General District wide	Support in	Considers the provisions of this chapter should also acknowledge the natural character, natural	Amend CE-R17 (Green infrastructure for the purposes of coastal hazard mitigation works undertaken	Reject	No
Protection Society	5 15.5 15	Matters / Coastal	nart	landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected. Ensure rules either cross reference	by a Crown entity or their nominated contractor or agent within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) to	neject	
1 Total Cition Society		Environment / CE-R17	part	appropriate provisions from other chapters, or include provisions to address adverse effects on	acknowledge natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values are protected via		
		Elivirollillelit / CE-K1/		these matters	reference to appropriate provisions from other chapters or by including provisions in the rule.		
				triese matters	leterence to appropriate provisions from other chapters or by including provisions in the rule.		
Wellington	FS36.126	Part 2 / General District	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the	Disallow	Accept	No
International Airport	1 330.120	wide Matters / Coastal	Оррозс	extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter.	Disanow	Ассере	110
Limited		Environment / CE-R17		Notably:			
Limited		Environment / CE RI/		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,			
				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;			
WCC Environmental	377.272	General District wide	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	Accept	No
Reference Group	3/1.2/2	Matters / Coastal	Support	CE-N17 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	by a Crown entity or their nominated contractor or agent within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as	Ассері	NO
Reference Group		Environment / CE-R17			notified.		
Danada at Danas ation	139.23		Comment	Community and the second control of the second seco		D-!+	No
Precinct Properties	139.23	General District wide	Support	Supports this rule as proposed including the Permitted	Retain CE-R18 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.	Reject	NO
New Zealand Limited		Matters / Coastal		activity status, and Restricted Discretionary activity status for			
		Environment / CE-R18		additions to buildings which do not comply with CE-R18.1.			
Fire and Emergency	273.148	General District wide	Support	Supports the rule as the rule framework for the construction, addition, or alteration of buildings and	Retain CE-R18 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.	Reject	No
New Zealand	1	Matters / Coastal		structures within the coastal environment does not hinder FENZ's ability to establish fire stations			
		Environment / CE-R18		within the coastal environment.			
Yvonne Weeber	340.62	General District wide	Support	CE-R18 is generally supported, but it is unclear where the Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal	Retain CE-R18 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.	Reject	No
	1	Matters / Coastal		Hazard Area and the High Coastal Hazard Area are in the coastal environment. These terms do not			
		Environment / CE-R18		appear on the Wellington City Proposed District Plan maps. Submission may be amended in the			
	ļ	ļ		future.			
Royal Forest and Bird	345.350	General District wide	Support in	Considers the provisions of this chapter should also acknowledge the natural character, natural	Amend CE-R18 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) to acknowledge natural	Reject	No
Protection Society	1	Matters / Coastal	part	landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected. Ensure rules either cross reference	character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values are protected via reference to appropriate		
	1	Environment / CE-R18		appropriate provisions from other chapters, or include provisions to address adverse effects on	provisions from other chapters or by including provisions in the rule.		
				these matters			
Wellington	FS36.127		Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the	Disallow	Accept	No
International Airport		wide Matters / Coastal		extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter.			
Limited		Environment / CE-R18		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.			
							1
				This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the	the state of the s		
				This chapter should only focus on those provisions that cannot otherwise be addressed by the underlying zone provisions; and.			
				underlying zone provisions; and,			

