



Te Tai o Poutini PLAN

A combined district plan for the West Coast

Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee Meeting

10 October 2024

9.00am

Grey District Council

105 Tainui St, Greymouth

and Via Facebook

AGENDA

9.00am	Welcome and Apologies	Chair
9.05am	Confirm previous minutes of 2 August 2024 Confirm previous minutes 7 August 2024 Confirm previous minutes 29 August 2024	Chair
9.10am	Matters arising from previous meeting	Chair
9.20am	Report – TTPP Financials Life to Date	Project Manager WCRC Accountant
9.40am	July and August 2024 Financial report	Project Manager
9.50am	Report – Coastal Hazard Mapping Variation 2 Summary of Submissions	Senior Planner
10.10am	Project Manager's Report	Project Manager
10.15am	Meeting ends	

Meeting dates for 2024:

- 12 November 2024 1.00pm via Zoom



Te Tai o Poutini PLAN

A combined district plan for the West Coast

MINUTES OF EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF TE TAI O POUTINI PLAN COMMITTEE HELD VIA ZOOM 3.15pm FRIDAY 2 AUGUST 2024

Present

Rex Williams (Chairperson), Mayor Jamie Cleine (Buller DC), Councillor Graeme Neylon (Buller DC), Mayor Tania Gibson (Grey DC), Councillor Allan Gibson (Grey DC), Mayor Helen Lash (Westland DC), Councillor Ashley Cassin (Westland District Council), Chairperson Peter Haddock (West Coast RC), Councillor Frank Dooley (West Coast RC), Kaiwhakahaere Francois Tumahai (Te Runanga o Ngati Waewae), Kaiwhakahaere Paul Madgwick (Te Runanga o Makaawhio)

In Attendance

Simon Pickford (Chief Executive, Buller DC), Paul Pretorius (Acting Chief Executive, Grey DC), Scott Baxendale (Acting Chief Executive, Westland DC), Darryl Lew (Chief Executive, West Coast RC), Jocelyne Allen (Group Manager, Regulatory and Policy, West Coast RC), Jo Armstrong (TTPP Project Manager, West Coast RC), Michael McEnaney (Regulatory Manager, Grey DC), Alice Balme (Partner and Solicitor, Wynn Williams, Queenstown), Laura Mills (Chief Reporter, Greymouth Star), Doug Bray (Senior Policy Planner, TTPP, West Coast RC)

Welcome and Purpose

The meeting opened at 3.15 with the Chairperson welcoming participants and outlining the purpose of the extraordinary meeting called in accordance with Section 8.3 of Standing Orders, to discuss a Notice of Motion from Mayor Gibson. This was the sole Agenda item. Mayor Gibson and Councillor Gibson expressed a desire to speak to the Notice of Motion.

Apologies - None received

Conflicts of Interest - None raised

Initial Notice of Motion and Report on it

Mrs Armstrong spoke to her report, which had been circulated as part of the agenda. The Notice of Motion from Mayor Gibson was read as follows:

I the undersigned ask that the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Hearing scheduled for the end of August 2024 be delayed for a minimum of six months or until the Crown Review of the Resource Management (Freshwater and Other Matters) Amendment Bill, which includes proposed changes to the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity has been finalized.

The reasoning given was as follows:

- *By all accounts it appears that the Government Review will impact key principles in relation to indigenous biodiversity which, if the Hearing should continue will most likely require a formal Plan Change to bring the TTPP in line with the intended changes. It is noted that the Section 42A Officer's Report does include proposed changes, however, it is considered problematic that changes that have not been passed as law are being incorporated. Should the provisions not become law or be changed then the TTPP will need to be rewritten and a Plan Change process gone through. This is not considered appropriate given the already considerable costs incurred by the TTPP process. RMA Section 34A and Clause 10 of the TTPP Order in Council enable you to delegate your power to hear submissions on the pTTPP.*
- *The joint TTPP Committee is not scheduled to meet before the Hearing date, which will mean that the Hearing will be purely on Officer's reports without benefit of Committee oversight. It is respectfully suggested that this is not in line with either the letter or the spirit of the Order in Council that created the TTPP process. It is further suggested that it will be untenable if the situation should arise where the Joint Committee may refuse to confirm the Officer comment after the Hearing. This is most likely to happen given that the Officer's Report deviates substantially from the Joint Committee's stance re: SNAs, especially as it relates to Grey District.*
- *The delay will give all concerned more time to formulate a robust input into this process, knowing the outcome of the Resource Management (Freshwater and other Matters) Amendment Bill.*

Discussion

Mrs Armstrong pointed out there is a TTPP Committee Meeting scheduled for 7 August 2024 in Hokitika which is prior to the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Hearings planned for 26-27 August 2024 in Westport and 29-30 August 2024 in Hokitika.

Ms Balme noted that Section 42A Reports are prepared at the request of the Hearings Panel (i.e. the Independent Commissioners). They are thus "evidence" in the Hearing process, prepared in accordance with the Environments Court's Code of Practice for Expert Witness – requiring that such Report writers provide *independent, unbiased* expert opinions. It would not be appropriate for the Committee to have oversight of or input into what are evidence documents.

Ms Balme also pointed out that the Bill as it stands only *delays* the timeframe for identifying Significant Natural Areas (SNA)s – for three years. Options could include separating out the SNA-related provisions of the Plan and continuing with other aspects of the Ecosystems and Biodiversity Chapter (although doing so would leave the Plan inconsistent with both the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPSIB – unless and until changed) and the West Coast Regional Policy Statement (RPS)).

Mrs Armstrong commented that the Committee has delegated its powers with respect to convening and scheduling the hearings to the Independent Commissioners. So it is their decision as to whether or not such a delay can be accommodated (they having agreed so in the past). Discussions with the Panel Chairperson indicates the Hearing programme as it stands is integrally linked to a schedule of work that enables progress to continue efficiently and in a timely manner. Compromising that schedule could have a significant "flow on" effect. In particular, panel members have significant other commitments to do with the Plan and elsewhere. Mrs Armstrong also commented that Local Government elections are scheduled for 2025, and the Committee had intended to make decisions prior to elections. Costs for staff on fixed term contracts would also increase with a delay. Continuity of commissioners, decision makers and staff could thus be threatened if the delay is excessive. The Committee also has a duty under Section 21 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) to avoid

“unreasonable delay”. The fact is that a degree of uncertainty remains over precisely what is happening with respect to SNAs, while deferral of the Plan’s progress is definitely going to increase costs. Realistically there are two options – i.e. delay or proceed (the report setting out the pros and cons).

Mrs Armstrong confirmed (following clarification sought from the Chairperson) that one amendment to her report as presented should be made – i.e. last sentence of paragraph 3 (beginning “RMA Section 34 ...”) should be removed from that paragraph and added to paragraph 7a (after “staff note”).

Councillor Dooley queried whether such a delay could set any “undesirable precedent” (given a somewhat similar degree of uncertainty exists around natural hazards). Ms Balme confirmed potentially yes – there is arguably always a degree of uncertainty around Central Government intentions.

Mr Pretorious confirmed that he and the Grey Councillors had in fact revised the initial Notice of Motion somewhat – to a *fixed term* delay.

Mayor Gibson spoke to the Notice of Motion. She predicts the exercise of undertaking SNAs would be costly (around \$1 million/District) and needs to be undertaken amidst considerable hostility, given the perceived popular notion that SNAs have been done away with by the Government. The last thing certainly Grey District wants is to have to go through such a process and then reverse it; it incumbent on both Central and Local Government to work together to avoid this.

Mayor Gibson confirmed that she has already commenced discussion with Minister Hoggard (regarding central government intentions. Minister Hoggard (and possibly other Ministers) has agreed to meet, and with the intention of better clarifying the Government’s position and its timing. The 26-27 (Westport) and 29-30 (Hokitika) August 2024 Hearings for the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Topic should, therefore, be delayed – at least until October 2024. Mayor Gibson drew parallels with Minute 14 of 11 January 2024, the Chairperson of the Independent Commissioners having agreed to delay the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Hearings from March 2024 to later in the year, to enable the Government’s position on SNAs to be made clearer.

Mayor Gibson emphasized there appears an element of confusion in terms of who is responsible for what, in terms of leading the Plan formulation process. While it is true that responsibility for conducting the Hearings and making decisions has in fact been delegated to the Independent Commissioners, the TTPP Committee itself is comprised of Mayors and other Council members from the four local authorities who are responsible to their ratepayers. The Committee should not be seen as simply a “rubber stamping” body which leaves matters such as this entirely to the Commissioners.

Revised Notice of Motion - Discussion

The Chairperson asked the Grey District Council attendees to display the Notice of Motion as revised.

This read as follows:

That the Committee asks the Project Manager to remind the Hearings Panel that it had by Minute 14 – 11 January 2024 postponed the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Hearing to October 2024, and that it be asked to reschedule the scheduled Hearing for the end of August 2024 to the end of October 2024 in line with that decision.

That the Committee seeks urgent meetings with the Crown to determine its intentions in relation to the signalled review on SNAs and how it impacts on the TTPP, and to inform the Crown of the grave implications for the Coast, both financial and social, if we continue to have to legislate for SNAs.

At the request of Councillor Dooley, the Grey District Team similarly posted Minute 14, highlighting paragraph 4:

The Hearing Panel agreed that there is sense in delaying the Hearing of the Ecosystems and biodiversity component of Topic 10 until later in the year, which is likely to be October, to see whether there is any clarity around the matter.

Mayor Cleine pointed out that the Notice of Motion as revised is essentially in two parts – i.e. firstly, is there a willingness to delay, and secondly *if so*, what should be next step? Mayor Gibson pointed out that a letter from Minister Hoggard encouraging the intended consultation had been received that day and was immediately circulated to Committee members, while Mr Pretorious emphasized that the Notice of Motion as revised takes into account the legal advice from Wynn Williams as discussed earlier.

The Chairperson confirmed his understanding of the Notice of Motion as revised. In particular, it was emphasised that any decision to delay would remain with the Chairperson of the Hearings Panel. The Chairperson also agreed that the revised Notice of Motion be voted on in its two separate paragraphs.

Chairperson Haddock expressed concern that the change to SNA provisions may not work out as intended, and the resultant delay could simply hold up finalizing the Plan generally – to the extent that increased costs and other difficulties result from changes in Committee personnel as a result of the 2025 Local Government Elections, and the inability of Commissioners and contracted staff to remain with the process. Such costs would be felt by ratepayers. To that extent, the Notice of Motion as revised was supported – i.e. an effective two months, c.f. the previous somewhat undefined period.

Some discussion took place around the relative costs of delaying or proceeding. Overall comments relative to the Revised Notice of Motion paragraph 1 were supportive.

Councillor Dooley confirmed that he and Mr Lew will be meeting next week with Simon Court (MP, Member of Environment Select Committee and Parliamentary undersecretary for RMA Reform), so that could present an opportunity for such discussion. Mayor Gibson confirmed it would be preferable to have a separate meeting with Associate Minister Hoggard as planned, so a good number of Committee members could attend.

The Chairperson questioned the extent to which *the Committee* (i.e. in its entirety) would need to attend. Mayor Gibson confirmed she is open to however many as available attending.

Mr Madgwick confirmed his support for the motion, pointing out it would be very unwise to proceed with such strong signals re: SNAs being sent from the Government. He pointed out the importance of the Committee “getting things right”. This was supported by Mayor Lash and Mr Tumahai. The inherent feeling is that the Te Tai o Poutini Plan (TTPP) is “our Plan” (i.e. a District Plan for the three District Councils – Buller, Grey and Westland – which the TTPP Committee needs to retain control of.

Mayor Gibson queried why a matter such as this has to go before the Hearings Panel – and particularly when the TTPP Committee *itself* recently agreed to extend the closing date on

submissions for Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping from 16 to 30 August 2024. The Chairperson felt that particular matter did not require any further attention at this stage.

Revised Notice of Motion – As Agreed

That the Committee asks the Project Manager to remind the Hearings Panel that it had by Minute 14 – 11 January 2024 postponed the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Hearing to October 2024, and that it be asked to reschedule the scheduled Hearing for the end of August 2024 to the end of October 2024 in line with that decision.

Moved Mayor Gibson/Seconded Councillor Gibson
CARRIED (9 for/2 against – Councillor Dooley and Mayor Cleine)

That the Committee seeks urgent meetings with the Crown to determine its intentions in relation to the signalled review on SNAs and how it impacts on the TTPP, and to inform the Crown of the grave implications for the Coast, both financial and social, if we continue to have to legislate for SNAs.

Moved Mayor Gibson/Seconded Councillor Gibson
AGREED

The Meeting ended at 4.15pm.



Te Tai o Poutini PLAN

A combined district plan for the West Coast

MINUTES OF MEETING OF TE TAI O POUTINI PLAN COMMITTEE HELD AT WESTLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL AT 10.00AM ON 7 AUGUST 2024

Present

Rex Williams (Chairman), Mayor T. Gibson (GDC), Cr A. Cassin (WDC), P. Madgwick (Makaawhio), F. Tumahai (Ngāti Waewae), Cr A. Gibson (GDC), Mayor H. Lash (WDC);
Online: Mayor J. Cleine (BDC), Cr G. Neylon (BDC), Cr B. Cummings (WDC), Cr P. Haddock (WCRC),

In attendance

Scott Baxendale (WDC), J. Allen (WCRC), P. Pretorius (GDC), Chu Zhao (WCRC)
Online: J. Armstrong (TTPP Project Manager), Michael McEnaney (GDC), D. Lew (WCRC), Simon Pickford (BDC), Mia Turner (Public)

Welcome

Confirm minutes of the previous meeting held 19 June 2024

Moved (Cr A. Cassin/ Mayor J. Cleine)

That the minutes of the meeting held 19 June 2024 be confirmed

Carried

Confirm minutes of emergency meeting held online on 26 July 2024

Moved (F. Tumahai / Cr A. Cassin)

That the minutes of the meeting held online on 26 July 2024 be confirmed

Carried

Matter arising from previous meeting

Mayor T. Gibson asked a question about mapping: the mapping for the Grey District in previous minute stated that it was still offline, and people were wanting to view it and download at the moment and being a backup.

J. Armstrong noted that she has put a link under Technical Reports on the TTPP website.

Cr A. Gibson asked if there is any way we could make it easier for people to understand the mapping.

J. Armstrong responded that there is a lot of information on those maps, but the TTPP info line is available and staff are happy to step people through the process while they are online.

R. Williams added that Doug Bray responds a lot to the public's questions. R. Williams said that getting in touch with Doug would be his suggestion if in doubt.

P. Madgwick suggested the staff could use plain English for writing letters.

R. Williams said he has read the letter very carefully to make sure that he is comfortable. He said he would do better in the future by using plain English.

P. Madgwick said sometimes the mapping on the website is not working.

J. Armstrong replied that they occasionally hear the same issue, but they don't have any trouble when they go to open it. She was not sure if it's a matter of overload or connections, but would follow up.

R. Williams added that he has found that using an IPAD is quite difficult and it's somewhat better if he tries his laptop.

Updated Te Tai o Poutini Plan Standing Orders

J. Armstrong noted that during the Committee Meeting in June 2024, committee members agreed to table amendments being made to Te Tai o Poutini Plan Standing Orders, and approved a recommendation that the amended Standing Orders would be presented at this meeting, to take effect from 1 October 2024. J. Armstrong has appended the final version of the standing orders and accepted the track changes from the version that committee members saw at the last meeting, and updated sections that committee members approved relating to attendance by electronic link.

Moved (Cr A. Gibson/ Cr P. Haddock)

That the Te Tai o Poutini Plan Standing Orders (attached) be adopted, to take effect from 1 October 2024.

Carried

Delegation to hear Variations 1 and 2

J. Armstrong noted that TTPP Committee approved the notification of Variation 1 - Activities on the Surface of Water, and Variation 2 – Coastal Natural Hazard Mapping at its 29 April 2022 meeting. Both variations were notified on 27 June 2024, and hearings for them have been scheduled for 26 November 2024 and the week of 17 March 2025. J. Armstrong noted the timing for this provides an opportunity for commissioners who have a really good understanding of the TTPP to continue with those variations and providing recommendations all at once. J. Armstrong pointed out one of the benefits of delegating to the current commissioners is that there is no need to amend the current contracts because they are engaged until all of the recommendation reporting is made.

Cr G. Neylon asked if people are submitting to the variation of the maps, are they entitled to submit to the rules that may come out of the variation.

J. Armstrong answered no, as the rules are not changing and rules were put out with the Proposed TTPP a couple of years ago, so they've already been out for submissions.

Cr G. Neylon asked if people who suddenly find that they're within the hazard zone don't have any opportunity to submit on the rules.

J. Armstrong answered they could try a late submission, and it's acceptable.

Moved (F. Tumahai/ Mayor H. Lash)

1. *That the Committee receives this report*
2. *Acting under section 34A of the Resource Management Act 1991, and clause 10 of the Local Government Reorganisation Scheme (West Coast Region) Order 2019 Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee delegates to Dean Chrystal, Anton Becker, Paul Rogers, Sharon McGarry and Maria Bartlett, all functions powers and duties necessary to hear submissions and evidence on Variations 1 and 2 to the proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan, including the exercise of any powers conferred by RMA sections 41 (a) and 42 (a).*

Carried

Extension Request for Te Tai o Poutini Plan Decision

Cr A. Cassin asked the reason for applying for an extension after the end of the two-year period, instead of prior to the end of the two-year period.

R. Williams answered that this was overlooked in the change of staff.

Mayor H. Lash asked should they be looking to have more time than 12 months.

J. Armstrong said it was possible, and it might be prudent to at least ask for 18 months.

Moved (Mayor H. Lash/ Cr A. Cassin)

1. *That the Committee receives this report 2.*
2. *That the Committee direct and approve staff to prepare an application to the Minister for the Environment for an 18-month extension, to 14 January 2026, for giving a decision on the TTPP.*

Carried

June 2024 Financial Report

J. Armstrong noted that this is the end of the financial year statement, and the expenditures are tracking below expected, with a favourable variance of \$393,105. J. Armstrong noted that the deficit in the budget line for Pokeka Poutini Ngāi Tahu Limited is offset against lower costs for other budget items. The Pokeka Poutini Ngai Tahu contract is to secure the ongoing detailed and valuable input from them for the remaining hearing topics s42A reports. They will also prepare and provide more information on the SASM in Schedule 3 that were not submitted on and combine all SASM information into one report. J. Armstrong noted that the variance for the Consultant Planners and Contractors items is still \$75,000. J. Armstrong noted that the borrowing requirement to the end of the period for the whole process so far is \$1,783,330.

Moved (Cr A. Cassin/ Cr G. Neylon)

1. *That the Committee receive the report*

Carried

Project Manager Update

J. Armstrong noted that the link to coastal variation maps for the Greymouth Coastal Hazards is available in response to Mayor Gibson's query. J. Armstrong pointed out that commissioners are doing a lot of site visits at the moment in all three of the districts. J. Armstrong noted that the Hearings Chair issued Minute 33 on 18 July 2024, which explained that coastal hazard rules will no longer be heard with the other natural rules in October. These rules will now be heard along with Variation 2 – Coastal Natural Hazard Mapping in the week of 17 March 2025. J. Armstrong corrected that five submissions were received for Variation 1, not four submissions. J. Armstrong pointed out that staff held a public information session on Variation 2 in Westport on 30 July 2024, in response to public calls for further information. It was attended by over 100 people. J. Armstrong suggested that monthly Committee meetings get reinstated from now on and would get some dates into Committee members' calendars.

Cr A. Cassin passed on the thanks of the people of South Westland for offering the second public information session from the staff.

P. Madgwick noted that it's important to make sure that the public has the opportunity to understand coastal hazard variation. P. Madgwick added that we should have the maps on display in libraries in the three main towns.

J. Armstrong noted that maps are in the libraries and the district councils alongside the variation information in submission forms.

Cr G. Neylon asked if we could have a drop-box at the council when would submissions need to be received there.

J. Armstrong noted that they have an agreement with the Buller District Council, that council staff will seal the box at 5pm, and it will be collected in the following week.

Cr B. Cummings asked is there any possibility that area maps could be put up in the information centres like Haast, Punakaiki and Karamea.

J. Allen said she is going to check that.

Moved (Mayor T. Gibson / Cr P. Haddock)

1. *That the Committee receives the report.*

Carried

Motion about Extraordinary Meeting on 2 August

J. Armstrong pointed out the background of the motion, and reasons why the Ecosystem and Biodiversity hearing was rescheduled to August. J. Armstrong noted that the hearing panel has carefully considered the TTPP committee's request to postpone the August hearing date to November. J. Armstrong noted that this will incur additional costs, require the rescheduling of outstanding matters in variation one hearing, and ultimately will delay the release of the hearing panel's decision next year. J. Armstrong noted that postponing the hearing will not enable the parties to provide further evidence. The Hearing Panel asks that the TTPP Committee urgently advise the Hearing Panel if it still requests the August hearing be postponed, in light of the consequences outlined above in Minute 36.

Mayor T. Gibson proposed that:

1. The Hearing Panel be advised that, whilst the implications of the delay as sought are duly noted, it is outweighed by the social and financial implications to the three District Councils of having to proceed with the process of identifying and protecting SNAs:
 - at a time that landowners are under a distinct impression that the District Councils are precluded from doing so.
 - at a time that the Government, per advice provided even over the past few days, remain committed to drastically modify the obligation of Councils in relation to SNAs.
2. On that basis, it be confirmed to the Hearing Panel that the Committee still requests the postponement of the August 2024 Hearing on the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter of TTPP to the week of 18th November 2024.

Moved (Mayor T. Gibson/ P. Madgwick)

Carried

Closing comments

R. Williams noted that we will have a brief meeting in September (the end of August), and we've got a full meeting on the 10th of October at Grey District Council at 9am.

Meeting ended at 11.35am.



Te Tai o Poutini PLAN

A combined district plan for the West Coast

MEETING OF TE TAI O POUTINI PLAN COMMITTEE HELD ONLINE AT 8.00AM ON 29 AUGUST 2024

Present

R. Williams (Chairman), Mayor T. Gibson (GDC), P. Madgwick (Makaawhio), Cr A. Gibson (GDC), Mayor J. Cleine (BDC), Cr G. Neylon (BDC), Cr P. Haddock (WCRC)

In attendance

Scott Baxendale (WDC), J. Armstrong (TTPP Project Manager), Doug Bray (WCRC), Chu Zhao (WCRC), Max Dickens (WCRC), D. Lew (WCRC), Simon Pickford (BDC), Adriana de Ruiter-James (Public), Tayla Nelson-Tuhuru (Ngāi Tahu)

Welcome

Apologies: Cr A. Cassin (WDC), F. Tumahai (Ngāti Waewae)

R. Williams suggested amending the agenda to not deal with the minutes of the previous meeting and they could pick them up at a future meeting. R. Williams noted that only one item would be discussed, which is the report on the Activities on the Surface of Water Variation 1.

Senior Policy Planner, Doug Bray, commented that the submissions have been received on the Activities on the Surface of Water, a variation about making sure port activities and matters are recognised as permitted activities. Mr Bray noted that 5 submissions were received. This variation was a limited notified process, meaning only those who were notified could submit. These parties are now being given the opportunity to make further submissions in opposition or support of the submissions received. The letter is to go out today for a two-week period closing on Friday 13 September. Mr Bray noted that the Committee paper incorrectly said 14 September.

Cr G. Neylon asked if the further submissions are open to the public and whether we post the submissions received on our website

Mr Bray answered that they are not totally open to the public, they are open to the people who made submissions because it was a limited notification variation. The variation 1 submissions will not be posted on the website.

R. Williams asked Doug Bray to clarify the 'irrelevant submission'.

Mr Bray explained that one irrelevant submission had been received. The sender did not indicate whether it was Variation 1 or the Variation 2 he was submitting on. However, this submission is not relevant to either of these narrowly prescribed variations, and Mr Bray does not believe the submission can be accepted. Mr Bray recommended the hearings panel assess the submission and write to the submitter suggesting he contact Grey District Council on the matter he raised.

Moved (Mayor J. Cleine / Mayor T. Gibson)

1. *That the information be received.*
2. *That in accordance with Clause 7(3) of Schedule 1 of the RMA, the Summary of Submissions be limited notified to all those to whom notification of the Variation was initially served, on 29 August 2024.*
3. *That the required two-week period for receipt of further submissions close on 14 September 2024.*
4. *That consistent with Section 41D of the RMA, the TTPP Committee recommend to the Chairperson of the Hearings Panel, responsible for convening the Hearing for Variation 1, that Mr. Alex Woods be advised that his submission bears no relevance to either subject of what have been two recently notified Variations to the TTPP – i.e. Variation 1: Activities on the Surface of Water or Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping. His submission cannot, therefore, be allowed in terms of being of relevance to either Variation. It is recommended that the Chairperson of the Hearings Panel be encouraged to so advise Mr. Woods ahead of the Hearing itself and recommend to Mr. Woods that he contact the Grey District Council if wishing to pursue the matter he has written about any further.*

Carried

Closing comments

J. Armstrong drew the Committee's attention to the letter about further submissions that will be sent out today.

Cr G. Neylon asked if the process for Variation 2 is similar to Variation 1.

Mr Bray answered yes, but Variation 2 was publicly notified, so anyone may submit on it.

Cr G. Neylon asked if submissions will still be accepted where some of these further submissions will be from people who are in the Westport area which was not actually covered by Variation 2.

Mr Bray answered that anyone is able to make a submission on Variation 2, and all will be accepted. It will be over to the commissioners to decide if the points are relevant.

R. Williams noted the next meeting is face to face at 9am on the 10th of October at Grey District Council and they will deal with previous minutes at the beginning.

Meeting ended at 8.14am.



Te Tai o Poutini

PLAN

A combined district plan for the West Coast

Prepared for: Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee
Prepared by: Jo Armstrong
Date: 10 October 2024
Subject: **Te Tai o Poutini Plan Financial Report – Life to Date**

This report provides background information on Te Tai o Poutini Plan (TTPP) funding and budget arrangements, identifies costs and borrowing to date and considers the future activities requiring ongoing funding.

BACKGROUND

1. On 14 July 2019 the *Local Government Reorganisation Scheme (West Coast) Order 2019* came into force. This set the requirement for there to be a combined district plan for the West Coast, established TTPP Committee and its membership, set up the Technical Advisory Team and determined that funding would be by means of a regional rate.
2. Arrangements made under the Order in Council for the Committee, TAT and funding were later confirmed by the TTPP Committee in their Deed of Agreement, signed by representatives of the six member organisations.
3. In November 2018, prior to the 2019 Order in Council, a West Coast Reorganisation Transition Board was established. The Transition Board had a similar membership to the current TTPP Committee, drawn from the six partner organisations.
4. The Board ran a competitive recruitment process before appointing Rex Williams as Chair. Mr Williams was confirmed as the inaugural Chair of the TTPP Committee following release of the 2019 Order in Council.
5. The role of the Transition Board was to advise on the reorganisation scheme, and set up the arrangements for the future TTPP Committee to commence its role following confirmation of the Order in Council.
6. A process for annual budget setting was then established whereby the TTPP Project Manager would determine the likely requirements and work with the TTPP Chair, West Coast Regional Council (WCRC) Chief Executive and Financial Officer to develop a budget for approval by TTPP Committee and acceptance by WCRC.
7. In the 2020 financial year the Local Government Commission provided \$200,000 of initial funding to kick start the project. It was anticipated that each of the four West Coast Councils would contribute \$25,000 towards costs in this first year. Westland District Council and WCRC made these contributions, providing a further \$50,000 of project funding. Grey and Buller district councils determined that the regional rate was the appropriate means of funding without their additional contribution.
8. In the 2021/22 year parties agreed that future funding of TTPP could include a loan component raised against the plan as a long term planning asset. This was in addition to the annual regional rate apportionment. The addition of loan funding has enabled TTPP development to continue at a steady pace through the costly research and hearings phases.

DISCUSSION

Income, Expenses and Borrowing to date

9. Each year when WCRC set their rates they decide what portion/amount will be used to directly fund TTPP. This amount is reflected in the Budgeted Income line at the top of the monthly financial statements.
10. The rates income is then attributed to the TTPP. The rates are not intended to fully cover the expenditure for the year.
11. When the annual expenses exceed the annual income, the remaining costs are debt funded by a bank loan. The loan is not drawn on in advance as an annual lump sum, only accumulating once the income is depleted.
12. Annual expenses have tracked really well against budgeted expenses throughout the years, and no unexpected additional borrowing has been required.
13. A table showing income, expenditure and borrowing across the life of the project to date is attached at Appendix 1.
14. This table shows some slight changes in expenditure to those reported at the end of some financial years, such as financial year ended 30 June 2024 where the end of June expenditure was reported as \$635,950 compared to the report at \$695,112 and amounted to a difference of \$59,163. This related to expenditure for June which was accrued after the report was submitted due to it being the end of council's financial year. The 2022 financial year shows a expenditure variance of \$3,226 less than the previously submitted report. This is due to some expenditure being reallocated.

Anticipated Future Activities and Expenses

15. At present WCRC is working through the 2023-2024 Annual Report which is set for adoption on the 31 October 2024. WCRC is also currently working through the first quarter of the 2024-2025 financial year. Once both of these work programmes are completed staff can then focus on developing an accurate forecast cost of the TTPP up until decisions are notified and the Plan becomes operative around September 2025.
16. An indication of anticipated activities to complete and maintain TTPP from July 2025 into the future, and the inputs required to achieve them, are tabled below.

Financial Year	Activities	Inputs
2025/26	TTPPC Decisions on TTPP including Variations 1 and 2 for notification	TTPPC and TAT Workshops - planning and presentation. TTPP document finalised for publishing. GIS and website updated. Plan design and print.
	Public Notification	Advertising, website announcements, public access to physical copies.
	Appeals Received	Accept and analyse appeals. Liaise with appellants and experts.
	Mediation	Plan mediation processes, engage mediator, experts and lawyers, expert/team conferencing. Travel accommodation and catering.
	Environment Court	Lawyers and expert liaison.
	Plan changes	Planning and other expert liaison. Appoint commissioners arrange hearings and decisions.

	Admin/enquiries	Ongoing to support all of the above and the community. Update the plan and notify changes as appeals are resolved. Support for TTPP Committee and its meetings.
2026/27	Environment Court	Lawyers and expert liaison.
	Plan changes	Planning and other expert liaison. Appoint commissioners arrange hearings and decisions.
	Admin/enquiries	Ongoing to support all of the above and the community. Update the plan and notify changes as appeals are resolved. Activities for TTPP Committee and their meetings.
2027/28 onwards	Plan changes	Planning and other expert liaison. Appoint commissioners arrange hearings and decisions.
	Admin/enquiries	Ongoing to support all of the above and the community. Update the plan and notify changes as appeals are resolved. Activities for TTPP Committee and their meetings.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Committee receives this report

Jo Armstrong

Project Manager

Appendix 1

Life of Project 1 July 2019-30 June 2024									
								TOTAL PROJECT TO DATE	
Prior Year -2024			2023	2022	2021	2020	2019		
Actual	Budget	Variance	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual		
Te Tai o Poutini Plan									
INCOME									
Targeted Rates	1,000,000	1,000,000	-	482,497	494,868	255,156	400,000	-	2,686,550
General Rates Contribution						150,000			150,000
Grants & Subsidies			-			30,000	200,000		230,000
Other Contributions							50,000		50,000
									-
TOTAL INCOME	1,000,000	1,000,000	-	482,497	494,868	435,156	650,000	-	3,116,550
EXPENDITURE									
Employee costs	205,577	283,957	78,380	183,472	279,060	268,762	199,591	67,022	1,236,603
Consultant Planners and Contractors	695,112	730,000	34,888	172,899	420,035	231,931	108,885	-	1,830,552
Chair and iwi representatives	60,000	65,000	5,000	60,000	60,000	54,500	55,000		299,500
Governance	-	1,610	1,610	747	1,949	-	-	-	2,695
Poutini Ngai Tahu	41,371	15,000	(26,371)	42,000	50,000	-	-	-	137,293
TTPP Website	5,354	8,000	2,646	27,560	5,781	-	5,000	-	62,298
Isovist e-plan Platform	7,463	20,001	12,539	11,273	9,425	3,713	-	-	31,872
Meals, Travel & Accom	78,466	85,251	6,785	9,568	17,680	17,164	19,585	5,372	177,787
Workshops & Events	13,384	15,000	1,616	3,298	3,246	840	14,000	-	37,991
Media Costs	6,494	40,000	33,506	71,088	25,536	5,878	4,950	-	122,597
Legal Advice	100,854	200,000	99,146	27,289	27,343	4,689	907	-	179,287
Hearings – commissioner fees	419,581	500,000	80,419	6,647	-	-	-	-	626,830
Interest Payments				40,090					40,090
Overhead costs	150,000	150,000	-	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	100,098	850,098
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	1,783,656	2,113,819	330,164	805,930	1,050,055	737,477	557,917	172,492	5,635,494
NET SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)	(783,656)	(1,113,819)		(323,434)	(555,187)	(302,320)	92,083	(172,492)	(2,518,944)

* Please note that the Total cost to date column also includes the current YTD figures (1 July -31 August 2024)



Te Tai o Poutini PLAN

A combined district plan for the West Coast

Prepared for: Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee

Prepared by: Jo Armstrong, Project Manager

Date: 10 October 2024

Subject: Financial Report to 31 August 2024

SUMMARY

This report includes the statement of financial performance to 31 August 2024.

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the Committee receive the report

REPORT

1. There has been a high level of expenditure in the first two months of this financial year. This relates to the hearings processes underway, and those in preparation.
2. Almost one third of the annual budget for consultants/contractors has been used for services related to officer presentations at hearings, writing Rights of Reply, expert conferencing, and preparing s42A reports and mapping for future hearings on Noise in September, Natural Hazards in October and Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity in November.
3. This expenditure is necessary and not unexpected. There is a possibility that there will be an overspend of the budget for the consultant/contractor item this financial year.
4. The second large expense in this period has been for Hearing Commissioners. Commissioners are not only preparing for and attending hearings, but also undertaking site visits and deliberations for their decision recommendation reports.
5. This work will be ongoing until the final reports are delivered around June 2025. It is anticipated that the Hearing Commissioner budget will produce a sizeable overspend by the end of the financial year.