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 27 of 38

r							
WCC Environmental	377.273	General District wide	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
Reference Group		Matters / Coastal					
		Environment / CE-R18					
Argosy Property No. 1	383.88	General District wide	Amend	Supports this rule to the extent that it enables additions to buildings within the coastal hazards	Amend CE-R18.1 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays):	Reject	No
Limited		Matters / Coastal		overlays. However, it is not appropriate to place controls on buildings in the Tsunami Hazard			
		Environment / CE-R18		Overlay. Due to the nature of tsunamis, it is not realistic to construct additions to buildings to avoid	e. The additions are in the Tsunami Hazard Overlay		
				tsunami risk.			
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.9	Part 2 / General District	Oppose	Mitigation of risks from tsunami is possible with land use planning and building design, and tsunami	Disallow	Accept	No
TORA TA ARC EQC	1370.3	wide Matters / Coastal	Оррозс		Distillow	Ассере	140
				risk should not be deleted from the policy. A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result			
		Environment / CE-R18		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.			
Oyster Management	404.102	General District wide	Support in	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
Limited		Matters / Coastal	part				
		Environment / CE-R18					
Oyster Management	404.103	General District wide	Amend	Supports rule to the extent that it enables additions to buildings within coastal hazard overlays.	Amend CE-R18.1 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows:	Reject	No
Limited		Matters / Coastal		However, considers it is not appropriate to place controls on buildings in the Tsunami Hazard	I		
		Environment / CE-R18		Overlay, due to the nature of tsunamis, it is not realistic to construct additions to buildings to avoid	e. The additions are in the Tsunami Hazard Overlay		
		Environment / CE 1120		tsunami risk.	e. The dadicons are in the Islandini Hazard Overlay		
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.78	Part 2 / General District	Oppose	Mitigation of risks from tsunami is possible with land use planning and building design, and tsunami	Disallow	Accept	No
TORA TU ARE EQC	F3/U./6	1	Oppose		DISGITOW	Ассері	NO
		wide Matters / Coastal		risk should not be deleted from the policy. The current probability of a rupture of the Hikurangi			
		Environmet / CE-R18		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.			
Oyster Management	404.104	General District wide	Amend	Supports rule to the extent that it enables additions to buildings within coastal hazard overlays.	Amend CE-R18.2.b (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows:	Reject	No
Limited		Matters / Coastal		However, considers it is not appropriate to place controls on buildings in the Tsunami Hazard	Q	,,	
		Environment / CE-R18		Overlay, due to the nature of tsunamis, it is not realistic to construct additions to buildings to avoid			
		LIMITORINIERIC / CL-K10		tsunami risk.	***		
				tsunami risk.			
					b. The addition is to a potentially hazard sensitive activity or a hazard sensitive activity within a high		
					coastal hazard area other than the high tsunami hazard area.		
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.79	Part 2 / General District	Oppose	Mitigation of risks from tsunami is possible with land use planning and building design, and tsunami	Disallow	Accept	No
		wide Matters / Coastal		risk should not be deleted from the policy. The current probability of a rupture of the Hikurangi			
		Environmet / CE-R18		subduction zone is calculated as 25% in the next 50 years1. 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.			
Incompany Description	405.44	General District wide	Common and in		Retain CE-R18.1 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) and seeks amendment.	Dailant	No
Investore Property	405.44		Support in	Supports the rule but considers that it would be appropriate to also enable additions within the	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Reject	NO
Limited		Matters / Coastal	part	Tsunami Hazard Overlay to be permitted to recognise that it is not realistic to construct additions to			
		Environment / CE-R18		buildings to avoid tsunami risk.			
Investore Property	405.45	General District wide	Amend	Supports the rule but considers that it would be appropriate to also enable additions within the	Amend CE-R18.1 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows:	Reject	No
Limited		Matters / Coastal		Tsunami Hazard Overlay to be permitted to recognise that it is not realistic to construct additions to	1. Activity status: Permitted		
		Environment / CE-R18		buildings to avoid tsunami risk.	Where:		
					e. The additions are in the Tsunami Hazard Overlay.		
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.43	Part 2 / General District	Oppose	A Hikurangi subduction earthquake is expected to result in a 2-4 m tsunami to impact parts of	Disallow	Accept	No
TORU TU ARC EQC	. 570.43	wide Matters / Coastal	Оррозс	Wellington within 10 minutes. Mitigation of risks from tsunami is possible with land use planning and		I cocpt	
					u		
		Environment / CE-R18		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.			
							ļ
Wellington	406.341	General District wide	Oppose	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas	Opposes CE-R18 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
International Airport	1	Matters / Coastal	1	only.		1	
Ltd	1	Environment / CE-R18					
İ	1	.,	1	[See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]		1	
Wellington	406.342	General District wide	Oppose	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas	Delete CE-R18 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) in its entirety. (Option A).	Reject	No
	.00.542		Oppose	11.7	Delete of 1120 (Additions to buildings within the coastal flazard Overlays) in its entirety. (Option A).		""
International Airport	1	Matters / Coastal	1	only.		1	
Ltd	1	Environment / CE-R18					
				[See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]			
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.103	Part 2 / General District	Oppose	Mitigation of risks from tsunami is possible with land use planning and building design, and tsunami	Disallow	Accept	No
		wide Matters / Coastal		risk should not be deleted from the policy. The current probability of a rupture of the Hikurangi		1	
		Environment / CE-R18		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			
	105.040	0 10:11		evacuate.	A LOS DAD ALTER ALTER AND ALTER ADDRESS OF ADDRESS OF ALTER ADDRESS OF ALTER ADDRESS OF		l
	406.343		Amend	***	Amena CE-KES (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows:	keject	INO
	1			only.			
Ltd	1	Environment / CE-R18			Seeks that CE-R18 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) is amended to apply to	1	
Ltu	I						
Wellington International Airport	406.343	General District wide Matters / Coastal	Amend	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only.	Amend CE-R18 (Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows:	Reject	No
					Seeks that at 120 placeholis to buildings within the coastal hazard overlays) is affeithed to apply to	1	1
Liu		1		[See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	coastal inundation hazard areas only. (Option B).		

Toka Tü Ake EQC	FS70.104	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R18		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.		Accept	No
Fabric Property Limited		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.		Reject	No
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	WML 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	Reject	No
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. At 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. Activity of the activity, or any members of the public; or one than 10 employees of the activity, or any members of the public; or c. Activity of the activity 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

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 29 of 38

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.	Opposes CE-R19 (Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Coastal Hazard Overlay) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
				[See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]			
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.	Amend CE-R19 (Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities within the Coastal Hazard Overlay) as follows:	Reject	No
				[See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	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).		
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.		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 Tü 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.		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
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. Note: The above restrictions do not apply to emergency service facilities.	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		WALL 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 chapters 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