Te Tai o Poutini Plan

Statement of Financial Performance to 31 August 2024

	Year to date			Full year		
	Actual	Budget	Variance	Forecast	Budget	Variance
INCOME						
Targeted Rates	54,029	54,029	-	324,176	324,176	-
General Rates Contribution						
Grants & Subsidies						
Other Contributions						
TOTAL INCOME	54,029	54,029	-	324,176	324,176	-
EXPENDITURE						
Employee costs	33,118	50,560	17,441	50,560	303,358	252,798
Consultant Planners and Contractors	219,057	112,400	(106,657)	112,400	674,400	562,000
Chair and iwi representatives	10,000	11,000	1,000	11,000	66,000	
Governance	-	233	233	233	1,400	1,167
Poutini Ngai Tahu	3,922	8,333	4,411	8,333	50,000	41,667
TTPP Website	1,235	2,000	765	2,000	12,000	10,000
Isovist e-plan Platform	-	1,333	1,333	1,333	8,000	6,667
Meals, Travel & Accom	29,953	11,525	(18,428)	11,525	69,150	57,625
Workshops & Events	3,223	1,400	(1,823)	1,400	8,400	7,000
Media Costs	8,651	3,000	(5,651)	3,000	18,000	15,000
Legal Advice	18,206	20,000	1,794	20,000	120,000	100,000
Hearings – commissioner fees	200,601	35,667	(164,935)	35,667	214,000	178,333
Interest Payments		23,194		23,194	139,165	
Overhead costs		11,033	-	11,033	66,198	-
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	527,968	291,679	(270,517)	291,679	1,750,071	1,232,257
NET SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)	(473,939)	(237,650)	(270,517)	32,497	(1,425,895)	1,232,257



Te Tai o Poutini PLAN

A combined district plan for the West Coast

Prepared for: Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee

Prepared by: Doug Bray, Senior Policy Planner

Date: 10 October 2024

Subject: Summary of Submissions Received on Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping to the Proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan

BACKGROUND

1. Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping to the Proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan (TTPP) has been undertaken to better inform application of the following three Coastal Natural Hazard Overlays:

- Coastal Hazard – Severe
- Coastal Hazard – Alert
- Coastal Hazard – Setback

This has been through the incorporation of superior LiDAR (light detection and ranging) data, in preference to these Overlays being informed by less reliable space shuttle data. Such information is not yet available for those areas north of Hector and south of Jackson Bay, while the work in the Greymouth area from the Taramakau River to Cobden has only just commenced. Those three areas were not, therefore, affected by the Variation. The Variation also had no impact on the immediate areas of Westport and Hokitika, as the Overlays in those areas were already informed by LiDAR data at the time of the Plan's public notification for submissions in mid-2022.

2. The Variation did not affect the Coastal Tsunami Overlay or any other of the Plan's Natural Hazard Overlays and made no changes to the provisions of the Plan's Natural Hazards Chapter. The Natural Hazards Chapter itself – and particularly its Rules – is presently undergoing a significant revision, with the assistance of Urban Edge Planning who are the s42A report writers.

3. This Variation was publicly notified in accordance with Clause 5 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). A public notice was placed in the Westport News, Greymouth Star and Hokitika Guardian, calling for submissions. In addition, notice of the Variation was served on over 4,000 coastal properties across the West Coast Region, plus the following organisations:

- Ministry for the Environment
- Department of Conservation
- Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Waewae
- Te Rūnanga o Makaawhio
- West Coast Regional Council
- Buller District Council
- Grey District Council
- Westland District Council

Copies of the Variation documents were placed in the Buller, Grey and Westland District Council Offices, the Westport, Greymouth and Hokitika Public Libraries and the West Coast Regional Council (WCRC) Offices. This included maps showing whether or not areas were affected, and the extent to which Variation 2 had affected the Overlays concerned.

4. The mailout (c.f. public notification in the newspapers) was the principal means by which awareness

of the Variation was generated. This included an Information Sheet, which made reference to the TTPP Website and included a copy of the public notice. Discussion of the Variation is still on the Website at <https://tppp.nz/coastal-hazards-variation/>, with the information provided there being very similar to that conveyed in the Information Sheet. The Website page includes a link to a Map Viewer, which enables properties to be zoomed in on in order to see precisely how the overlays affect a given property, and to what extent the Variation has altered such overlays relative to a given property.

5. The initial closing date and time for submissions was Friday 16 August 2024 at 5.00pm. In response to public requests, this was extended to Friday 30 August 2024. And following concerns about time taken for postage expressed by several without access to computer facilities, it was agreed that posted submissions would be accepted up to and including the end of the following week, being Friday 6 September 2024.
6. Public request also led to the convening of a Public Meeting in Westport on Tuesday 30 July 2024, with an online Zoom meeting held for South Westland coastal property owners on the evening of Thursday 8 August 2024. Councillor Graeme Neylon from the Buller District Council and a member of the TTPP Committee convened the Westport meeting attended by around eighty, while around fifteen participated in the online meeting for South Westland, which was convened by Jo Armstrong (TTPP Project Manager). Presentations at both meetings were delivered by Lois Easton (Principal Policy Planner – Consultant from the TTPP Team) and Dr Sharon Hornblow (Natural Hazard Analyst with the WCRC Catchment Management Team).

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

7. 112 submissions were received, and all within the timeframe agreed. These were from the following:
 - Mary Stewart (Submitter 222) – mary.ada.stewart@gmail.com
 - David and Janice McMillan (Submitter 670) – gidday2U@xtra.co.nz
 - Dee Deaker (Submitter 691) – deakerdeanaccounts@mail.com
 - Mark Vanstone (Submitter 708) – sundogsurf@gmail.com
 - Kenneth Wiltshire (Submitter 749) – ken.wiltshire@yahoo.co.nz
 - Jane Whyte and Jeff Page (Submitter 467) – jane@responseplanning.co.nz
 - Mandy Deans (Submitter 549) – mandydeans@yahoo.com
 - Paparoa Track Services Ltd, Craig and Sue Findlay, Tim Findlay, Punakaiki Beach Camp (Submitter 605) – Jorja.Hunt@tpri.co.nz
 - Dave Henderson (Submitter 742) – 12 Russell Street Westport 7825
 - David Hughes (Submitter 743) – 322 Palmerston Street Westport 7825
 - Les and Kathy McManaway (Submitter 751) – lesmcmaway@outlook.com
 - Lynda Reynolds (Submitter 752) – 294 Utopia Road Westport
 - Marilyn McKinney (Submitter 753) – 171B Peel Street Westport 7825
 - Maxmillion Donnelly (submitter 754) – beachcoast9@gmail.com
 - Patricia Paxton (Submitter 755) – p.a.paxton@gmail.com
 - Piet and Alison Geldenhuys (Submitter 757) – pietg@xtra.co.nz
 - Ray Karl (Submitter 759) – raykarl@xtra.co.nz
 - Ronald Williams (Submitter 760) – 105 Domett Street Westport 7825
 - Wendy Sheenan (Submitter 761) – wendyandleesa@hotmail.com
 - Desna Bruce-Walker (Submitter 692) – desnabruce@gmail.com
 - Michael Rogers (Submitter 709) – rockiesmining@hotmail.co.nz
 - Mitchell Rogers (Submitter 710) – mitchellrogers@hotmail.com
 - Forest Habitats Ltd (Submitter 186) – barry@macdonellconsulting.co.nz
 - Michael Snowden (Submitter 492) – rosie.hill@toddandwalker.com and ben.russell@toddandwalker.com
 - Barbara Clark (Submitter 673) – lucapema90@gmail.com
 - Biggles Ltd (Submitter 685) – brett@townplanning.co.nz
 - Neils Beach Special Rating District Committee (Submitter 669) – john.allisonsutton@xtra.co.nz

- Allison Sutton (Submitter 672) – suttonoffice@xtra.co.nz
- Finn Lindqvist (Submitter 694) – suelind.nz@gmail.com
- MTP Ltd (Submitter 711) – brett@townplanning.co.nz
- Murray and Rachel Petrie (Submitter 712) – murray@mcarthurridge.co.nz
- Rod Thornton (Submitter 724) – rodthornton663@gmail.com
- Westpower Ltd (Submitter 547) – MartinK@xtra.co.nz
- Charlotte May (Submitter 762) – maylord@xtra.co.nz
- John Sutton (Submitter 704) – john.allisonsutton@xtra.co.nz
- P & A Horrell (Submitter 715) – brett@townplanning.co.nz
- Vance and Carol Boyd (Submitter 447) – rvcnb@xtra.co.nz
- Karen Lippiatt (Submitter 439) – kairlippiatt@gmail.com
- Chris Reynolds (Submitter 362) – c.w.reynolds@xtra.co.nz
- Laurence Rueter (Submitter 381) – jlymaneric@gmail.com
- Richard Arlidge (Submitter 419) – whitecube1@gmail.com
- Lyn McIntosh (Submitter 469) – lynmcintosh@xtra.co.nz
- Frank O'Toole (Submitter 595) – anna@blg.nz
- Grey District Council (Submitter 608) – michael.mcenaney@greydc.govt.nz
- Gary Clarke (Submitter 667) – jacken@connorslegal.co.nz
- Anna Leary (Submitter 668) – anna@annaleary.com
- Brette & Irene-Sharel Kokshoorn (Submitter 671) – sharel.kockshoorn@jamesprint.co.nz
- Helen & Tom Sawyers (Submitter 674) – h.tsawyers@xtra.co.nz
- Joshua Tranter (Submitter 675) – joshmarkt@gmail.com
- Mike MacMillan (Submitter 677) – PO Box 141 Karamea 7864
- Adriana James (Submitter 678) – adriana.james59@gmail.com
- Adrienne Fraser (Submitter 679) – elizafraser275@gmail.com
- Alexa Kliebenstein (Submitter 680) – alexa.a.kliebenstein@gmail.com
- Andrew Dempster (Submitter 681) – sherwoodrabbit42@gmail.com
- Andrew Lisseman (Submitter 682) – andyllisseman@gmail.com
- Andrew Wiffen (Submitter 683) – wiffendairying@gmail.com
- Ash Oldham (Submitter 684) – 1928chord@gmail.com
- Brian McFarlane (Submitter 686) – bdmcfarlane@xtra.co.nz
- Christine Carter (Submitter 687) – 080026well@gmail.com
- Colman Creagh (Submitter 688) – 2 Anderson Street Rapahoe 7803
- Craig Hipson (Submitter 689) – craig.hipson@icloud.com
- David Gourlay (Submitter 690) – davegourlay@yahoo.com.au
- Elizabeth Duncan (Submitter 693) – ejaneaustin@hotmail.com
- Daniel Reynolds (Submitter 695) – danreynoldsconsulting@gmail.com
- George Field (Submitter 696) – georgefield86@gmail.com
- Glen Kingan (Submitter 679) – office@karameahelicharter.co.nz
- Jason Jacobs (Submitter 698) – sharkjas@yahoo.co.nz
- Jim and Anne Murray (Submitter 699) – glenmorestation@xtra.co.nz
- Jocelyn Billet (Submitter 700) – joel.luzanne@outlook.com
- Joey Keen (Submitter 701) – njkeens@gmail.com
- John and Suzanne Willetts (Submitter 702) – s.willetts@xtra.co.nz
- John Phillips (Submitter 703) – 78 Domett Esplanade Greymouth 7802
- Karamea Aerodrome Inc (Submitter 705) – karameaaeroinc@gmail.com
- Irene and Ken Tiller (Submitter 706) – tillerbay7@gmail.com
- Kevin Smith (Submitter 707) – kevinsmith.kiwi@gmail.com
- Murray Gibson (Submitter 713) – mrgibson@xtra.co.nz
- Nicholas Keen (Submitter 714) – nicholas.keen@police.govt.nz
- Paul Drake (Submitter 716) – ekard@slingshot.co.nz
- Paul Fraser (Submitter 717) – outtarange12@gmail.com
- Paul Murray (Submitter 718) – paulm@pb.co.nz
- Paul Scott (Submitter 719) – scottptgy@xtra.co.nz
- Prue and Daimon Schawalger (Submitter 720) – prue55@hotmail.com
- Punakaiki Farm Ltd (Submitter 721) – info@pancake-rocks.co.nz
- Rae Reynolds (Submitter 722) – rae.reynolds@gmail.com

- Rebecca Blackhurst (Submitter 723) – rebecca_blackst@hotmail.com
- Ros Bradley (Submitter 725) – rosb17@outlook.com
- Sam Carter (Submitter 726) – samcarter2013@gmail.com
- Stephen and Pauline Tranter (Submitter 727) – paulinetranter7@gmail.com
- Steve Miller (Submitter 728) – solak9@yahoo.com
- Stuart Liddicoat (Submitter 729) – sliddicoat@electronet.co.nz
- Tania Reynolds (Submitter 730) – tania.reynolds@outlook.com
- Tom McGaveston (Submitter 731) – tom.mcgaveston@inforceglobal.com
- Trevor Reid (Submitter 732) – trevreid5@hotmail.com
- Vanessa Kingan (Submitter 733) – nesslewis@gmail.com
- Vicki Stevenson (Submitter 734) – michaelandvic@xtra.co.nz
- William Sage (Submitter 735) – wsage@xtra.co.nz
- Hans Gutenbrunner (Submitter 736) – h.gut@xtra.co.nz
- Laurie and Marlene Collins (Submitter 737) – lauriecollins42@gmail.com
- Susan Norgart (Submitter 738) – susannorgart@yahoo.co.uk
- Alan Paxton (Submitter 739) – p.a.paxton@gmail.com
- Ann Hamplough (Submitter 740) – 158B Peel Street Westport 7825
- Damer Farrell (Submitter 741) – damer@xtra.co.nz
- Derek Roberts (Submitter 744) – derekroberts119@gmail.com
- Grant Rowberry (Submitter 746) – grant.david.rowberry@gmail.com
- Jane Abraham (Submitter 747) – 133/1 Powerhouse Road Fairdown Westport 7891
- Janette Donaldson (Submitter 748) – janettekydd123@gmail.com
- Paul Reynolds (Submitter 756) – jfhoney56@gmail.com
- Rachael Blick (Submitter 758) – 153 Peel Street Westport 7825
- Hamish Macbeth – hlmacbeth@yahoo.com.au
- Garry Duckett – 459 Utopia Road Westport 7892
- Kerera Corbett-Manera – kereracorbettmanga@gmail.com
- Anthea Keenan (Submitter 759) – keenanr@kinect.co.nz

8. The following two Summaries of the Submission Tables provide a comprehensive analysis of all 112 submissions received:
9. Appendix 1: Summary of Submissions on Plan Sections: Natural Hazards, Natural Hazards Maps - Coastal Hazards Variation Maps, which contains a full list of the Submission points relative to all submissions received, for your acceptance.
10. Appendix 2: Submissions on Variation 2 that are Submissions Points Relating to Other Parts of the Plan
11. Appendix 2 lists those Submission points which are deemed to be about other parts of the TTPP – i.e. they are Submission points which are not specifically related to Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping. This includes submissions on the objectives, policies and rules for coastal natural hazards. These provisions have not been changed since TTPP was notified in 2022 and submissions on them have been received previously.
12. It is recommended that the Submission points in Appendix 2, covering topics outside of Coastal Hazard Mapping, be accepted as “late submissions” on the TTPP itself, as notified in mid-2022. While these submissions are strictly out of scope for Variation 2, natural justice would suggest submitters should be given the opportunity to speak to the related provisions, and it has been the practice of the TTPP Committee to accept all late submissions in the past. None of the submissions were considered to be irrelevant or to meet any other reasons for rejection, as specified in Section 41D of the RMA.
13. The Chairperson of the Panel of Independent Commissioners has recommended that late submissions be dealt with in hearings as follows:
 - Submission points related to the Natural Hazards Objectives and Policies or above be dealt with at the Coastal Environment and Natural Hazard Hearing, Scheduled for 30-31 October 2024 in Hokitika and via remote access; with
 - All other Submission points in Appendix 2 being dealt with at the Variation 2: Coastal Natural

Hazards Mapping and Coastal Natural Hazards Rules hearing during the week 17-21 March 2025.

That would see the following eight submitters invited to appear at the October 2024 Hearings:

- Jane Whyte and Jeff Page (Submitter 467) – jane@responseplanning.co.nz
- Desna Bruce-Walker (Submitter 692) – desnabruce@gmail.com
- Michael Rogers (Submitter 709) – rockiesmining@hotmail.co.nz
- Mitchell Rogers (Submitter 710) – mitchellrrogers@hotmail.com
- Paparoa Track Services Ltd, Craig and Sue Findlay, Tim Findlay, Punakaiki Beach Camp (Submitter 605) – Jorja.Hunt@tpri.co.nz
- Kenneth Wiltshire (Submitter 749) – ken.wiltshire@yahoo.co.nz
- Mary Stewart (Submitter 222) – mary.ada.stewart@gmail.com
- Mandy Deans (Submitter 549) – mandydeans@yahoo.com

14. The Submissions from Susan Norgart (Submitter 738) and Rae Reynolds (Submitter 722) were accompanied by letters to the TTPP Committee, and these have been considered as part of the submission process.
15. A number of submitters have requested the opportunity to speak in support of submissions.
16. It is recommended that the Committee accept the Summary of Submissions contained within Appendix 1, and direct that the further submissions period be notified on 11 October 2024 for the statutory 10 working day period, with the closing date for receipt of further submissions being Friday 25 October 2024 at 5pm.
17. The letter informing submitters of the Further Submissions period is attached at Appendix 3 for your information.

RECOMMENDATIONS

2. That the information be received.
3. That in accordance with Clause 7(1) of Schedule 1 of the RMA, the Summary of Submissions contained within Appendix 1 be accepted and publicly notified for the receipt of further submissions.
4. That in accordance with Clause 7(2) of Schedule 1 of the RMA, copies of both public notice and the Summary be served on those who lodged submissions.
5. That the required two-week period for receipt of further submissions open on 11 October 2024 with a closing date of Friday 25 October 2024.
6. That the Committee:
 1. Accepts Submission points included within Appendix 2 as Late Submissions on the TTPP generally; with
 2. Those Submission points relating to the Objectives and Policies of the Natural Hazards Chapter addressed at the upcoming Coastal Environment and Natural Hazards Hearings, scheduled for 30-31 October 2024 in Hokitika; and
 3. Remaining Submission points from Appendix 2 being heard with all other submissions and further submissions received on Coastal Natural Hazard Mapping and Coastal Natural Hazard Rules, at the Hearing for Variation 2, scheduled for 17-21 March 2025.