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 30 of 38

		I=	I	I	I	F2	T
Argosy Property No. 1	383.89	General District wide	Amend	Supports this rule to the extent that it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard	Amend CE-R20 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City	Reject	No
imited		Matters / Coastal		sensitive activities within the City Centre zone where those activities are also within the medium and			
		Environment / CE-R20		high coastal hazard areas. However, it is unclear why potentially hazard sensitive activities should be	Activity status: Permitted		
				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	Where:		
				employees are unlikely to have a different risk profile to one office occupied by 50 employees. This	I. It does not involve the construction of a building that would be occupied predominantly by more—		
				rule also does not achieve the objectives and policies of the coastal hazard overlays, specifically	than 10 employees of the activity, or any members of the public; or		
				Objective CE-O8 and Policy CE-P21. The rule should also be clarified to reflect that it would be very	2. It does not involve the conversion of an existing building into a building that would be occupied		
				difficult for buildings to entirely avoid being occupied by members of the public occasionally e.g. a	predominantly by more than 10 employees of the activity, or any members of the public		
				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			
				, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			
Ainistry of Education	400.71	General District wide	Support	Supports CE-R20 as the submitter considers the matters of discretion to be appropriate where the	Retain CE-R20 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City	Reject	No
,.		Matters / Coastal		permitted activity standards are not met.	Centre Zone and are also within the medium and high coastal hazard areas) as notified.	,,	
		Environment / CE-R20					
Dyster Management	404.105	General District wide	Support in	Supports the rule to the extent it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive	Retain CE-R20 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City	Reject	No
imited		Matters / Coastal	part	activities within the City Centre zone where those activities are also within the medium and high	Centre Zone and are also within the medium and high coastal hazard areas) with amendments.		
		Environment / CE-R20		coastal hazard areas.			
yster Management	404.106	General District wide	Amend	Supports the rule to the extent it enables potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive	Amend CE-R20 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City	Reject	No
imited		Matters / Coastal		activities within the City Centre zone where those activities are also within the medium and high	Centre Zone and are also within the medium and high coastal hazard areas):		
		Environment / CE-R20		coastal hazard areas.			
					Activity status: Permitted		1
				However, considers it is unclear why potentially hazard sensitive activities should be permitted	Where:		İ
				where a building will be occupied by 10 or less employees of an activity. This number appears to be	1. It does not involve the construction of a building that would be occupied <u>predominantly</u> by more		İ
				arbitrary and impractical. For example, five offices that are occupied by 10 or less employees are	than 10 employees of the activity, or any members of the public; or		
				unlikely to have a different risk profile to one office occupied by 50 employees. This rule also does	2. It does not involve the conversion of an existing building into a building that would be occupied		
				not achieve the objectives and policies of the coastal hazard overlays, specifically Objective CE-O8	<u>predominantly</u> by more than 10 employees of the activity, or any members of the public		
				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.			
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.80		Oppose	Coastal hazard risk is going to increase in the near future with the impact of climate change and sea		Accept	No
		wide Matters / Coastal		level rise, and high occupancy developments in high risk areas will expose more people to increasing			
		Environmet / CE-R20		risk.			
Oyster Management	404.107	General District wide	Common and in	Supports CE-R20 to the extent that activities which cannot comply with CE-R20.1 are restricted	Details CE DOO /Details	Delegat	No
Dyster Management Limited	404.107	Matters / Coastal	Support in part	11	Retain CE-R20 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City	Reject	NO
Imitea		Environment / CE-R20	part	discretionary.	Centre Zone and are also within the medium and high coastal hazard areas) with amendments.		
abric Property Limited	125 17	General District wide	Amend	Supports the intention of CE-R20 to enable of development in medium and high coastal hazard areas	Supports CE-R20 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City	Reject	No
abile i roperty Ellilitea	425.47	Matters / Coastal	Amena	in the City Centre Zone.	Centre Zone), with amendment.	neject	140
		Environment / CE-R20		in the city centre zone.	centre zone), with amendment.		
		Environment, de neo		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.			
				to amended to rocus 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			
				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			
abric Property Limited	425.48	General District wide	Amend	There also needs to be clarification to reflect that it would be very difficult for buildings to entirely	Amend CE-R20 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities or hazard sensitive activities within the City	Reject	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.48	General District wide Matters / Coastal	Amend	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:	Reject	No
abric Property Limited	425.48		Amend	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 the intention of CE-R20 to enable of development in medium and high coastal hazard areas	, ,	Reject	No
abric Property Limited	425.48	Matters / Coastal	Amend	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 the intention of CE-R20 to enable of development in medium and high coastal hazard areas in the City Centre Zone.	, ,	Reject	No
abric Property Limited	425.48	Matters / Coastal	Amend	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 the intention of CE-R20 to enable of development in medium and high coastal hazard areas	Centre Zone) as follows: Activity status: Permitted	Reject	No
abric Property Limited	425.48	Matters / Coastal	Amend	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 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	Centre Zone) as follows: Activity status: Permitted	Reject	No
abric Property Limited	425.48	Matters / Coastal	Amend	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 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	Centre Zone) as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where:	Reject	No
abric Property Limited	425.48	Matters / Coastal	Amend	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 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	Centre Zone) as follows: Activity status: Permitted	Reject	No
abric Property Limited	425.48	Matters / Coastal	Amend	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 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	Centre Zone) as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: 1. It does not involve the construction of a building that would be occupied predominantly by more-	Reject	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.48	Matters / Coastal	Amend	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 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.	Centre Zone) as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: I. It does not involve the construction of a building that would be occupied predominantly by merethan 10 employees of the activity, or any members of the public; or	Reject	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.48	Matters / Coastal	Amend	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 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	Centre Zone) as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: 1. It does not involve the construction of a building that would be occupied predominantly by morethan 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	Reject	No
Fabric Property Limited	425.48	Matters / Coastal	Amend	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 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	Centre Zone) as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: 1. It does not involve the construction of a building that would be occupied predominantly by morethan 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	Reject	No
	425.48 FS70.16	Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20		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 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	Centre Zone) as follows: 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 No
Fabric Property Limited Foka Tü Ake EQC		Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20		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 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.	Centre Zone) as follows: 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. Disallow		
		Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20		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 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.	Centre Zone) as follows: 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. Disallow		
		Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20 Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal		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 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.	Centre Zone) as follows: 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. Disallow		
		Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20 Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal		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 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.	Centre Zone) as follows: 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. Disallow		
oka Tü Ake EQC	FS70.16	Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20 Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R20	Oppose	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 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. 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.	Centre Zone) as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: 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 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. Disallow Retain CE-R21 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard areas) notified.	Accept	No

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 31 of 38

16 14/b	340.65	Comment District wide	C	CC D24 is according to the first considerable to the Constal Harmad According Constal	Debain CE DOM (Debankin), bened assisted as the law and benedicted	Ia	In-
Yvonne Weeber	340.65	General District wide Matters / Coastal	Support	CE-R21 is generally supported, but it is unclear where the Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal	Retain CE-R21 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) as notified.	Accept	No
				Hazard Area and the High Coastal Hazard Area are in the coastal environment. These terms do not			
		Environment / CE-R21		appear on the Wellington City Proposed District Plan maps. Submission may be amended in the future.			
Royal Forest and Bird	345.353	General District wide	Support in	Considers the provisions of this chapter should also acknowledge the natural character, natural	Amend CE-R21 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) to acknowledge	Reject	No
Protection Society	343.333	Matters / Coastal	part	landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected. Ensure rules either cross reference	natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values are protected via reference to	Reject	NO
1 Total City		Environment / CE-R21	parc	appropriate provisions from other chapters, or include provisions to address adverse effects on	appropriate provisions from other chapters or by including provisions in the rule.		
		Environment / CE R21		these matters	appropriate provisions from other chapters or by including provisions in the rule.		
Wellington	FS36.130	Part 2 / General District	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the	Disallow	Accept	No
International Airport		wide Matters / Coastal		extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter.			
Limited		Environment / CE-R21		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;			
WCC Environmental	377.276	General District wide	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
Reference Group		Matters / Coastal					
		Environment / CE-R21					
Oyster Management	404.108	General District wide	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
Limited		Matters / Coastal					
	405.047	Environment / CE-R21				l	<u> </u>
Wellington	406.347	General District wide	Oppose	Considers that to avoid unnecessary duplication with the Proposed Plan and for other reasons, this	Delete CE-R21 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) in it's entirety.	Reject	No
International Airport		Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R21		chapter should focus on those additional consent requirements necessary to manage effects within			
Ltd		Environment / CE-R21		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]			
				[See paragraphs 4.30 to 4.31 and 4.48 or original submission for full reason]			
Fire and Emergency	273.151	General District wide	Support in	Seeks to exclude restrictions on establishing emergency service facilities in these areas. Considers	Supports CE-R22 (Hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area), with amendment.	Reject	No
New Zealand	273.131	Matters / Coastal	part	fire stations may have a functional need to be located in certain areas, including coastal hazard	Supports CE-N22 (Hazard Sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area), with amendment.	Reject	IVO
IVCW Zealand		Environment / CE-R22	parc	areas. The ability to construct and operate fire stations in locations which will enable reasonable			
		Environment / CE NEE		response times to fire and other emergencies is paramount the health, safety and wellbeing of			
				people and the community.			
Fire and Emergency	273.152	General District wide	Amend	Seeks to exclude restrictions on establishing emergency service facilities in these areas. Considers	Amend CE-R22 (Hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) as follows:	Reject	No
New Zealand		Matters / Coastal		fire stations may have a functional need to be located in certain areas, including coastal hazard		,	
		Environment / CE-R22		areas. The ability to construct and operate fire stations in locations which will enable reasonable	1. Activity Status: Permitted		
				response times to fire and other emergencies is paramount the health, safety and wellbeing of	Where:		
				people and the community.	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.		
Yvonne Weeber	340.66	General District wide	Support	CE-R22 is generally supported, but it is unclear where the Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal	Retain CE-R22 (Hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) as notified.	Reject	No
		Matters / Coastal		Hazard Area and the High Coastal Hazard Area are in the coastal environment. These terms do not			
		Environment / CE-R22		appear on the Wellington City Proposed District Plan maps. Submission may be amended in the			
				future.			
Royal Forest and Bird	345.354	General District wide	Support in	Considers the provisions of this chapter should also acknowledge the natural character, natural	Amend CE-R22 (Bazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) to acknowledge natural	Reject	No
Protection Society		Matters / Coastal	part	landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected. Ensure rules either cross reference	character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values are protected via reference to appropriate		
		Environment / CE-R22		appropriate provisions from other chapters, or include provisions to address adverse effects on these matters	provisions from other chapters or by including provisions in the rule.		
Wellington	FS36.131	Part 2 / General District	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the	Disallow	Accept	No
International Airport	F330.131	wide Matters / Coastal	Oppose	extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter.	DISAHOW	Accept	INU
Limited		Environment / CE-R22		Notably:			
Limited		E. FIROITICITY CE-NZZ		The Coastal Environment has been broadly mapped, with its corresponding policy directives]
				applying to large urban areas of the District which are highly modified;]
				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,]
				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;			
WCC Environmental	377.277	General District wide	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
		Matters / Coastal	''	-			
Reference Group		I	1				1
Reference Group		Environment / CE-R22					
Argosy Property No. 1	383.90	General District wide	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
	383.90		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