Doug Bray

Senior Policy Planner (TTPP)

Appendix 1: Plan Sections: Natural Hazards, Natural Hazards Maps - Coastal Hazards Variation Maps

This is a summary of decisions requested in submissions made on the Proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan Variation 2 Coastal Hazards Mapping. Note that this document may only contain a subset of decisions requested. Summaries of all decisions requested and details on how to make a further submission are available at www.ttpn.nz

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Mary Stewart (S222)	S222.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose	Is concerned this will affect land value and ability to get insurance as well the quality of the scientific data used to identify the overlay.	That Karamea not be included in the Coastal Hazard Overlays until the LIDAR is completed.
David & Janice McMillan (S670)	S670.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose	Our property is not affected by this natural hazard risk and we consider the identification is inaccurate.	Remove Coastal Alert and Coastal Setback overlays from the property at 6 Main Road, Ngakawau .
Dee Deaker (S691)	S691.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose	People and communities should have the freedom to live where they wish and exist. The WCRC should resist unreasonable "dictates" by central government. TTPP/WCRC/BDC need evidence if going against ratepayer wishes, and should be transparent about what is happening or required	Neither Variation 2 nor the TTPP goes ahead in its present form; and opposition to any form of management retreat is noted
Mark Vanstone (S708)	S708.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose	Impacts on property prices and insurance	Oppose coastal hazard overlay on 33 Glasseye Drive, Karamea.
Kenneth Wiltshire (S749)	S749.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose	Assumptions and propositions are scientifically invalid and untestable. In particular, the one metre rise in sea level over 100 years is hypothetical only. It takes no account of topography, and beyond minimal photographic comparisons, there is little evidence of scientific measurement or research on coastal processes to show erosion and deposition cycles,	Oppose the coastal natural hazards maps in the proposed Plan for the Granity - Ngakawau area

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					river change courses and flooding data over time. There have, for instance been NO studies of beach profiles or attrition rates along the Ngakawau Straight between 11 Main Road and Torea Street. Yet this area has been included within the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay, devaluing property and suggesting both State Highway 67 and the electricity distribution network to Karamea are under threat.	
Mary Stewart (S222)	S222.003	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Oppose	Is concerned about the impact of the coastal hazards identification on rates, and the amount of protection provided for Karamea. I have a number of questions about how this will be managed in the future - how will access to Karamea be maintained, will protection works be upgraded, will we be required to retreat.	That further consultation is undertaken about the proposals for Coastal Alert areas.
Mary Stewart (S222)	S222.005	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Oppose	I am concerned about the accuracy of the maps and the science that underpins them.	That I have the option to resubmit when accurate LIDAR has been completed.
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.045	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Amend	While Variation 2 is about Coastal Natural Hazards MAPPING, such Mapping itself links to provisions - and in particular Objectives, Policies and Rules in the Natural Hazards Chapter. If and when a Change in overlay has changed the provisions - and particularly Rules - which apply, it is appropriate that comments on the relevant provisions of the Natural Hazards Chapter can also be considered.	That when and where Variation 2 has in fact altered the Natural Hazard Overlays applying to a property, those persons affected also be able to comment on the relevant provisions of the Natural Hazards Chapter. Ideally (and it is understood to be the case - and supported), submissions on both Variation 2 and the Natural Hazards Provisions should be heard together.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Dave Henderson (S742)	S742.001	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Not Stated	Not enough information	Not stated - not enough information
David Hughes (S743)	S743.001	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Oppose	Not enough information, very sparse on information.	Place implementation on hold until the public is fully informed.
Kerera Corbett-Manga (S750)	S750.001	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Not Stated	Not enough information	Not stated – Not enough information
Les & Kathy McManaway (S751)	S751.001	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Oppose	It has no basis in fact. Not enough information.	Withdraw the Variation
Lynda Reynolds (S752)	S752.001	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Oppose	Not enough information	Withdraw the Variation
Marilyn McKinney (S753)	S753.001	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Oppose	Not enough information, no graphs to view. Did not receive this one in mail.	Withdraw the Variation
Maxmillion Donnelly (S754)	S754.001	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Oppose	Not enough information, cannot find the zone graph of Westport to know what houses are effected by this plan.	Not stated - not enough information
Patricia Paxton (S755)	S755.001	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Not Stated	Not enough information, do not know how they will be affected.	Withdraw the Variation
Piet & Alison Geldenhuys (S757)	S757.001	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Not Stated	Do not understand how this variation effects their property	Not stated
Ray Karl (S759)	S759.001	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Not Stated	Not enough information	No stated - not enough information
Ronald Williams (S760)	S760.001	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Not Stated	Not enough information	Not stated - not enough information
Wendy Sheenan (S761)	S761.001	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Not Stated	They do not understand how experts come up with this variation	Not stated - do not understand how experts come up with this variation
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.046	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Policies	Amend	Further to Submission point S467.045, Policies NH_P1 to NH-P3, plus any new Policies recommended that will have relevance to the Coastal Hazard Overlays affected by Variation 2 should be able to be commented on when and where the Overlay	That when and where Variation 2 has altered the Coastal Natural Hazard Overlay applying to a given property, persons so affected be able to comment on Policies NH-P1 to NH-P3 plus any new policies of relevance, in addition to the change in mapping itself.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					has changed relative to a given property.	
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.050	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Policies	Amend	As Variation 2 has altered the extent of the hazard overlays, and in some cases which hazard overlay applies it is appropriate for people who have properties affected by Variation 2 to be able to address all of the relevant provisions on the Plan that apply.	Create a new policy for natural hazards alert overlay. Ensure that the policy recognises that the appropriate management response in the policies applying in the Coastal Hazard Alert areas is mitigation, not avoidance.
Desna Bruce Walker (S692)	S692.005	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Policies	Oppose	All individual owners have had thus far is the notice, the public meeting in Westport (with a Carters Beach Meeting of 28 July 2024 not attended, despite invitation), and extension of the initial closing date for submissions to 30 August 2024. Initial communication (via letter) was very poor, with insufficient information contained. Many are concerned about effects on property values and insurance costs, transition and relocation costs, do not favour a regulatory approach, and believe more should be spent on coastal protection works. And such feedback has not been listened to.	That engagement with the community, especially owners of affected properties, be more thorough, transparent and clear (informing owners individually), with "managed retreat" removed as an option unless a property is in immediate danger..
Michael Rogers (S709)	S709.001	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Policies	Support	Overall, the provisions for Natural Hazards - and particularly the Policies - are supported. But the Natural Hazard Overlays and their generation is not.	That the Natural Hazard Policies - of the TTPP, as originally notified in the natural Hazards Chapter, be retained.
Mitchell Rogers (S710)	S710.001	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Policies	Support in part	The Natural Hazards Policies provide for existing structures to be maintained, but guidance is lacking as to how protection measures should be designed and what thresholds make a	That existing protection structures and provision for their maintenance are included in the Planning.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					property uninhabitable. Local communities have already taken action to prevent inundation - including seawalls, enhanced drains and pumps. The process needs to be formalised.	
Mitchell Rogers (S710)	S710.002	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Policies	Amend	National guidance is required on how to incorporate the effects of climate change into development. The Environmental Defence Society has drafted some documents, providing a good plan for this. This should be incorporated into the Policies, applying both national directions and local solutions, to give communities clear guidance on what can and should be done, e.g: - Where to put protective structures; -Where to adapt properties; -When to abandon properties; -How to be compensated, etc.	That Climate Change planning be incorporated into the Natural Hazards policies.
Paparoa Track Services Ltd, Craig and Sue Findlay, Tim Findlay, Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd (S605)	S605.045	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Policies	Oppose	Assumptions and propositions are scientifically invalid and untestable. In particular, the one metre rise in sea level over 100 years is hypothetical only. It takes no account of topography, and beyond minimal photographic comparisons, there is little evidence of scientific measurement or research on coastal processes to show erosion and deposition cycles, river change courses and flooding data over time. There have, for instance been NO studies of beach profiles or attrition rates along the Ngakawau Straight	That submissions on the objectives and policies that relate to the Coastal Natural Hazards are further considered alongside the Rules and Variation 2 at the same hearing.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					between 11 Main Road and Torea Street. Yet this area has been included within the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay, devaluing property and suggesting both State Highway 67 and the electricity distribution network to Karamea are under threat.	
Kenneth Wiltshire (S749)	S749.006	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Policies	Amend	Mitigation plans and damage minimisation, including progressive, proactive retreat, receive very brief mention only. There is certainly no discussion as to HOW such outcomes are to be achieved, with no real guidance offered to local Councils. This is arguably a nationwide problem, requiring Government commitment and support to address. Certainly there is nothing to suggest HOW such matters should be addressed going forward, despite arguably \$ billions in costs with potentially millions affected. There are potentially NUMEROUS options to better protect properties and infrastructure from coastal erosion and inundation.	That the Plan text include mitigation plans for national hazards, so as to guide both Councils and ratepayers/owners as to what remedial action may be undertaken in the short, medium and long terms.
Mary Stewart (S222)	S222.004	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Policies	Oppose	Is concerned about the impact of the coastal hazards identification on rates, and the amount of protection provided for Karamea. I have a number of questions about how this will be managed in the future - how will access to Karamea be maintained, will protection works be upgraded, will we be required to retreat.	That proactive measures be implemented to ensure that Karamea area is future proofed with adequate seawalls and river stop banks.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Mandy Deans (S549)	S549.004	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Policies	Oppose	There is really no need for such an Overlay - or certainly to the extent that it imposes such penalties and constrains residents. Rather, ratepayers should be facilitated in their ability to respond to the erosion threat by carrying out mitigation works - such as the bund installed by ratepayers in 2016. The WCRC should ideally grant a West Coast-wide resource consent for erosion protection works, which would enable e.g. works to alter the Arawhata River mouth (to align the outlet in a manner that promotes beach accretion, c.f. erosion) at Neils Beach and various other such works elsewhere.	We have been asking WCRC for a number of years for a Resource Consent to be set up for changing the Arawhata River mouth, should it be necessary. We ask now that you continue to explore the implementation of one Resource Consent for the whole of the West Coast, for doing works to reduce erosion. We see this as a logical and timely application that would assist all coastal communities.
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.047	Natural Hazards	NHP1	Amend	As Variation 2 has altered the extent of the hazard overlays, and in some cases which hazard overlay applies it is appropriate for people who have properties affected by Variation 2 to be able to address all of the relevant provisions on the Plan that apply.	Ensure that the policies recognise that the appropriate management response in the policies applying in the Coastal Hazard Alert areas is mitigation, not avoidance.
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.048	Natural Hazards	NHP3	Amend	As Variation 2 has altered the extent of the hazard overlays, and in some cases which hazard overlay applies it is appropriate for people who have properties affected by Variation 2 to be able to address all of the relevant provisions on the Plan that apply.	Ensure that the policies recognise that the appropriate management response in the policies applying in the Coastal Hazard Alert areas is mitigation, not avoidance.
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.049	Natural Hazards	NHP5	Amend	As Variation 2 has altered the extent of the hazard overlays, and in some cases which hazard overlay applies it is appropriate for people who have properties	Ensure that the policies recognise that the appropriate management response in the policies applying in the Coastal Hazard Alert areas is mitigation, not avoidance.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					affected by Variation 2 to be able to address all of the relevant provisions on the Plan that apply.	
Forest Habitats Limited (S186)	S186.005	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Support in part	It is in fact clear that properties outside the hazard mapped areas are not being thoroughly assessed - e.g. Golf Links Road subdivision, which a subsequent assessment by a Registered Engineer confirms is in fact at risk of flooding. This is consistent with submission point S488.020 in the WCRC submission on the TTPP, which concludes that hazard maps do not follow contours and need further refinement to determine which areas are in fact subject to natural hazard risk. Reliance on general studies alone is placing undue restrictions on some property owners.	That the Natural Hazards Rules make it clear that site specific investigations by a registered Engineer - assessing flood levels and proposing mitigation measures such as minimum floor levels, and based on detailed topographical information - should take precedence over hazard mapping, which is based on high level, often out of date, modelling.
Michael Snowden (S492)	S492.015	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	While Variation 2 concerns Coastal Natural Hazards MAPPING, Rules relevant to the Variation require greater clarification - particularly in terms of legal effect/operative status, in relation to consents given effect to, previous subdivisions and existing use rights. Clarity is required as to what "lawfully established" means, while certain rules are unnecessarily restrictive. Particular Changes to Rules sought are set out in submission points 492.016 to 492.019 below. Should these not be possible, then additional, alternative, consequential or otherwise necessary changes to the Rules generally may be sought.	That the Rules in the Natural Hazards Chapter that are of relevance to Variation 2 are given greater clarity with respect to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Legal effect/operative effect of the Rule; - Savings/exemptions when resource consents are granted and/or implemented ahead of the Rule itself becoming Operative; - Existing use rights apply; and The meaning of "lawfully established (with that to be consistent with such terminology in the RMA).

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Neils Beach Special Rating District Committee John Sutton (S669)	S669.003	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	Driftwood on beaches also aids dune rebuilding. The WCRC and Westland DC should work together to ensure that driftwood gathering (principally undertaken to provide firewood) is regulated to ensure it takes place away from areas where its presence is vital to dune rebuilding. This would be as part of the Regional Land and Water Plan and existing Westland District Plan, with the latter carrying through to the TTPP.	Address the possible regulation of Driftwood gathering in an appropriate section of the TTPP to ensure it does not undermine the dune rebuilding process. Identify a specific driftwood collection area or alternatively a driftwood collection exclusion zone.
Allison Sutton (S672)	S672.003	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	The Arawata River mouth acts as a natural, ongoing provider of replenishment material at Neils Beach. The NIWA Report of 2016 confirms that this is providing the mouth is aligned north/northwest (as typically occurring following floods) c.f. a tendency to veer east over time. Allowing river realignment works to "correct" such an unfavourable veering eastwards as a Permitted Activity would facilitate dune rebuilding. And this should be a Permitted Activity, because any need to apply for resource consent would be costly, while facilitating such an exercise would be a cost-effective means of hazard mitigation for ratepayers.	That the TTPP provide a new permitted activity for special rating districts for river realignment works including at the Arawata River mouth to support erosion mitigation and accretion facilitation at Neils Beach.
Barbara Clark (S673)	S673.002	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	Aware from a previous talk in Nelson on Climate Change that "triggers" can be used to decide when properties are at risk. Feeling is that present approach is somewhat of a "blunt hammer" (i.e. too undifferentiated and too harsh)	That a triggered, stage and conditional process for when land must be abandoned is adopted.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Biggles Limited (S685)	S685.002	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	<p>- There are significant changes introduced by the Variation; and It is therefore essential that all affected landowners, including the Submitter, can participate in discussions to provide input on what are significant modifications. In particular, such Rules need to be clear and unambiguous in relation to lawfully established activities (including by subdivision consents partially given effect to and other existing use rights, while some Rules are unnecessarily restrictive, specifically:</p> <p>This is consistent with Policy 25 of the NZCPS, that avoiding increasing risk, c.f. blanket risk avoidance or risk reduction, should be the approach.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>That the respective Rules are amended to protect existing and consented residential activities and buildings, including extensions and modifications to existing residential buildings, by providing for them as a Permitted Activity;</p> <p>And</p> <p>That any additional or consequential relief necessary to properly address the issues raised in this submission is granted. This includes alternative, consequential, or necessary amendments to both the proposed TTPP and the District Plan, as required to fully implement the requested changes and ensure that all relevant matters are adequately addressed.</p>
Finn Lindqvist (S694)	S694.001	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	<p>Recognise no modelling is "perfect"(in fact proving only 40% reliable during 2022 New Zealand storms), while sea level rise estimates themselves take no note of land rise via tectonic processes (which has been documented at Neils Beach). Want to see stringent, somewhat draconian Rules applying to such overlays modified (e.g. along lines of Tasman District Council approach in Ruby Bay. That refers to "adaptation building" - applying floor levels above sea level and encouraging use of relocatable buildings. Approach as it stands</p>	<p>That Rules NH-R38 to NH-R46, applying to the Coastal Natural Hazard Overlays concerned be modified by a more nuanced approach, consistent with the Government's Coastal Hazards and Climate Change Guidance" Document (2024). Additional rooms and new dwellings with floor heights above sea level and relocatable buildings should be permitted within the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay.</p>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					threatens to "wipe out" small coastal communities like Neils Beach.	
MTP Limited (S711)	S711.002	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	<p>The associated Coastal Hazard Overlay Rules applying to those Overlays affected by Variation 2 are opposed, because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The mapping concerned has fundamentally altered the planning framework for property owners so affected; - The Rules themselves are directly derived from the overlays, which are now themselves being revised; - There are significant changes introduced by the Variation; and <p>It is therefore essential that all affected landowners, including the Submitter, can participate in discussions to provide input on what are significant modifications. In particular, such Rules need to be clear and unambiguous in relation to lawfully established activities (including by subdivision consents partially given effect to and other existing use rights, while some Rules are unnecessarily restrictive, specifically:</p>	<p>That the respective Rules are amended to protect existing and consented residential activities and buildings, including extensions and modifications to existing residential buildings, by providing for them as a Permitted Activity;</p> <p>And</p> <p>That any additional or consequential relief necessary to properly address the issues raised in this submission is granted. This includes alternative, consequential, or necessary amendments to both the proposed TTPP and the District Plan, as required to fully implement the requested changes and ensure that all relevant matters are adequately addressed.</p>
Murray & Rachel Petrie (S712)	S712.002	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	That erosion is occurring is not in dispute - but 100 years is a time in which much can change. Such Overlays effectively apply Rules which constrain development, but do nothing to protect people and properties (including their values)	Such Rules need to be refocussed - and through community engagement - so that they ensure community viability and sustainability, c.f. "chasing people out" That feedback on the sources of information be provided, confirming its accuracy and how it could be better responded to.
Rod Thornton (S724)	S724.001	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	Effects of Climate Change are acknowledged, and no issue is raised with respect to mapping	That the Rules applying to the Overlays concerned are further investigated and amended accordingly.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>alterations, BUT RULES APPLYING TO the Coastal Hazard - Severe and Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlays are opposed. Specifically, the Rules as they stand:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impinge on personal choice and property rights to too great an extent; - Create a scenario in which technical evidence to support proposals is unknown, and can easily burgeon out; - Don't consider possible mitigation measures or alternative uses; - Create potential "vested interests" for some pushing particular agendas (e.g. "managed retreat"); - Are based on questionable assumptions (e.g. 100 year events, one metre rise in sea level); - Have been justified by some on a "don't panic" or "doesn't effect existing use rights" basis - but that hides the real truth; and - Doesn't allow for possible changes in processes, cycles, etc. Further investigation of the Rules applying is necessary. 	
Rod Thornton (S724)	S724.002	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Oppose	<p>Rules Applying to the Coastal Hazard - Severe and Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlays are opposed. Specifically, the Rules as they stand:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impinge on personal choice and property rights to too great an extent; - Create a scenario in which 	That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping not proceed - with the status quo to remain.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>technical evidence to support proposals is unknown, and can easily burgeon out;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Don't consider possible mitigation measures or alternative uses; - Create potential "vested interests" for some pushing particular agendas (e.g. "managed retreat"); - Are based on questionable assumptions (e.g. 100 year events, one metre rise in sea level); - Have been justified by some on a "don't panic" or "doesn't effect existing use rights" basis - but that hides the real truth; and - Doesn't allow for possible changes in processes, cycles, etc. Further investigation of the Rules applying is necessary. 	
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.0514	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Neutral	<p>Given the topography of the Region, it is inevitable that elements of Westpower's 2,229 circuit kilometres of lines, cables and other infrastructure needs to be sited within areas subject to Natural Hazard Overlays. Westpower supports the use of up to date data to inform hazard risk, and this has no problems with the Variation itself - just that this network could be potentially further impacted by the Variation modifying the Coastal Hazard-type Overlays. Westpower therefore seeks a comprehensive, integrated and strategic approach to the distribution and supply of electricity throughout the West</p>	That notwithstanding any Changes to Overlays resulting from Variation 2: Coastal natural Hazards mapping, the TTPP continue to encourage and provide for the continued distribution of electricity to the community and Westpower's other activities associated with this as "Regionally Significant Infrastructure".