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 32 of 38

Ministry of Education						1	
	400.72	General District wide	Support	Supports CE-R22 as the submitter supports the Restricted Discretionary Activity status for the	Retain CE-R22 (Hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) as notified.	Reject	No
		Matters / Coastal		establishment of educational facilities in the low coastal hazard area. In addition, the submitter			
		Environment / CE-R22		considers the matters of discretion to be appropriate.			
Wellington	406.348	General District wide	Oppose	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas	Opposes CE-R22 (Hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
International Airport		Matters / Coastal		only.		-	
Itd		Environment / CE-R22					
				[See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]			
Wellington	406.349	General District wide	Amend	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas	Amend CE-R22 (Hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) as follows:	Reject	No
International Airport	400.349	Matters / Coastal	Amenu	only.	Afficial CE-NZZ (flazaru serisitive activities ili tile low coastal flazaru area) as follows.	Reject	NO
				only.			
Ltd		Environment / CE-R22			Seeks that CE-R22 (Hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) is amended to apply to		
				[See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]	coastal inundation hazard areas only. (Option A).		
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.107		Oppose	While the trigger of a tsunami cannot be mitigated, the consequences can be reduced through good	Disallow	Accept	No
		wide Matters / Coastal		design, evacuation planning and communication of the risk, and the tsunami hazard overlay should			
		Environment / CE-R22		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.			
Wellington	406.350	General District wide	Oppose	Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas	Delete CE-R22 (Hazard sensitive activities in the low coastal hazard area) in its entirety. (Option B).	Reject	No
International Airport		Matters / Coastal		only.		-	
Ltd		Environment / CE-R22					
				[See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason]			
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.108	Part 2 / General District	Onnose	While the trigger of a tsunami cannot be mitigated, the consequences can be reduced through good	Disallow	Accept	No
TONG TO AND EQU	. 370.108	wide Matters / Coastal	Oppose	design, evacuation planning and communication of the risk, and the tsunami hazard overlay should	- Closing II	лесери	
		Environment / CE-R22					
		Environment / CE-K22		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.			
Yvonne Weeber	340.67	General District wide	Support	CE-R23 is generally supported, but it is unclear where the Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal	Retain CE-R23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area, excluding	Reject	No
		Matters / Coastal		Hazard Area and the High Coastal Hazard Area are in the coastal environment. These terms do not	the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities)		
		Environment / CE-R23		appear on the Wellington City Proposed District Plan maps. Submission may be amended in the	as notified.		
				future.			
Royal Forest and Bird	345.355	General District wide	Support in	Considers the provisions of this chapter should also acknowledge the natural character, natural	Amend CE-R23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area, excluding	Reject	No
Protection Society		Matters / Coastal	part	landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected. Ensure rules either cross reference	the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities)	-	
		Environment / CE-R23		appropriate provisions from other chapters, or include provisions to address adverse effects on	to acknowledge natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values are protected via		
		Environment / CE NES		these matters	reference to appropriate provisions from other chapters or by including provisions in the rule.		
				these matters	reference to appropriate provisions from other enapters of by including provisions in the rule.		
Wellington	FS36.132	Part 2 / General District	Onnoco	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the	Disallow	Accept	No
International Airport	1 330.132	wide Matters / Coastal	Oppose	extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter.	Disallow	Ассері	NO
Limited							
Limited		Environment / CE-R23		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.			
				2. The chapter, as notified, duplicates controls found within other chapters of the Proposed Plan.			
				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			
				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,			
WCC Environmental	377.278	General District wide	Support	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;	Retain CE-R23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area. excluding	Reject	No
	377.278	General District wide Matters / Coastal	Support	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, The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those	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)	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.278	Matters / Coastal	Support	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;	the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities)	Reject	No
Reference Group		Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23		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, 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; CE-R23 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.	-	
Reference Group Argosy Property No. 1		Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide	Support Support	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; CE-R23 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial. Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being restricted discretionary in the medium coastal.	the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities)	-	No No
Reference Group		Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal		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, 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; CE-R23 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.	-	
Reference Group Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.91	Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23	Support	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; CE-R23 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial. Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being restricted discretionary in the medium coastal hazard area.	the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified. Retain CE-R23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area) as notified.	Reject	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited Oyster Management		Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide		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; CE-R23 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial. Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being restricted discretionary in the medium coastal hazard area. Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being an RD activity in the medium coastal hazard.	the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified. Retain CE-R23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area) as notified. Retain CE-R23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area, excluding	-	
Reference Group Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.91	Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal	Support	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; CE-R23 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial. Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being restricted discretionary in the medium coastal hazard area.	the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified. Retain CE-R23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area) as notified. 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)	Reject	No
Reference Group Argosy Property No. 1 Limited Oyster Management Limited	383.91 404.109	Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23	Support Support	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; CE-R23 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial. Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being restricted discretionary in the medium coastal hazard area. Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being an RD activity in the medium coastal hazard area.	the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified. Retain CE-R23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area) as notified. 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 No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited Oyster Management	383.91	Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal	Support	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; CE-R23 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial. Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being restricted discretionary in the medium coastal hazard area. Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being an RD activity in the medium coastal hazard.	the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified. Retain CE-R23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area) as notified. 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)	Reject	No