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Coast, including the ability to continue such supply, notwithstanding any such changes. It is understood that no changes have been made to the Natural Hazard Rules, with Westpower's earlier submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter itself remaining unchanged.	
Charlotte May Treasurer (S762)	S762.003	Natural Hazards	All Natural Hazard Overlays	Oppose	Approach to Natural Hazard threats is excessive - and driving people away from the region.	That the overall approach/response to coastal erosion and inundation be reconsidered.
Neils Beach Special Rating District Committee John Sutton (S669)	S669.002	Natural Hazards	Permitted Activities	Amend	Consistent with the above, the Neils Beach Special Rating District Committee has in fact asked the WCRC to consider allowing river mouth realignment works to be undertaken as a Permitted Activity (in accordance with the Regional Land and Water Plan) - so as to ensure any movement of the mouth eastwards can be "corrected", thereby enabling beach replenishment to continue.	Include a new Permitted Activity to allow river out realignment works for Special Rating Districts.
John Sutton (S704)	S704.003	Natural Hazards	Permitted Activities	Amend	Driftwood on beaches also aids dune rebuilding. The WCRC and Westland DC should work together to ensure that driftwood gathering (principally undertaken to provide firewood) is regulated to ensure it takes place away from areas where its presence is vital to dune rebuilding. This would be as part of the Regional Land and Water Plan and existing Westland District Plan, with the latter carrying through to the TTPP.	Address the possible regulation of Driftwood gathering in an appropriate section of the TTPP. This could include either the identification of areas for collection, or exclusion zones.
MTP Limited (S711)	S711.006	Natural Hazards	Permitted Activities	Amend	This is consistent with Policy 25 of the NZCPS, that avoiding increasing risk, c.f. blanket risk	Permitted Activities under Rules NH-R1 and NH-R38 should be expanded to include provision for

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					avoidance or risk reduction, should be the approach.	existing structures.
P & A Horrell (S715)	S715.006	Natural Hazards	Permitted Activities	Amend	This is consistent with Policy 25 of the NZCPS, that avoiding increasing risk, c.f. blanket risk avoidance or risk reduction, should be the approach.	Permitted Activities under Rules NH-R1 and NH-R38 should be expanded to include provision for existing structures.
Vance & Carol Boyd (S447)	S447.018	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Amend	the statuses of some activities under proposed TTPP rules relevant to the Variation are unnecessarily restrictive and should be reduced.	Amend NH - R1 as follows: Reconstruction and Replacement of Lawfully Established Buildings in all Natural Hazard Overlays Activity Status Permitted Where: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is the reconstruction/replacement of a building lawfully established at the time of notification of the Plan; 2. <u>This is the reconstruction, replacement, or reasonable extension of an existing structure which has either obtained resource consent, or been lawfully established at the time the Plan becomes operative; and</u> 3. The building has been destroyed or substantially damaged due to fire, natural disaster or Act of God; 4. The destroyed/damaged building is reconstructed or replaced within 5 2 years in the Westport Hazard, Coastal Severe and Flood Severe Overlays; 5. The destroyed/damaged building is reconstructed or replaced within 5 years in all other natural hazard overlays; and 6. The reconstructed/replaced building is similar in character, intensity and scale to the building that it replaces.
Michael Snowden (S492)	S492.016	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Amend	Consistent with Submission point S492.015, Rule NH-R1 should be expanded to include rebuilds and reasonable extensions of existing structures (as of the date the	That Rule NH-R1 be expanded to include rebuilds and reasonable extensions of existing structures (as of the date the proposed TTPP Rule gains legal effect or becomes operative) as a Permitted Activity.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					proposed TTPP Rule gains legal effect or becomes operative) as a Permitted Activity.	
Biggles Limited (S685)	S685.006	Natural Hazards	Permitted Activities	Support	Rules need to be clear and unambiguous in relation to lawfully established activities (including by subdivision consents partially given effect to and other existing use rights, while some Rules are unnecessarily restrictive	Permitted Activities under Rules NH-R1 and NH-R38 should be expanded to include provision for existing structures.
John Sutton (S704)	S704.002	Natural Hazards	Permitted Activities	Amend	Consistent with the above, the Neils Beach Special Rating District Committee has in fact asked the WCRC to consider allowing river mouth realignment works to be undertaken as a Permitted Activity (in accordance with the Regional Land and Water Plan) - so as to ensure any movement of the mouth eastwards can be "corrected", thereby enabling beach replenishment to continue.	That a Permitted Activity that allows for river mouth realignment works undertaken by a Special Rating District Committee be included in the Plan.
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.042	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	The five year timeframe for building a home on properties subject to the Coastal Hazard - Severe and Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlays is unduly restrictive. It is unduly restrictive, given there are transportable or tiny home options.	That the five year restriction on building within the Coastal Hazard - Severe and Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlays be removed.
Vance & Carol Boyd (S447)	S447.019	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	the statuses of some activities under proposed TTPP rules relevant to the Variation are unnecessarily restrictive and should be reduced.	Amend the rule as follows: Where: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For repairs and maintenance there is no increase in the area of the building; 2. <u>For the rebuild or reasonable extension of an existing structure which has either obtained resource consent or been lawfully</u>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p><u>established at the time the Plan becomes operative;</u></p> <p>3. For reconstruction of a building lawfully established at the time of notification of the Plan where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The building has been destroyed or substantially damaged due to fire, natural disaster or Act of God; 2. The destroyed/damaged building is reconstructed within 5 years in the Coastal Alert overlay and 2 years in the Coastal Severe overlay; 3. The reconstructed building is similar in character, intensity and scale to the building it replaces.
Michael Snowden (S492)	S492.017	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	Consistent with Submission point S492.015, Rule NH-R38 should be expanded to include rebuilds and reasonable extensions of existing structures (as of the date the proposed TTPP Rule gains legal effect or becomes operative) as a Permitted Activity.	That Rule NH-R38 be expanded to include rebuilds and reasonable extensions of existing structures (as of the date the proposed TTPP Rule gains legal effect or becomes operative) as a Permitted Activity.
Vance & Carol Boyd (S447)	S447.020	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Amend	the statuses of some activities under proposed TTPP rules relevant to the Variation are unnecessarily restrictive and should be reduced.	Amend to be a Restricted Discretionary Activity
Vance & Carol Boyd (S447)	S447.021	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Amend	the statuses of some activities under proposed TTPP rules relevant to the Variation are unnecessarily restrictive and should be reduced.	Alternative Relief - amend as follows: <u>Activity Status Restricted Discretionary Where:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>These are located within a single title subdivided for lifestyle or residential purposes at the time the Plan becomes operative.</u>
Biggles Limited (S685)	S685.004	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Oppose	Rules need to be clear and unambiguous in relation to lawfully established activities (including by subdivision consents partially given effect to and other	Rule NH-R43 should be Restricted Discretionary Activities

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					existing use rights, while some Rules are unnecessarily restrictive	
MTP Limited (S711)	S711.004	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Oppose	Rules are unnecessarily restrictive	Rule NH-R43 should be a Restricted Discretionary Activity
P & A Horrell (S715)	S715.004	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Oppose	Rules are unnecessarily restrictive,	Rules NH-R43 should be Restricted Discretionary Activity
Vance & Carol Boyd (S447)	S447.022	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Amend	the statuses of some activities under proposed TTPP rules relevant to the Variation are unnecessarily restrictive and should be reduced	Amend to Restricted Discretionary Activity
Vance & Carol Boyd (S447)	S447.023	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Amend	the statuses of some activities under proposed TTPP rules relevant to the Variation are unnecessarily restrictive and should be reduced	Alternative Relief: Amend as follows: <u>Activity Status Restricted Discretionary Where:</u> <u>1. These are located within a single title subdivided for lifestyle or residential purposes at the time the Plan gains legal effect.</u>
Michael Snowden (S492)	S492.019	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Amend	Consistent with Submission point S492.015, Rule NH-R44 should move from a Non-Complying Activity to a Restricted Discretionary Activity. Alternatively, Rule NH-44 should exclude single titles already subdivided for lifestyle or residential purposes as of the date that the proposed Rule gains legal effect or becomes operative.	That Rule NH-R44 move from a Non-Complying Activity to a Restricted Discretionary Activity. Alternatively, Rule NH-44 exclude single titles already subdivided for lifestyle or residential purposes as of the date that the proposed Rule gains legal effect or becomes operative.
Biggles Limited (S685)	S685.005	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Oppose	Rules need to be clear and unambiguous in relation to lawfully established activities (including by subdivision consents partially given effect to and other existing use rights, while some Rules are unnecessarily restrictive	Rule NH-R44 should be a Restricted Discretionary Activity
MTP Limited (S711)	S711.005	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Oppose	Rules are unnecessarily restrictive	Rule NH-R44 should be a Restricted Discretionary Activity

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
P & A Horrell (S715)	S715.005	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Oppose	Rules are unnecessarily restrictive,	Rule NH-R44 should be Restricted Discretionary Activity
Barbara Clark (S673)	S673.001	Natural Hazards	Westport Hazard Overlay	Oppose in part	<p>Initiatives like Westport NBS meeting appreciated and believe those working on TTPP well intentioned, but public typically lack technical knowledge and skills, so many groups are involved, and concerns about properties cannot be overlooked. Various conditions for managing impacts of climate change need to be differently managed.</p> <p>Own situation is one of having lived in Westport since June 2020, having moved into new home in July 2021 - just before big flood. Information on hazards had been lacking, and situation not helped by COVID-19.</p> <p>Many variables can affect a build or rebuild. Costs of inflation, updates to the Building Code, neighbourhood aesthetics and family requirements also need factoring in. Any restrictions need to be more "nuanced", e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Building on flood-prone land could be subject to a bond: and/or - Options can be looked at for provisions of services; and - Opportunity exists to include statements on LIMs and in Property Files. 	Remove all building conditions relating to the Buller Hazard Zone
Forest Habitats Limited (S186)	S186.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Neutral	Hazard mapping is a high level, overview, modelling-type exercise. It cannot replace site-specific engineering assessments based on detailed topographical data	That hazard mapping be for guidance purposes only - and to put people on notice that there may be a potential hazard.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Forest Habitats Limited (S186)	S186.003	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	Alert level mapping in the Arthurstown Road area, south of the Hokitika River does not reflect that in the Land River Sea Report. And it was understood that Variation 2 did NOT include changes around Hokitika.	That the Hazard Mapping in the Arthurstown Road area be unchanged - i.e. as initially included in the TTPP.
Forest Habitats Limited (S186)	S186.004	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	Presumably both the initial TTPP Flood Hazard Mapping and that for Variation 2 were based on the 2019 Data from the Land River Sea Report. This is already out of date - the bed of the Hokitika River having migrated northwards leading to significant accretion along the southern riverbank. Out of date and inaccurate maps are placing undue risks and costs on property owners, without site-specific engineering evidence to support these restrictions	That hazard mapping should be a guide only, and should not be used by Councils for making definitive decisions when assessing development proposals.
Haamish Macbeth (S307)	S307.008	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose in Part	Property is close to Otumahana Estuary in Karamea - and within Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay. Aware that area north of Hector yet to have LiDAR data applied (so Overlay is indicative only). Fact is property does have stopbank protection which is being added to, and protection of infrastructure also needs to be considered. The present approach has really been too "broad brush", with information to residents poor - being difficult to locate and understand.	Understands that once LiDAR data available for area north of Hector that there will be an opportunity for Karamea residents to comment. Until then, unable to make a well informed decision. Wishes to be kept informed and have opportunity at that time to submit.
Chris Reynolds (S362)	S362.003	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	There is no reliable data to make assumptions. This is not consultation.	Do not impose hazards without reliable data on 294 Utopia Road

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Chris Reynolds (S362)	S362.004	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	There is no reliable data. Information sent did not even include a map or anything else that could be easily referred to. This is NOT "consultation.	That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn - certainly unless and until there is more reliable data and better information generally.
Laurence Rueter (S381)	S381.003	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	Submitter argues that they take full responsibility for living (and sustainably) AND STAYING where they are. Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping is seen as a waste of ratepayers' money and an initiative ill informed by sea level rise of one metre in 100 years, climate change, etc. and refusal to consider resilience and adaptability.	That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn.
Richard Arlidge (S419)	S419.007	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	Relates essentially to sand dunes relative to Okari Road (the road being constructed on these). This sand dune country is highly vulnerable to sea level rise and storm surge, and should be included.	Expand the Coastal natural Hazard Overlays inland from Okari Road, to include the sand dune country.
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.043	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	For Punakaiki Village, there is limited potential for material; increase in the consequences of natural hazards through development and redevelopment. An overly strict approach to existing buildings and existing land is not warranted.	The approach to natural hazards as it applies to Punakaiki Village needs to allow for the reasonable use of land and buildings.
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.044	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Support in part	The Variation removes the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay from part of 11 Owen Street, Punakaiki. It is preferable that if any Natural Hazard Overlay is to apply to this property in whole or in part, that it be the Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay.	That the Coastal Hazard -Severe Overlay to be removed from 11 Owen Street, Punakaiki, with any part of that property deemed susceptible to Natural Hazards to be subject to the Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Lyn McIntosh (S469)	S469.003	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	Consultation on determining the criteria for the Overlays has been insufficient. It is realistically based on a "worst case scenario", a seemingly "blanket approach (relative to any land under 2.5 metres of the sea) and without regard for consequences, such as devaluing of property and increasing of insurance costs.	That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn.
Michael Snowden (S492)	S492.013	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping as a procedure is opposed on the following basis (as conveyed to the TTPP Committee on 20 May 2024, ahead of the Variation itself being notified): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inconsistency with the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPSD), the West Coast Regional Policy Statement (RPS) and Ministry for the Environment (MFE) guidance on coastal hazard mapping; - The methodology used in NIWA reports informing the Variation; - Uncertainties in the mapping of erosion and inundation hazards - stemming from the NIWA reports; - Policies 24 and 25 of the NZCPS; - Ineffective and insufficient consultation; and - Inconsistency with Plan Variation processes in other Councils. 	That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn - because the mapping itself requires revision, consistent with the NZCPS, the RPS and MFE guidance on coastal hazards mapping .
Michael Snowden (S492)	S492.014	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	Consistent with Submission point S492.013, the Coastal Hazard - Alert and Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlays, as imposed by the TTPP and altered by Variation 2	That consistent with Submission point 492.013, the Coastal Hazard - Severe and Coastal Hazard - Alert be removed from the Submitter's properties, at Okuru, South Westland being: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lot 5 DP 3034; and