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited Oyster Management Limited Wellington	383.91 404.109	Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23	Support Support	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; CE-R23 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial. Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being restricted discretionary in the medium coastal hazard area. Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being an RD activity in the medium coastal hazard area.	the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified. Retain CE-R23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area) as notified. 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. Opposes CE-23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area, excluding	Reject	No No
Reference Group Argosy Property No. 1 Limited Oyster Management Limited	383.91 404.109	Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide	Support Support	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; CE-R23 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial. Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being restricted discretionary in the medium coastal hazard area. Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being an RD activity in the medium coastal hazard area Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas	the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified. Retain CE-R23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area) as notified. 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 No
Reference Group Argosy Property No. 1 Limited Oyster Management Limited Wellington International Airport	383.91 404.109	Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal	Support Support	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; CE-R23 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial. Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being restricted discretionary in the medium coastal hazard area. Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being an RD activity in the medium coastal hazard area. Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only.	the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified. Retain CE-R23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area) as notified. 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. 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) the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities)	Reject	No No
Reference Group Argosy Property No. 1 Limited Oyster Management Limited Wellington International Airport Ltd	383.91 404.109 406.351	Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23	Support Support Oppose	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; CE-R23 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial. Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being restricted discretionary in the medium coastal hazard area. Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being an RD activity in the medium coastal hazard area 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]	the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified. Retain CE-R23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area) as notified. 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. 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 Reject Reject	No No
Reference Group Argosy Property No. 1 Limited Oyster Management Limited Wellington International Airport Ltd Wellington	383.91 404.109	Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide General District wide	Support Support	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; CE-R23 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial. Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being restricted discretionary in the medium coastal hazard area. Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being an RD activity in the medium coastal hazard area Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only. Isee paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason] Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas	the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified. Retain CE-R23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area) as notified. 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. 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. Amend CE-23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area, excluding	Reject	No No
Reference Group Argosy Property No. 1 Limited Oyster Management Limited Wellington International Airport Ltd Wellington International Airport	383.91 404.109 406.351	Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal	Support Support Oppose	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; CE-R23 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial. Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being restricted discretionary in the medium coastal hazard area. Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being an RD activity in the medium coastal hazard area 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]	the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified. Retain CE-R23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area) as notified. 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. 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. 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)	Reject Reject Reject	No No
Reference Group Argosy Property No. 1 Limited Oyster Management Limited Wellington International Airport Ltd Wellington	383.91 404.109 406.351	Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide General District wide	Support Support Oppose	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; CE-R23 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial. Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being restricted discretionary in the medium coastal hazard area. Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being an RD activity in the medium coastal hazard area Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only. Isee paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason] Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only.	the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified. Retain CE-R23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area) as notified. 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. 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. Amend CE-23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area, excluding	Reject Reject Reject	No No
Reference Group Argosy Property No. 1 Limited Oyster Management Limited Wellington International Airport Ltd Wellington International Airport	383.91 404.109 406.351	Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal	Support Support Oppose	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; CE-R23 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial. Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being restricted discretionary in the medium coastal hazard area. Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being an RD activity in the medium coastal hazard area Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only. Isee paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason] Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas	the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified. Retain CE-R23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area) as notified. 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. 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. 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:	Reject Reject Reject	No No
Reference Group Argosy Property No. 1 Limited Oyster Management Limited Wellington International Airport Ltd Wellington International Airport	383.91 404.109 406.351	Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal	Support Support Oppose	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; CE-R23 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial. Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being restricted discretionary in the medium coastal hazard area. Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being an RD activity in the medium coastal hazard area Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only. Isee paragraphs 4.85 to 4.92 of original submission for full reason] Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only.	the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified. Retain CE-R23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area) as notified. 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. 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. 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	Reject Reject Reject	No No
Reference Group Argosy Property No. 1 Limited Oyster Management Limited Wellington International Airport Ltd Wellington International Airport	383.91 404.109 406.351	Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R23 General District wide Matters / Coastal	Support Support Oppose	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; CE-R23 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial. Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being restricted discretionary in the medium coastal hazard area. Supports potentially hazard sensitive activities being an RD activity in the medium coastal hazard area 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] Considers that this rule should be deleted or reworked to apply to coastal hazard inundation areas only.	the City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified. Retain CE-R23 (Potentially hazard sensitive activities in the medium coastal hazard area) as notified. 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. 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. 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:	Reject Reject Reject	No No

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 33 of 38

	I				In a		1
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.		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 Tü 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.		Accept	No
VicLabour	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 probited 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
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