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					should not, therefore, remain on the Submitters properties at Okuru, South Westland, being Lot 5 DP 3034 and Section 6 SO 11816. Such mapping is considered "out of date" relative to the latest topographic mapping, and should at the very least be amended to exclude the Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay from the south-western area of these properties.	- Section 6 SO 11816. And Should such relief itself not be possible, then at the very least the Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay be excluded from the south-western area of the Submitter's properties.
Mandy Deans (S549)	S549.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	Concerns Nelis Beach - Map CHA26 - which shows much of the Township subject to the Coastal Hazard - Severe Alert. This has significant implications, i.e.: - Increased costs of (and potentially no access to) insurance; - Property values, hence reduced capital and falling rates; - Houses becoming unsaleable; - Inability to achieve loans for building or maintenance; - Major anxiety for residents - Significant decrease in WCRC and Westland DC rates take. The process has not involved consultation, and is therefore undemocratic - and for an initiative with far reaching consequences for residents.	That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn.
Mandy Deans (S549)	S549.003	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	The science behind the Variation itself is lacking. The NIWA Report by Dr Murray Hicks (2016) points to Neils Beach being subject to cyclical depletion AND REPLENISHMENT over the past 40 years. And a bund has been	That the classification of Neils Beach as Coastal Hazard Severe be changed to enable us as ratepayers to have control over our freehold properties and to be free from penalties imposed on us.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					installed to reduce the erosion risk, while the overlays as shown exclude properties at the Highway end of the Village yet INCLUDE houses opposite these on a hill. This suggests no account has been taken of land contours	
Frank O'Toole (S595)	S595.032	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Support in part	It is noted that (consistent with relief sought by the Submitter on the TTPP as initially notified) Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping does reduce and better define The Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay, relative to the Submitter's property at 211 Utopia Road. BUT, the Rules as they apply (which it is noted are not themselves altered by the Variation) plus presence of such an overlay on a property being noted on a LIM Report means there are still implications for property values.	That as a minimum, the Change made by Variation 2 to the Coastal Hazard-Severe Overlay along the Orowaiti Lagoon Frontage relative to properties on Utopia Road be accepted.
Frank O'Toole (S595)	S595.033	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	The property at 211 Utopia Road in fact includes a drop off to the river, to the north of the line of the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay. In the 20 years the Submitter has lived on the site, the highest levels occurred during the 2021 flood - and did NOT extend into the grassed paddocks beneath the stopbank (there being approximately 1 metre clearance between the fences and the highest flood level, with the stopbank itself adding another 2 metres). This, plus the fact that the sand spit on the northern side of the Lagoon is accreting, should	That the position and extent of the Coastal Hazard Severe Overlay more accurately reflect the top of the bank location on 211 Utopia Road and surrounding properties.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					enable the overlay extent to be shifted further north.	
Paparoa Track Services Ltd, Craig and Sue Findlay, Tim Findlay, Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd (S605)	S605.040	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose in part	Is a joint submission - including: - Paparoa Track Services Ltd; - Craig and Sue Findlay; - Tim Findlay; - Dion Findlay; and - Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd. Punakaiki residents who own 4 Owen Street, 12 Owen Street, 18 Dickson Parade and 20 Punakaiki Road, and also operate the Camp (on Crown Land). Have previously submitted jointly on the TTPP when notified - seeking a relaxation of restrictions imposed by Coastal Hazard - Severe and Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlays - esp. finished floor requirements. Also desire that relocatable buildings that do not meet the requirement for finished floor levels can be moved as part of managed retreat. Wish to effectively restate such issues under Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping.	That any area where the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay has been extended over residential property in Punakaiki or the Punakaiki Beach Camp as a result of Variation 2 be removed (with the situation returned to what it was prior to Variation 2).
Paparoa Track Services Ltd, Craig and Sue Findlay, Tim Findlay, Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd (S605)	S605.041	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Support in part	Is a joint submission - including: - Paparoa Track Services Ltd; - Craig and Sue Findlay; - Tim Findlay; - Dion Findlay; and - Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd. Punakaiki residents who own 4 Owen Street, 12 Owen Street, 18 Dickson Parade and 20 Punakaiki Road, and also operate the Camp (on Crown Land). Have previously submitted jointly on the TTPP when notified - seeking a	That any area where the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay has been reduced over residential property in Punakaiki or the Punakaiki Beach Camp as a result of Variation 2, then such a reduction of coverage should proceed.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					relaxation of restrictions imposed by Coastal Hazard - Severe and Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlays - esp. finished floor requirements. Also desire that relocatable buildings that do not meet the requirement for finished floor levels can be moved as part of managed retreat. Wish to effectively restate such issues under Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping.	
Paparoa Track Services Ltd, Craig and Sue Findlay, Tim Findlay, Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd (S605)	S605.042	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	Mapping in relation to 4 Owen Street does not allow the location of Overlay boundaries to be determined on the ground, because there is no discernible topographic or legal feature. Such boundaries would, therefore, be uncertain and impractical to administer.	That the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay be removed from the property at 4 Owen Street
Paparoa Track Services Ltd, Craig and Sue Findlay, Tim Findlay, Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd (S605)	S605.043	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Support in part	Is a joint submission - including: - Paparoa Track Services Ltd; - Craig and Sue Findlay; - Tim Findlay; - Dion Findlay; and - Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd. Punakaiki residents who own 4 Owen Street, 12 Owen Street, 18 Dickson Parade and 20 Punakaiki Road, and also operate the Camp (on Crown Land). Have previously submitted jointly on the TTPP when notified - seeking a relaxation of restrictions imposed by Coastal Hazard - Severe and Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlays - esp. finished floor requirements. Also desire that relocatable buildings that do not meet the requirement for finished floor	That any area where the Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay has been reduced over residential property in Punakaiki or the Punakaiki Beach Camp as a result of Variation 2, then such a reduction of coverage should proceed.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					levels can be moved as part of managed retreat. Wish to effectively restate such issues under Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping.	
Paparoa Track Services Ltd, Craig and Sue Findlay, Tim Findlay, Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd (S605)	S605.044	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose in part	Is a joint submission - including: - Paparoa Track Services Ltd; - Craig and Sue Findlay; - Tim Findlay; - Dion Findlay; and - Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd. Punakaiki residents who own 4 Owen Street, 12 Owen Street, 18 Dickson Parade and 20 Punakaiki Road, and also operate the Camp (on Crown Land). Have previously submitted jointly on the TTPP when notified - seeking a relaxation of restrictions imposed by Coastal Hazard - Severe and Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlays - esp. finished floor requirements. Also desire that relocatable buildings that do not meet the requirement for finished floor levels can be moved as part of managed retreat. Wish to effectively restate such issues under Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping.	That any area where the Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay has been extended over residential property in Punakaiki or the Punakaiki Beach Camp as a result of Variation 2 be removed (with the situation returned to what it was prior to Variation 2).
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.852	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Support	The Submitter is supportive of the Variation generally. Within Grey District, those areas subject to the overlays concerned are sparsely populated - except Rapahoe, 12 Mile and Colville Close (Punakaiki). Recognise is a Coastal Natural Hazards MAPPING Variation, but given implications for property rights (esp. at Rapahoe) cannot be	That extensive landowner consultation is undertaken when and where there are properties affected by the Overlays - and particularly if restrictions will increase. Where risk is assessed as severe and removal of occupation could be necessary, landowner rights must be at the forefront of Council decisions.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					viewed in isolation from Objectives, Policies and Rules.	
Gary Clarke (S667)	S667.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	There is no scientific evidence to support the new mapping. Such Overlays should not take into account a possible rise in sea level of one metre, which is speculative. Such changes would prevent an ability for property owners to plan and create stress. The resultant decrease in land values will penalise owners. The inherent suggestion that voluntary relocation may be appropriate is incorrect - it being more likely to be forced, through consequential economic pressure.	That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards mapping not proceed - with the mapping of such overlays as it presently stands retained.
Anna Leary (S668)	S668.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	The overall need to plan for and mitigate coastal hazard risk is understood. But data from GNS Science in 2016 showing Okarito to be rising (as shown on a Map). Also CLIMsystems provides location specific climate assessments and insights - which demonstrate that risk associated with Okarito property concerned was less than anticipated. Information is available at www.climsystems.com and www.gns.cri.nz .	That all data available - including that from GNS (2016) and CLIMsystems - is taken into account in Variation 2 mapping for Okarito.
Neils Beach Special Rating District Committee John Sutton (S669)	S669.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	Use of the LiDAR data to more accurately identify erosion and inundation risks is supported, but other mitigating factors must be considered. In particular: - Neils Beach is sheltered by Jackson Bay from southerly and westerly winds, with the Arawata River supplying millions of tons of	That Map CHA26, which assigns a Coastal Hazard - Severe (Erosion and Inundation) classification to much of the Neils Beach township area be reconsidered and amended (so as to better provide for the survival of a vibrant community and not carry a burden of unnecessary penalties for property owners).

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>foreshore rebuilding materials in flood flow. - The 2016 NIWA Report "River Related Shore Erosion at Hokitika and Neils Beach, Westland" (Hicks, 2016) points to positioning of the Arawata River mouth affecting the extent of erosion or depletion - i.e. north east/east = erosion 2010-2015, c.f. north since 2016, allowing NE induced waves to move gravels in front of the township;</p> <p>- Fact is the NIWA 2022 reports (Measures and Rouse, "Review of West Coast Region Coastal Hazard Areas Version 2" and Bosserelle and Allis "Mapping for Priority Coastal Hazard Areas in the West Coast") make much of the 2010 to 2015 erosion BUT DO NOT MENTION the subsequent fantastic beach rebuild; and</p> <p>- This has been somewhat aided by construction of an earth bund - consented to by the WCRC, constructed by residents and financed by Special Rating District funds, enabling windblown sand to be trapped to aid dune rebuilding. That this bund is not considered by NIWA in its reports as a means of erosion prevention is INCORRECT - because it has assisted such a rebuild (aided by a favourable alignment of the River mouth), while the lagoon behind it has more or less drained itself (ponding only now occurring during heavy rains; while</p> <p>There are now at least 41, c.f.</p>	

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					around 15, houses in the township. So what is in the NIWA Reports is essentially out of date, meaning the Coastal Hazard Severe classification is "over-reach", and carries with it an unnecessary burden for property owners of additional insurance costs and other commercially negative connertations.	
Neils Beach Special Rating District Committee John Sutton (S669)	S669.004	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	Application of the overlay as it stands is unnecessary, and is likely to drive people away from the community due to negative commercial consequences, e.g.: - Inability to afford insurance; - Devaluing of properties; - Rendering properties unsalable; - Making it difficult to obtain bank loans; - reducing the WCRC and Westland DC rating bases; and Creating an effective "slum". Consistent with this, those Coastal Natural Hazard Zones applied should be periodically reviewed, with both Rivermouth realignment works and the management of driftwood gathering off the beach (in relation to dune areas) facilitated.	Provide for periodic reviews of the coastal severe hazard overlay at Neil's Beach taking into account dune rebuilding
David & Janice McMillan (S670)	S670.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	Area at 6 Main Road Ngakawau - where experience of stoms and events (e.g. Cyclones Fehi and Gita, other storms, King Tides from Supermoons, etc. over period 2022-2024) have NOT led to any inundation of property - simply small entries to carpark and occasionally the road. Unique	That the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay line is redrawn in a way that ensures 6 Main Road, Ngakawau is removed from such coverage (which presently includes two thirds of the property). The line should be pulled back to the western edge of the State Highway - as shown on a map included (which shows all other features mentioned, including those which protect the property concerned).

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					geographical position plus temporary seawall contains storms well. NZTA can and does protect the Highway, while tree planting adjacent to residence itself has worked well. If ever needed, future mitigation could include 900x500 Gabion Baskets on a Nib to the front. House itself was built to a high and safe in 1951 by Ministry of Works, on what is a Government surveyed and developed land parcel. There has been NO subsequent risk to the property. Erroneously including it within the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay will have adverse consequences for property values, mortgages, insurance, etc.	
Brette & Irene-Sharel Kokshoorn (S671)	S671.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	The Variation is lacking in information - with the Mp Viewer on the Website not loading and the Maps not being appropriately colour coded. In particular, it is unclear to what height Raleigh Creek is expected to rise - hence to what extent will the property at 971 Seven Mile Road Rapahoe be "affected"? Raleigh Creek itself is a low flow estuary-type Creek, and would need to rise substantially (i.e. at least 6 metres or more) to pose any flooding or inundation risk at the property concerned.	That the area identified as Coastal Hazard Risk be removed from 971 Seven Mile Creek Road, Rapahoe. Anything reflecting any existence of such risk to the property should similarly be removed from any LIM Report or Land Title for the property.
Allison Sutton (S672)	S672.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	Opposition is specifically to the majority of Neils Beach township being included in the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay as refined by Variation 2. Because:	That Map CHA 26 be reviewed and audited - with a view to removing and/or considerably reducing the Coastal Hazard-Severe and Coastal Hazard-Alert overlays as they apply to Neils Beach.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>- Does NOT believe that the NIWA Report "Rivermouth-Related Shore Erosion at Hokitika and Neils Beach, Westland" (Hicks, 2016) has been properly considered - which discusses cyclical erosion/accretion at Neils Beach; while</p> <p>- Subsequent NIWA Reports by Measures and Rouse (2022) are inaccurate (i.e. Neils Beach now has 41 c.f. 15 houses, and does not consider either the post 2015 accretion phase or presence of a gravel bund constructed in 2015;</p> <p>- "Lagoon" referred to at Area E in 2022 Report has in fact drained away (only now ponding in heavy rain periods).</p> <p>So while not opposed to the initiative (i.e. more informed mapping of coastal natural hazard risk GENERALLY, as based on LiDAR data), this needs to be properly informed and accurate, given potential consequences for insurance, financing, mortgages, property values and ability to sell. Fact is that the information in this instance is OUTDATED relative to Neils Beach - certainly based on personal observations over the past 28 years.</p>	
Allison Sutton (S672)	S672.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	Somewhat related, the apparent lack of "nuance" in mapping needs correcting. Specifically, Neils Beach at Area E (as referred to in the NIWA Report of 2022) was at the time and still is in a phase of accretion, with NO erosion taking place. This would	That information sources informing Map CHA 26 be further reviewed and properly audited for factual accuracy.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					suggest what is on Map CHA 26 is excessive , and should at least be subject to periodic review c.f. 100 year modelling, to better appreciate the actual impacts which climate change and sea level rise are having on erosion and accretion at Neils Beach.	
Helen & Tom Sawyers (S674)	S674.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	Persons/property (at 2 McIntyre Road Carters Beach) received NO notification of the Variation (finding out via neighbours). And information itself is not easily understood (including the computer mapping).	That the Coastal Hazard-Alert overlay on the property at 2 McIntyre Road Carters Beach be removed.
Joshua Tranter (S675)	S675.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	The problem itself is "man-made" - and principally due to: - Lack of infrastructure maintenance - particularly stormwater; and - Not dredging the Buller River (both Councils seen as being at fault).	No change should be made to Coastal natural Hazards mapping. The issue is "man-made" - with Councils needing to accept responsibility by continuously dredging the River and upgrading infrastructure to OECD standards.
Mike MacMillan (S677)	S677.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	The modelling process used is speculative and not based on factual historical evidence. What is intended compromises property values and people's rights to live where they choose.	That any scientific evidence supporting Variation 2 be at least subject to independent scientific analysis, and take greater account of historical evidence of erosion and inundation.
Mike MacMillan (S677)	S677.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	The modelling process used is speculative and not based on factual historical evidence. What is intended compromises property values and people's rights to live where they choose.	Withdraw Variation
Adriana James (S678)	S678.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	Communication has been unclear, confusing and inadequate - with no effort made to correct this. Scientific data is too difficult for lay person to understand. There is NO available data regarding sea	Defer Variation until sufficient data available - ideally for a ten year period. Based on proper analysis, c.f. incorrect extrapolation and unsubstantiated modelling. And more informed, transparent and democratic consultation.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					level rise for the entire West Coast.	
Adrienne Fraser (S679)	S679.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	Does not understand implications for property, and requires better informing. [Property is 52 Henley Street, Westport]	Plan Change needs to be better informed - and particularly in terms of implications for individual properties.
Alexa Kliebenstein (S680)	S680.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Support	Variation is supported - because Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay has been removed from 2/75 Snodgrass Road (being Sec 2 Orowaiti Blk III Kawatiri SD). So supports for THIS property (notwithstanding Original Submission of 10 Nov 2022 and Further Submission of 30 Jun 2022 filed on behalf of Snodgrass Road Submitters). Also aware that Variation itself does not alter Rules or Policies of the Natural Hazards Chapter.	Support removal of Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay from 2/75 Snodgrass Road. That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping proceeds.
Andrew Dempster (S681)	S681.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	Focus is on rising sea levels and Variation as outlined is confusing. The focus should be on enhancing infrastructure to deal with the principal source of flooding (i.e. blocked inland waterways and enclosing sand bars) c.f. sea level rise and imposing more "red tape" via associated consenting requirements.	I oppose the intent of the planned variation 2 as a resident landowner as it focuses on rising sea levels as its basis of evidence.
Andrew Lisseman (S682)	S682.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	This particular Variation and the Plan in its entirety should be scrapped (a letter requesting the latter having been sent (a letter requesting the latter having been sent on 14 September 2022). Is seen as driven by an ill-informed climate change agenda aimed at extracting money and subjugating	That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards mapping (and ideally the TTPP in its entirety) be withdrawn.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					freedoms. Has asked 12 questions which were in fact included in a SEPARATE email as well - which were all responded to in a separate email on 4 September 2024.	
Andrew Wiffen (S683)	S683.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	The Maps contain significant errors - there being no data verification with respect to how LiDAR relates to humps and hollows. Also ASSUMES sea level rise - how has that been verified, and is it acceptable? Is earthquake modelling included (earthquakes being just as likely as sea level rise).	Before the Variation proceeds, the maps must be made more accurate by: - Clarifying sea, river and land boundaries; - Excluding hump and hollow land (as data not sufficiently accurate); and Verifying whether sea level rise assumptions are appropriate (as parts of the coast will rise and fall, based on Mean High Tide Line (MHTL)).
Ash Oldham (S684)	S684.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	The Variation contains no history regarding sea level rise in the past 10 years, and no other facts to back up any other levels. Believes from observance that land around Westport is accreting, not eroding. Has lived at lower end of [15] Domett St for past 40 years, and believes that Cyclone Fehi flooding resulted from non working non return valve fitted to culverts at what is now Avery's corner on Orowaiti Road, with waters then flooding Paddocks leading to Domett Street and inundating the stormwater system. And despite complaints the problem has never been fixed.	That the history of how mapping changes have been made is shown - so that true extent of problem is shown (c.f. mere "scaremongering").
Biggles Limited (S685)	S685.003	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	Consultation has been insufficient and ineffective. In particular, the submitter owns a site within the Hapuka Landing subdivision, which has been subject to a considerable amount of earthworks which have raised	That the submitter's property at 33 Fox Moth Drive Okuru (Lot 17 DP 498766) is excluded from the coastal hazard overlays concerned.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					the site well above sea level. A specific Consent Notice was placed on all 18 allotments, requiring that residential buildings are set back sufficiently to avoid the risk of coastal erosion and inundation. Furthermore, the effects dealt with by the Variation generally can be remedied or mitigated with earthworks and building placement (including the imposition of minimum floor levels).	
Biggles Limited (S685)	S685.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	The mapping subject to the Variation is opposed because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Such mapping is inconsistent with the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS); - The NIWA methodology informing the Variation overestimates coastal hazard risk, including uncertainties with respect to erosion and inundation; - There is a lack of site specific hazard risk - Policies 24 and 25 of the NZCPS are applicable; and - Consultation has been insufficient and ineffective. 	That the proposed mapping overlays are not accepted;
Brian McFarlane (S686)	S686.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	The proposed mapping makes no distinction between individual properties at Carters Beach (e.g. floor or section level), while the location has no history of serious flooding or susceptibility to Tsunamis. Most tsunamis occur in the Pacific Ocean (c.f. Tasman Sea), and the natural hazards portal indicates no previous claims on the property (40 Cook Street, Carters Beach);	Withdraw Variation as relates to Carters Beach

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no record of sea level rise at Carters Beach or on the West Coast; -The information from NIWA is unreliable and unproven; - The TTPP has taken considerable time to reach the stage it has and consultation thus far has been poor. A very short timeframe has been allowed for property owners to absorb what is considerable information; and Implications for Carters Beach residents should be carefully considered before the Natural Hazard Overlays are altered. Property values may be impacted, affecting resale values and eroding security 	
Brian McFarlane (S686)	S686.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose in part	<p>Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping is opposed for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The informing letter is overly complicated, leaving property owners concerned and anxious; - The proposed mapping makes no distinction between individual properties at Carters Beach (e.g. floor or section level), while the location has no history of serious flooding or susceptibility to Tsunamis. Most tsunamis occur in the Pacific Ocean (c.f. Tasman Sea), and the natural hazards portal indicates no previous claims on the property (40 Cook Street, Carters Beach); - There is no record of sea level rise at Carters Beach or on the West Coast; -The information from NIWA is 	That Carters Beach residents be better informed - in plain and simple terms - how their properties may be affected by Variation 2.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					unreliable and unproven; - The TTPP has taken considerable time to reach the stage it has and consultation thus far has been poor. A very short timeframe has been allowed for property owners to absorb what is considerable information; and Implications for Carters Beach residents should be carefully considered before the Natural Hazard Overlays are altered. Property values may be impacted, affecting resale values and eroding security.	
Christine Carter (S687)	S687.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	None given	Any Variation of the Maps north of Hector should be delayed until full LiDAR mapping is complete. Insurance companies should be informed of such action.
Christine Carter (S687)	S687.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	None given	More information provided to the communities of Karamea and Little Wanganui to explain the reasons for Variation 2 properly.
Colman Creagh (S688)	S688.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose in part	Decision appears to be a "bulk one" - whereas properties in Rapahoe need to be treated separately - in terms of how far they are from the sea and how high above sea level they are (most having built well away from the sea and at high altitude). State Highway 6 itself is an effective "sea wall" relative to the Rapahoe elevated terrace. Much of downtown Greymouth, Cobden, Blaketown and even the WCRC Offices at Paroa are in a position of inundation from rising	Recognise SH6 acts as a "seawall" for Rapahoe protecting the area on the elevated terrace. Ensure mapping reflects the individual risk to property not a "bulk approach".

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					sea levels - so can the Council's own Planners "get it right"?	
Craig Hipson (S689)	S689.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose in part	The Variation is opposed with respect to 110 Golf links Road, Ruatapu, Hokitika. The section has never flooded, even after prolonged rains, with a drain at the rear emptying into the Mahinapua Creek.	That 110 Golf Links Road, Ruatapu, Hokitika not be included in the Variation as it is not subject to flooding or inundation.
David Gourlay (S690)	S690.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	Computer modelling used to supposedly indicate what is hazardous has no proven accuracy. Claims by NIWA have no scientific evidence and are unfounded. Proposed Variation in its entirety is disagreed with.	That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn
Dee Deaker (S691)	S691.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	While not specifically stated, "managed retreat" could become a likely future scenario. Humans have lived close to coast and rivers for years, with no real changes in climate in last 10,000 years to suggest that cannot continue. Future should be monitored, but "modelling" and "worst case scenarios" have limitations, and should not be construed as evidence of sea level rise and that "the worst" will happen. People and communities should have the freedom to live where they wish and exist. The WCRC should resist unreasonable "dictates" by central government. TTPP/WCRC/BDC need evidence if going against ratepayer wishes, and should be transparent about what is happening or required.	undertake monitoring and provide information and data to residents who remain free to make their own decisions about where they live (no forced retreats);

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Desna Bruce Walker (S692)	S692.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	The approach taken in terms of a 100 year projection is contrary to Policy 24 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement, recommendations of the Ministry for the Environment's Coastal Hazard and Climate Change Guidance and the International Panel of Climate Change recommendations. It is also contrary to the New Zealand Sea Rise Programme, which recommends that "low confidence" scenarios be applied to stress testing infrastructure, allowing subdivision and applying managed retreat, while there are a series of reports (e.g. that of the Expert Working Group on Managed retreat) which all recommend a more moderate approach be taken to issues such as sea level rise.	That sea level rise is based on more moderate RCP 2- 4.5, with regular monitoring of sea level every 2-5 years for next 25 years, and 100 year coastal planning period reduced to 25 years
Desna Bruce Walker (S692)	S692.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	The effects of such planning, if given effect to, could be catastrophic. No one in fact taking responsibility for "what if it DOESN'T in fact happen, while the livelihoods and rights of people are being compromised. There is in fact NO evidence to support a 1 metre rise in sea level in 100 years, and such reaction to it has obvious consequences for people, properties, and livelihoods, and is prematurely forcing "overreactions" in terms of safety, such as managed retreat.	That each district be able to manage their own risk assessments, based on local knowledge and input. Individual property owners need to have a much bigger say
Desna Bruce Walker (S692)	S692.003	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards	Amend	Presence of such Overlays shows up on LIM Reports with obvious consequences. And this is	That the proposed Coastal Hazard - Alert overlay be removed from 33 Elley Drive, Carters Beach. Such an overlay should not be shown unless and until the

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
			Variation Maps		AHEAD OF submissions (written and oral being considered). All individual owners have had thus far is the notice, the public meeting in Westport (with a Carters Beach Meeting of 28 July 2024 not attended, despite invitation), and extension of the initial closing date for submissions to 30 August 2024. The sea level at Carters Beach is in fact RETREATING relative to this property - due to the build up of sand since the addition of tip heads or groins at the Buller River mouth.	Plan has come into effect.
Elizabeth Duncan (S693)	S693.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Support	Is noted that, consistent with Original Submission of 10 November 2022 and Further Submission of 30 June 2023 that Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay has been removed from 2/75 Snodgrass Road (Sec 2 Orowaiti Blk III Kawatiri SD. It is noted that Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping does not impact on the Natural Hazard Rules of the TTPP.	That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping proceed noting that the Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay is removed from 2/75 Snodgrass Road in this proposed Variation.
Finn Lindqvist (S694)	S694.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	Own property at Neils Beach an area where Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay appears to take no cognisance of heavily forested bush covered hill, which acts as a "buffer zone" between property and coast (passing on the inland, c.f. coastal side of it), and on which an extra room is planned. Recognise the no modelling is "perfect"(in fact proving only 40% reliable during 2022 New Zealand storms), while sea level rise	Review the mapping and remove it from my property at Neil's Beach

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					estimates themselves take no note of land rise via tectonic processes (which has been documented at Neils Beach. So not opposing mapping in itself. Approach as it stands threatens to "wipe out" small coastal communities like Neils Beach.	
Daniel Reynolds (S695)	S695.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unnecessary or pre-emptive use of 1 metre sea level rise figure - based on models which are little more than an "educated guess" - Scepticism about sea level rise projections - and why should it be "expected" when current NIWA data for Westport and Granity-Hector points to no change -Modelling measures are pseudoscience at best (some data even showing levels are decreasing); Poor consultation process - i.e. entire use of "Te Tai o Poutini" has been confusing (many associating it with the Polytechnic, and has simply "assumed" people know more than they do; and" -Approach must therefore be more "prudent" - e.g. installation of metres and tectonic change instruments, then having qualified researchers critically analyse data (so that approach is scientific and "knee jerk" reactions are avoided. Overall approach is "heavy handed" and based on uncertainty. 	Withdraw Plan Change - Approach needs to slow down - by improving local data collection on sea level and groundwater changes and adopting a prudent, evidence-based approach including clarifying and understanding the rate of sea level change (i.e. is it linear or exponential), improving the consultation process and adopting an adaptive, flexible approach so that international trends are more critically examined, and premature, unnecessary actions are avoided.
George Field (S696)	S696.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Support	Is noted that, consistent with Original Submission of 10 November 2022 and Further Submission of 30 June 2023 that	That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping proceed as it removes the coastal hazard - alert overlay from 2/75 Snodgrass Road.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay has been removed from 2/75 Snodgrass Road (Sec 2 Orowaiti Blk III Kawatiri SD. It is noted that Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping does not impact on the Natural Hazard Rules of the TTPP.	
Glen Kingan (S697)	S697.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	The property concerned is within the area north of Hector (hence NOT within the area to which the updated LiDAR data yet applies). The present situation is thus confusing. The overlays as they exist do not follow the contour of the land, and should be removed.	Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards mapping should be placed on hold - until all accurate LIDAR data is received.
Glen Kingan (S697)	S697.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	The property concerned is within the area north of Hector (hence NOT within the area to which the updated LiDAR data yet applies). The present situation is thus confusing. The overlays as they exist do not follow the contour of the land, and should be removed. Such overlays put property owners at a disadvantage, and should not be applied unless properly informed. The property is in fact at 28 feet/9 metres AMSL - similar to the Aerodrome runway and three neighbours, yet this property plus the southern end of the Aerodrome runway are incorrectly subjected to the overlay. Such a situation has consequences for the ability to extend, sell and insure the property. And there is no risk of either coastal erosion or coastal inundation - in own lifetime or beyond.	Remove the Coastal Hazards Alert layer from the property concerned - i.e. 127C Kohaihai Road, Karamea.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Jason Jacobs (S698)	S698.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	Does not believe own place (at 53 Bright Street, Cobden) would be affected - as if it was, others who were not so informed would be affected first. And the Cobden Greymouth area is protected by the floodwall.	That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards mapping be withdrawn.
Jim & Anne Murray (S699)	S699.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	Science to justify the zoning is lacking - many experts disagree with what are "worst case scenarios" which are unnecessary. Consultation has been lacking. The implications of what is proposed are high, i.e.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A major hike in insurance costs; - Capital value of buildings declining; - Future building requiring resource consent as well as a building permit; - Major anxiety for Neils Beach property owners; and - Reduced capital assets resulting in rates being increased by WCRC and Westland DC 	That the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay as it applies to Neils Beach be removed. Rather, an Advisory Notice be issued to ratepayers, who should also be advised of the Hearings.
Joelyn Billett (S700)	S700.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	No Reason Given.	That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping not proceed.
Joey Keen (S701)	S701.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	The property was purchased in late 2022 - and on the basis of the Natural Hazard Overlays as they then existed. EXPANDING such and overlay to INCLUDE that are between the dwelling and Utopia Road at the property known as "Rock Wall" is what is opposed. Because that area can (according to local contractors) be protected from erosion and will be done so.	That the land at 331 Utopia Road Westport, between the dwelling and the road edge not be included in the Coastal Hazard - Severe overlay, as now proposed by the Variation. The situation as it existed in the proposed Plan- i.e. such an overlay covering only those areas across the dwelling and towards the water (thus excluding the southern end of the property) is acceptable.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Joey Keen (S701)	S701.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	There is also a sand bar along North Beach that will afford protection to the area. This has been building up over recent years and will increase such protection in future years. The Orowaiti River mouth is a substantial distance to the north, with Google Maps having shown how erosion levels over three year periods have decreased substantially since the River migrated northwards. This will enable erosion protection plans to be put in place for the property.	That the land at 331 Utopia Road Westport, between the dwelling and the road edge not be included in the Coastal Hazard - Severe overlay, as now proposed by the Variation. The situation as it existed - i.e. such an overlay covering only those areas across the dwelling and towards the water (thus excluding the southern end of the property) is acceptable.
Joey Keen (S701)	S701.003	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	An "open mind" should be taken to such trends - which clearly show that the Orowaiti River is migrating northwards, thus reducing the level of erosion and making erosion protection practicable.	That the land at 331 Utopia Road Westport, between the dwelling and the road edge not be included in the Coastal Hazard - Severe overlay, as now proposed by the Variation. The situation as it existed - i.e. such an overlay covering only those areas across the dwelling and towards the water (thus excluding the southern end of the property) is acceptable.
John & Suzanne Willetts (S702)	S702.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	Concerns 146 and 147 Torea Street, Granity in particular - where Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping has effectively revised overlay from Coastal Hazard - Alert to Coastal Hazard - Severe. These properties, plus several adjacent ones, are protected by a rock seawall, between the end of the properties and the sea itself, meaning Coastal Hazard -Alert is deemed sufficient.	That the proposed application of the Coastal Hazard - Severe overlay to 146 and 147 Torea Street Granity not proceed, with the Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay retained for those properties.
John & Suzanne Willetts (S702)	S702.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	Consistent with the above, the NIWA Report "mapping for Priority Coastal Hazard Areas in the West Coast (2022) itself points out that sea walls have in fact been constructed - at various properties	That the proposed application of the Coastal Hazard - Severe overlay to 146 and 147 Torea Street Granity not proceed, with the Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay retained for those properties.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					in Hector, Ngakawau and Granity. The Report acknowledges that such walls can effectively mitigate coastal hazard risks to an extent.	
John & Suzanne Willetts (S702)	S702.003	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	Further to the above, the NIWA Report itself should NOT "assume" that longer term protection by such walls will fail, due to lack of investment. The wall protecting 146 and 147 Torea Street was constructed and is maintained by reputable contractors (one of whom was Buller District Council approved). Raising the Coastal Hazard level applying to the site and others so protected is based on assumptions and erroneous.	That the proposed application of the Coastal Hazard - Severe overlay to 146 and 147 Torea Street Granity not proceed, with the Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay retained for those properties. A similar approach should be taken to all properties which similarly benefit from seawall protection.
John Phillips (S703)	S703.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Neutral	Concerned with any potential impacts on 78 Domett Esplanade, Cobden. Unaware that this property "affected" to any extent - and should not be so, because it is not known to have had any history of issues with coastal hazards.	That the Submitter be advised, should the proposed Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping Variation affect what is a residential dwelling at 78 Domett Street, Cobden in any way.
John Phillips (S703)	S703.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Neutral	Concerned with any potential impacts on the Greymouth Nursery at Preston Road, Greymouth. Understands that it should not be so, because what is a commercial property should be adequately protected by the Greymouth Floodwall.	That the Submitter be advised, should the proposed Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping Variation affect what is a commercial nursery business at Preston Road, Greymouth in any way.
John Sutton (S704)	S704.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	Use of the LiDAR data to more accurately identify erosion and inundation risks is supported, but other mitigating factors must be considered. In particular: - Neils Beach is sheltered by Jackson Bay from southerly and	That Map CHA26, which assigns a Coastal Hazard - Severe (Erosion and Inundation) classification to much of the Neils Beach township area be reconsidered and amended so as to better provide for the survival of a vibrant community and not carry a burden of unnecessary penalties for property