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 34 of 38

Wellington	406.355	General District wide Matters / Coastal	Amend	Opposes this rule insofar as it relates to the existing seawall located between Lyall Bay and Moa	Amend CE-R24 (All hard engineering measures in the high coastal hazard area) as follows:	Reject	No
International Airport Ltd		Environment / CE-R24		Point.	CE-R24 New All hard engineering measures in the high coastal hazard area except measures		
				Considers that the rule should only be applicable to new hard engineering structures. The ongoing	associated with regionally significant infrastructure		
				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	1. Activity Status: Discretionary		
				Natural Open Space Zone.	(Option A).		
				[See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	[Note that it should not be ISPP as it does not relate to housing]		
KiwiRail Holdings	FS72.64	Part 2 / General District	Support	Supports the amendment to allow for operation, maintenance and repair to existing hard	Allow	Reject	No
Limited		wide Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R24		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.			
Wellington	406.356		Oppose	Opposes this rule insofar as it relates to the existing seawall located between Lyall Bay and Moa	Delete CE-R24 (All hard engineering measures in the high coastal hazard area) in its entirety. (Option	Reject	No
International Airport Ltd		Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R24		Point.	B).		
Ltu		Environment / CE-R24		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.			
				Hattara Open Space Zone.			
				[See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]			
Guardians of the Bays	FS44.75	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal	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	Disallow	Accept	No
		Environment / CE-R24		environment. It is a complex environment which requires the NZCPS and Greater Wellington			
10 TO 11 LE	400 400	0 10:4:4		Regional Policy Statement for land below MHWS.	2	a · ·	
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.103	General District wide Matters / Coastal	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
		Environment / CE-R24					
Yvonne Weeber	340.69	General District wide Matters / Coastal	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	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)	Reject	No
		Environment / CE-R25		appear on the Wellington City Proposed District Plan maps. Submission may be amended in the	as notified.		
				future.			
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.357	General District wide Matters / Coastal	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	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)	Reject	No
Troccocion society		Environment / CE-R25	purt	appropriate provisions from other chapters, or include provisions to address adverse effects on	to acknowledge natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values are protected via		
				these matters	reference to appropriate provisions from other chapters or by including provisions in the rule.		
Wellington	FS36.134	Part 2 / General District	Oppose	WIAL opposes all of the identified submissions made on the Coastal Environment chapter to the	Disallow	Accept	No
International Airport		wide Matters / Coastal		extent that they are inconsistent with the concerns raised by WIAL with respect to this chapter.			
Limited		Environment / CE-R25		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,			
				The chapter does not adequately give effect to all relevant parts of the NZCPS, including those			
woo s	277.25	a lavini		that recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of infrastructure;		a : .	
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.280	General District wide Matters / Coastal	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)	Reject	No
		Environment / CE-R25			as notified.		
VicLabour	414.25	General District wide	Amend	Considers that the provision may insufficient given recent evidence that sea level rise and weather	[Inferred decision requested] Seeks that a probited activity status is applied to Rule CE-R25	Reject	No
		Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R25		impacts related to climate change may become worse, quicker than thought not long ago.	(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)		
				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.			
				isea level rise.			

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 35 of 38

Yvonne Weeber	340.70	General District wide	Support	CE-R26 is generally supported, but it is unclear where the Low Coastal Hazard Area, Medium Coastal	Retain CE-R26 (Hazard sensitive activities within the medium coastal hazard area, excluding the City	Painet	No
TVOITIE WEEDER	340.70	Matters / Coastal Environment / CE-R26	Support	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.	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
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) ain 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.		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 probited 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

1							
Royal Forest and Bird	345.359	General District wide	Support in	Considers the provisions of this chapter should also acknowledge the natural character, natural	Amend CE-R27 (Hazard sensitive activities within the high coastal hazard area, excluding the City	Reject	No
Protection Society		Matters / Coastal	part	landscape and biodiversity values that must be protected. Ensure rules either cross reference	Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) to		
		Environment / CE-R27		appropriate provisions from other chapters, or include provisions to address adverse effects on	acknowledge natural character, natural landscape, and biodiversity values are protected via		
				these matters	reference to appropriate provisions from other chapters or by including provisions in the rule.		
WCC Environmental	377.282	General District wide	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	Reject	No
Reference Group	377.202	Matters / Coastal	Зирроге	tee N27 is supported as it is considered logical and beneficial.	Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as	neject	140
neierence Group		Environment / CE-R27			notified.		
Kāinga Ora Homes and	391.267	General District wide	Support in	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	Reject	No
Communities	551.207	Matters / Coastal	part	be the spartially supported and an amenantic is sought.	Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) with	neject	
Communicies		Environment / CE-R27	puit		amendment.		
Kāinga Ora Homes and	391.268	General District wide	Amend	Considers that CE-R27 should be amended to change the activity status of Hazard Sensitive Activities	Amend CE-R27 (Hazard sensitive activities within the high coastal hazard area, excluding the City	Reject	No
Communities		Matters / Coastal		within the High Coastal Hazard Area from Non-Complying to Discretionary to enable the potential fo			
		Environment / CE-R27		these activities to be provided where the risks can be managed through mitigation measures.	follows:		
					1. Activity Status: Non Complying Discretionary		
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.65	Part 2 / General District	Oppose	Hazard sensitive activities, which include emergency facilities, hospitals, major hazardous facilities	Disallow	Accept	No
		wide Matters / Coastal		and childcare, within high coastal hazard overlay should remain non-compliant. Coastal hazard risk is			
		Environment / CE-R27		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	3		
				coastal hazard risk.			
Greater Wellington	FS84.83	Part 2 / General District	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose the suggested change in activity status as this would not have regard to	Disallow / Seeks that SUB-R21 and SUB-R25 are retained as notified.	Addressed in Subdivision	n s42A report
Regional Council		wide Matters / Coastal		Proposed RPS Change 1.			
		Environment / CE-R27					
							1
Greater Wellington	FS84.85	Part 2 / General District	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose the suggested change in activity status as this would not have regard to	Disallow / Seeks that CE-R27 is retained as notified.	Accept	No
Regional Council		wide Matters / Coastal		Proposed RPS Change 1.			
		Environment / CE-R27					
Ministry of Education	400.74	General District wide	Comment	Supports CE-R27 as the submitter considers that the non-complying activity status for hazard	Retain CE-R27 (Hazard sensitive activities within the high coastal hazard area, excluding the City	Reject	No
Ministry of Education	400.74	Matters / Coastal	Support	sensitive activities within the high coastal hazard area is appropriate.	Centre Zone or Airport) as notified.	Reject	NO
		Environment / CE-R27		isensitive activities within the riigh coastal hazard area is appropriate.	Centre Zone of Airport/ as notined.		
VicLabour	414.27	General District wide	Amend	Considers that the provisions relating to restrictions on new development in areas at risk of coastal	Seeks that a prohibited activity status is applied to Rule CE-R27 (Hazard sensitive activities within	Reject	No
VICEBOOLI	414.27	Matters / Coastal	Amena	inundation and tsunami due to sea level rise may be insufficient given recent evidence that sea level		neject	140
		Environment / CE-R27		rise and weather impacts related to climate change may become worse, quicker than thought not	passenger port facilities and rail activities). [Inferred decision requested]		
		Environment / CE RZ7		long ago.	passenger por racinges and rail activities). [interred decision requested]		
				Considers that Council needs to consider a complete prohibition on all development of potentially of	,		
				actually hazard sensitive activities within areas at-risk of coastal inundation or tsunami as a result of			
				sea level rise.			
Wellington	FS36.15	Part 1/ Interpretation	Oppose	WIAL opposes this submission to the extent that it conflicts with WIAL's primary submission which	Disallow	Accept	No
International Airport		Subpart / Definitions /		seeks to remove the application of the tsunami coastal hazard overlays.			
Limited		COASTAL HAZARD					
		OVERLAY					
CentrePort Limited	402.6	Interpretation Subpart /	Support	Support the intent of this definition.	Retain the definition of 'Coastal Hazard Overlays' as notified.		
		Definitions / COASTAL				Accept	No
		HAZARD OVERLAYS					
Wellington	FS36.16	Part 1/ Interpretation	Onnoco	WIAL opposes this submission to the extent that it conflicts with WIAL's primary submission which	Disallow		
International Airport	1 330.10	Subpart / Definitions /	Oppose	seeks to remove the application of the tsunami coastal hazard overlays.	Disallow		1
Limited		COASTAL HAZARD		seeks to remove the application of the isunami coastarnazara overlays.		Reject	No
Limited		OVERLAY					
Wellington	406.2	Whole PDP / Whole	Amend	Not opposed to the coastal inundation mapping in principle, however considers further nuancing of	Opposes the coastal hazard provisions that apply to coastal tsunami hazard overlays.		
International Airport		PDP / Whole PDP		the provisions that relate to coastal hazards and more specifically, tsunami hazard, is required.			İ
Ltd		,				Reject	No
				[See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.89 of original submission for full reason]			İ
Board of Airline	FS139.2	Whole PDP / Whole	Support	Support WIAL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow		<u> </u>
Representatives of		PDP / Whole PDP					İ
New Zealand Inc *Late						Reject	No
further submission							
accepted as per Minute							
3							
Yvonne Weeber	340.1	Mapping / Mapping	Amend	Considers that the District Plan maps need to be clearly mapped using the language and	Seeks that the mapping of Coastal Hazards be more clearly categorized and mapped.		
		General / Mapping		classifications from CE-P14. It is understood that there are no "medium coastal hazard area and high			L
		General		coastal hazard areas" mapped, and that there is an arbitrary mix of hazard and risk overlays instead,		Accept in part	Yes
	1	1		which are difficult to discern from each other (Coastal inundation, Liquefaction, Tsunami Hazard			1
I				Overlay, etc).			

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. [Inferrerd decision requested].	Reject	No
Dawid Wojasz	295.2	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Oppose	Considers that the coastal hazard overlays put much of the CBD in an 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 / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Amend	Considers that the coastal hazard overlays put much of the CBD in an 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 / AllOverlays / 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 / AllOverlays / 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 Rangi/the island in Island Bay.	Reject	No
VicLabour	414.11	Mapping / AllOverlays / Coastal Inundation Overlay	Support in part	Supports restrictions on development in areas at risk of coastal innundation and tsunami with amendment as detailed below.	Retain coastal inundation and tsunami overlays.	Accept	No
Poneke Architects	292.2	Mapping / AllOverlays / 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 / AllOverlays / 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 / AllOverlays / Tsunami Hazard Overlay		Supports restrictions on development in areas at risk of coastal innundation and tsunami.	Retain coastal inundation and tsunami overlays.	Accept	No

Date of report: 03/07/2023 Page 38 of 38