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>westerly winds, with the Arawata River supplying millions of tons of foreshore rebuilding materials in flood flow. - The 2016 NIWA Report "River Related Shore Erosion at Hokitika and Neils Beach, Westland" (Hicks, 2016) points to positioning of the Arawata River mouth affecting the extent of erosion or depletion - i.e. north east/east = erosion 2010-2015, c.f. north since 2016, allowing NE induced waves to move gravels in front of the township;</p> <p>- Fact is the NIWA 2022 reports (Measures and Rouse, "Review of West Coast Region Coastal Hazard Areas Version 2" and Bosserelle and Allis "Mapping for Priority Coastal Hazard Areas in the West Coast") make much of the 2010 to 2015 erosion BUT DO NOT MENTION the subsequent fantastic beach rebuild; and</p> <p>- This has been somewhat aided by construction of an earth bund - consented to by the WCRC, constructed by residents and financed by Special Rating District funds, enabling windblown sand to be trapped to aid dune rebuilding. That this bund is not considered by NIWA in its reports as a means of erosion prevention is INCORRECT - because it has assisted such a rebuild (aided by a favourable alignment of the River mouth), while the lagoon behind it has more or less drained itself (ponding only now occurring</p>	<p>owners.</p>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					during heavy rains; while There are now at least 41, c.f. around 15, houses in the township. So what is in the NIWA Reports is essentially out of date, meaning the Coastal Hazard Severe classification is "over-reach", and carries with it an unnecessary burden for property owners of additional insurance costs and other commercially negative connotations.	
John Sutton (S704)	S704.004	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	Application of the overlay as it stands is unnecessary, and is likely to drive people away from the community due to negative commercial consequences, e.g.: - Inability to afford insurance; - Devaluing of properties; - Rendering properties unsalable; - Making it difficult to obtain bank loans; - reducing the WCRC and Westland DC rating bases; and Creating an effective "slum". Consistent with this, those Coastal Natural Hazard Zones applied should be periodically reviewed, with both Rivermouth realignment works and the management of driftwood gathering off the beach (in relation to dune areas) facilitated.	Any coastal hazard classification for Neils Beach should be less severe and periodically reviewed; with Initiatives by the Neils Beach community to better manage coastal erosion facilitated and taken advantage of.
Karamea Aerodrome Inc (S705)	S705.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	The Karamea Aerodrome is uniform in level across the entire site (i.e. 28 feet/9 metres AMSL). The LiDAR Data used cannot, therefore, be following the land contour (which itself ensures that the entire property at Aerodrome	That the entire Karamea Aerodrome property has the Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay removed from it.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Road Karamea is well and truly NOT coastal erosion or inundation susceptible).	
Irene & Ken Tiller (S706)	S706.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	More information is required on the heights to which Raleigh Creek is expected to rise, before deeming 1003 Seven Mile Road, Rapahoe "affected". Raleigh Creek itself is a low, flat, estuary creek - rising by 6 metres or more maximum, and even then poses no flooding or inundation risk to the property concerned. No flooding or inundation has been witnessed in the past 50 years on the site, meaning any proper investigation would realistically conclude that NO such risk exists	That any Coastal Hazard Risk Overlays be removed from the property at 1003 Seven Mile Road, Rapahoe - as well as any LIM Reports and Land Titles of relevance.
Kevin Smith (S707)	S707.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	the science is lacking as is knowledge overall (particularly local) with what is proposed seemingly politically driven and poorly presented - leaving communities confused and upset.	That the Proposed Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be at least delayed, pending any further direction from the Coalition Government.
Mark Vanstone (S708)	S708.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	Opposition is to the way in which an initiative, which will impact on property prices and insurance, has been "pushed onto" the community without consultation.	That affected residents are notified well in advance of initiatives such as this, so that they can have their say.
Michael Rogers (S709)	S709.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	The approach to Natural Hazard Overlays - including Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazard Overlays - has been flawed, i.e.: - Communication with especially small communities has been poor - leaving many with a feeling of not being listened to and over something which has significant implications for property values, rates, insurance, etc., and therefore communities; while	That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn, and the overall delineation of the Natural Hazard Overlays be re-examined, in the context of existing initiatives to protect properties from erosion and inundation.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>-No account has been taken of existing seawalls and numerous other erosion/inundation mitigation initiatives to protect property;</p> <p>This is realistically a New Zealand-wide problem - i.e. the Government needs to recognise just where initiatives such as this are leading - given the obvious responses from agencies concerned and the "snowball" effect this will have on many communities and local authorities. Can, for instance, the Government look at stepping in to e.g. provide affordable insurance, buy out "Red zones", etc.</p>	
Michael Rogers (S709)	S709.003	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	<p>What has resulted from Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping, does not appear "relevant" to the real situation, i.e.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Indications are the data was from around 2016 - and much has changed since then; - Raster to vector transfer has been poor - meaning "real values" within the 5 metre resolution are not reflected; - Seawalls and other mitigation devices constructed since 2018 have not been considered (some of which can withstand 8 metre swells, amidst strong westerly winds and king tides); - No consideration has been given to the real effects of storm surges, wind direction, tsunami, rainfall extent, tidal variations, etc. which all impact on inundation levels and extent; and 	<p>That the whole approach to determining Natural Hazard Overlays is amended to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Take into account existing mitigation features (e.g. seawalls); - Involve infrastructural organisations and consider the protection of their assets; - Consider reassessments, in the context of physical force changes; - Allow ongoing community input; - Consider other effects - e.g. earthquakes, and tectonic uplift; - Respond to hazard risk identification in terms of setting rates; - Consider consequences for areas abandoned over time (e.g. extent to which infrastructure is maintained); and - Address compensation for landowners

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>- There is no real consistency between Overlay delineation and physical features.</p> <p>The Tsunami Overlay (while not affected by the Variation itself) is incorrectly applied. The overall consequence is a series of Overlays which themselves have no practical benefit, but major socio-economic implications for property owners and communities. Responses by key infrastructure providers (e.g. NZTA, KiwiRail, Westpower) are not considered. And there is no real direction in terms of WHERE TO go, should inundation occur</p> <p>Has only a quite inadequate "desktop" analysis been undertaken</p>	
Mitchell Rogers (S710)	S710.003	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose in part	<p>The methodology is understood, but the data has not been well presented, with clear errors on alert layers that are based on elevation but don't factor in real situations. Also it is clear that the LiDAR data used for the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay was taken prior to 2018, when several cyclones removed areas of coastline and forced walls to be built. Certain such walls are significant (e.g. Hector beachfront, excluding just two properties), with some being over five metres above mean beach level, affording significant protection to towns and infrastructure, with drainage possible behind these. Yet Such initiatives have not been factored into the mapping, leaving</p>	<p>That the Coastal Natural Hazard Maps align with up to date information. Locals in impacted communities should be consulted as part of this process (as they could advise on what is in place, could be provided, etc.).</p>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					many such areas within the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay. It is important to understand the specifics along the entire coastline, as such Overlays have massive effects on e.g. insurance, rates and other costs.	
MTP Limited (S711)	S711.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	The mapping subject to the Variation is opposed because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Such mapping is inconsistent with the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS); - The NIWA methodology informing the Variation overestimates coastal hazard risk, including uncertainties with respect to erosion and inundation; - There is a lack of site specific hazard risk - Policies 24 and 25 of the NZCPS are applicable; and - Consultation has been insufficient and ineffective. 	That the proposed Variation mapping overlays are not accepted;.
MTP Limited (S711)	S711.003	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	The submitter owns a site within the Hapuka Landing subdivision, which has been subject to a considerable amount of earthworks which have raised the site well above sea level. A specific Consent Notice was placed on all 18 allotments, requiring that residential buildings are set back sufficiently to avoid the risk of coastal erosion and inundation. Furthermore, the effects dealt with by the Variation generally can be remedied or mitigated with earthworks and building placement (including the imposition of minimum floor levels).	That the submitter's properties at 19 and 29 Fox Moth Drive Okuru (Lots 10 and 15 DP 498766) are excluded from the coastal hazard overlays concerned.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Murray & Rachel Petrie (S712)	S712.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	Ongoing insurance will be so expensive once this is notified that landowners will not be able to afford the premiums. Neils Beach has a beach that naturally rebuilds from material transported from the Arawhata River a proven natural occurrence documented by NIWA? The WCRC also have in place a rating district fund for beach protection works for the community, a process to date that works and has provided the community with extra protection since it was established and has helped to rebuild the beach	The natural hazards overlay from 12 O'Leary Place Neils Beach be removed
Murray & Rachel Petrie (S712)	S712.003	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	The remapping and Rules will impact adversely on insurance and building/rebuilding costs, leading to problems with mortgages, rates, business viability and maintenance of property. The Submitter's own property at 12 O'Leary Place remains with the Coastal Hazard-Alert Overlay. What implications does this have (e.g. will the Council pay any compensation)? The real problem seems to be that no notice is taken of the fact that Neils Beach is in fact naturally rebuilding - through material transported by the Arawhata River, while a Rating District Frind is in place for beach protection works, that has afforded extra protection. Building restrictions, c.f. effective "Red Zoning" would be the way to go.	That the extensive application of the Coastal Hazard-Severe Overlay to much of Neils Beach be revised, in the context of local beach rebuilding processes and coastal erosion protection initiatives.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Murray Gibson (S713)	S713.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	<p>The approach is incorrect because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Climate change is not as severe as scientists are making out; - Scientific computer modelling is mere "guesswork" and not to be trusted; - Neils Beach has in fact existed for thousands of years - and will continue to do so; - Mental health issues that will arise due to the initiative as it exists will be huge; - Properties will be left uninsurable, devalued and virtually unsaleable; and - Will such properties still be rated - by the WCRC and Westland DC. And the driving force is simply man-made weather manipulations, which need to stop. 	Do not proceed with the Variation
Murray Gibson (S713)	S713.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	<p>The approach is incorrect because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Climate change is not as severe as scientists are making out; - Scientific computer modelling is mere "guesswork" and not to be trusted; - Neils Beach has in fact existed for thousands of years - and will continue to do so; - Mental health issues that will arise due to the initiative as it exists will be huge; - Properties will be left uninsurable, devalued and virtually unsaleable; and - Will such properties still be rated - by the WCRC and Westland DC. And the driving force is simply 	That the overall approach inherent in Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be amended - to one which better reflects local conditions, pays less attention to climate change and scientific modelling, and seeks a more practical outcome.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					man-made weather manipulations, which need to stop.	
Nicholas Keen (S714)	S714.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	Concerns extent to which Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay affects 331 Utopia Road, Westport ("Rock Wall"). Initially only covered the dwelling and out towards the water (when purchased in late 2022). But now encompasses the entire property - i.e. now includes the southern portion of the property, between the existing dwelling and Utopia Road (i.e. away from the water). Why? Because it will affect usability of the land and measures can be put in place to afford protection. And a sand bar/build up along North Beach is increasing, and will continue to afford enhanced protection from severe erosion. So extending the Coastal Hazard-Severe Overlay in relation to the property is incorrect and unnecessary.	That the Coastal Natural Hazard Map which includes 331 Utopia Road, Westport be amended - so that in relation to that property, there is no extension of the Overlay beyond what existed on the initial map (i.e. as was included in the Plan when notified).
P & A Horrell (S715)	S715.003	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	The submitter owns a site within the Hapuka Landing subdivision, which has been subject to a considerable amount of earthworks which have raised the site well above sea level. A specific Consent Notice was placed on all 18 allotments, requiring that residential buildings are set back sufficiently to avoid the risk of coastal erosion and inundation. Furthermore, the effects dealt with by the Variation generally can be remedied or mitigated with earthworks and	That the submitter's property at 31 Fox Moth Drive Okuru (Lots 16 DP 498766) is excluded from the coastal hazard overlays concerned.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					building placement (including the imposition of minimum floor levels)	
Paul Drake (S716)	S716.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose in part	Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards effectively "tags" freehold properties, with a view to forcing people off. This is (similar to COVID-19 approach) a case of "bureaucratic overreach". Are other agencies (e.g. Local Government New Zealand, the United Nations, the World Economic Forum, etc.) involved? So called "environmental reasons" (global warming, climate change, etc.) have been scientifically challenged. Do not oppose overall intent to map - but don't use "fear mongering", "mandatory bullying", etc.	That the existing overall approach under the RMA remain - but the mapping not be include provision for climate change.
Paul Fraser (S717)	S717.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	Feeling is that Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards mapping has arbitrarily changed the Hazard Overlay boundaries - and principally to deflect responsibility from the Councils and place pressure on property owners (in terms of property values, rates and insurance costs. Enquiries of neighbours confirm that the area (adjacent to 52 Henley Street, Westport) has not, in fact, flooded in past 30 years. And Councils have allegedly done NOTHING in the past to alleviate flood risk - and now are imposing a "punishing" approach.	That: The status quo be maintained for Overlay boundaries; and that the Councils themselves seek to better mitigate flood events.
Paul Murray (S718)	S718.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose in part	An initiative such as this is understandable, given current knowledge, data on climate change, and associated risks to	That there be a more proactive approach to natural hazard mitigation, through reinforcing flood protection and mitigation, with greater attention paid to the costs of initiatives such as Variation 2 for

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					property and human life. But are potential financial implications - especially in terms of insurance, building costs including resource consents, etc. which needs better understanding. Could the Council provide an estimate of such likely costs? At the same time, can there not be proactive plans to better mitigate hazard risks - e.g. could stopbanks be further improved? Landowners are concerned about costs and other consequences, and would prefer to see initiatives to protect, rather than measures to penalise.	landowners.
Peter Scott (S719)	S719.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	Opposes what is effective "Red Zoning" of Neils Beach (i.e. inclusion of what is virtually the entire Township within the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay). This will devalue properties and takes no account of beach replenishment processes centred on the Arawhata River (which can themselves be facilitated via managing the outlet via southward movement every five years). Consequences will be unsellable properties (would these then be rates free?), which is creating stress, anxiety and mental health issues.	That the Coastal Hazard -Severe Overlay as it applies to Neils Beach be removed.
Prue & Daimon Schawalger (S720)	S720.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	The information sent via post was extremely hard to read and understand, and what was online was no better. [re 133 Russell Street, Westport]	That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn
Punakaiki Farm Ltd (S721)	S721.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards	Amend	The Maps as updated by Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping do not take into account	That the Coastal Natural Hazard - Severe and Coastal natural hazard - Alert Overlays, as amended by Variation 2 take into account the raised platform

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
			Variation Maps		the raised platform on the seaward side of the Main Road at Punakaiki. This is an anomaly - because it effectively results in a clear swathe of land running through the Village that is free of Hazards, yet that area (in fact not much above sea level) is in fact deemed less susceptible to hazard risk than the Submitter's property on the raised platform. Surely the lower land would be more susceptible to flooding from both the coast (via seawall overtopping) and the Pororari River (back flooding), while the platform has not been reached by even the highest seas to date. Furthermore, a Coastal Engineering Report and Works Completion Certificate for a house build on the platform itself confirms there is adequate protection on the platform for a one metre rise in sea level.	on the seaward side of the Main Road at Punakaiki, in defining the extents of the Overlays.
Punakaiki Farm Ltd (S721)	S721.003	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	The Submitter's own property includes a double-layer armour rock seawall, 80 metres inland from MHWS and parallel to the coastline, to the immediate east of the property boundary. It is largely unsighted (being mostly buried or planted in flax). It is that, not the rock placed in front of Takutai House (which is part of landscaping only) which should be a defining feature.	That the Seawall, as opposed to the Rock, be used as a defining protective feature on the Submitter's property, in terms of aligning the Coastal Hazard Overlays in the Punakaiki Area.
Punakaiki Farm Ltd (S721)	S721.004	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	There is a disconnect between the Submitter's own seawall and the Scenic Hotel Group property's frontage, through to the toe of the	That the ability to construct further seawall protection, if necessary, be noted.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Pancake Rocks. The Group itself has seen no need to build such a structure, but could do should the need arise. The Submitter's own wall includes around 1,000 tonnes of rock.	
Rae Reynolds (S722)	S722.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	<p>The TTPP Committee (the Submitter having listened into the TTPP Committee Meeting of 7 August 2024) acknowledges that the process has not been well managed and caused much anxiety, e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Many confused and upset people; - Calls not responded to - Letters not understood (not "plain English"); - Consequences for insurance, etc.; - Map Viewer on website not working properly and difficult to locate - and from the outset; - Confusion around "Te Tai Poutini" - many thinking it was the Polytechnic (and simply threw the information away) - Somewhat related, letters didn't really include much in the way of contact information (with significant opposition to use of Te Reo Maori expressed by some); - No understanding of what the Variation was based on (scientifically); and - Not properly identified as to who was/was not "affected" - leaving many "confused". <p>Entire process needs to be rethought/redone.</p>	That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards mapping as it stands be withdrawn.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					NB: Has written letter to TTPP Committee to that effect (as placed in the box at Buller DC) - in addition to submission lodged online.	
Rebecca Blackhurst (S723)	S723.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	<p>Submitter questions validity of data , including 1 metre sea level rise and 100 year worst case scenario being applied , and relative to a "one off" LiDAR mapping exercise. Ideally want BOTH Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping, and entire TTPP Withdrawn.</p> <p>Have addressed a series of points on matters including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TTPP Committee membership (esp. relative to elected personnel); - Credentials of TTPP Committee Members; - What do Overlays in fact mean, and what are implications; - To what extent do Councils "have a say" in what can take place on affected properties; - Can people be forcibly removed from homes; - What about "red stickered" houses - can people remain; - What happens to properties following "retreat"; - Who is responsible for climate modelling, and can they be held accountable for errors; - Will there be compensation, and on what basis; - Will such Overlays appear on LIM Reports; and - To what extent is the TTPP a "theft of property rights". 	The Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Those are not THEMSELVES to do with the Variation directly, and have been answered separately.	
Ros Bradley (S725)	S725.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	The mapping itself seems unreliable. For instance the Map showing McIntyre Road, Carters Beach shows the Hazard Area extended to include the road, but not the adjacent farm. Yet in July 2021, the road remained dry while the farm flooded. And the Submitter's property at 1 McIntyre Road was similarly not flooded - being at least one metre above any known "flood zone".	That the Variation 2 mapping be discontinued in its present form - unless and until it can become better substantiated and more reliable.
Sam Carter (S726)	S726.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	Inclusion of the property at 26 Nikau Heights, Little Wanganui within Coastal Hazard Overlays is opposed. It is well above both the sea and the river. While recognising that the LiDAR update does not apply to this area, any risks would be well into the future - there have been no past effects from flooding. Such inclusions unnecessarily threaten the existence of small communities like Little Wanganui - through impacting property values, insurability, etc. And consultation has been insufficient re: responsibility for financing, where people move to, etc.	That Coastal Natural Hazard Mapping for the Area be updated - but on a properly notified basis, with consideration given to measures to effectively mitigate such risks.
Stephen & Pauline Tranter (S727)	S727.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	The proposal has been incompetently and deceptively run - being highly confusing and based on inadequate literature. The timeframe is inadequate, and takes no account of people's needs to seek professional assistance. And no account is	That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping not proceed - with no changes made to previous such mapping.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					taken of potential tectonic uplift through earthquakes - which would well and truly "cancel out" the effects of a one metre rise in sea level over 100 years. So the data cannot be "credible".	
Steve Miller (S728)	S728.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	Property at 19 Glasseye Drive, Little Wanganui is within a Coastal Hazard Overlay, and this will affect insurability, saleability and value of the property concerned. And is one on which has been investment in a superfruit orchard and a dwelling.	That any Coastal hazard Overlays on 19 Glasseye Drive, Little Wanganui be removed.
Steve Miller (S728)	S728.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	Other housing in the community and the community in general will be similarly adversely affected by Coastal Hazard Overlays similarly applied. The NIWA data on which the Variation is based is incorrect and falsified, with what is an approach that will greatly reduce Council rate takes short sighted and misinformed. Greater accountability is needed.	That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn. Rather, effort should go into having insurance companies take a more reasonable approach to the insuring of properties potentially affected by natural hazards.
Stuart Liddicoat (S729)	S729.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose in part	Owner of 36 Hall Street, Cobden - which is close to the edge of the Coastal Hazard Overlays as they exist. Such mapping (as seemingly advised by NIWA) requires a "second opinion" - as the consequences of such overlays for what is a relatively low socio-economic area could be significant. Impacts on insurance costs and saleability potential could cripple some households.	That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be subject to a "second opinion" in terms of the NIWA informing. Alternatively, the Council should consider contributing towards the cost of insuring affected properties.
Tania Reynolds (S730)	S730.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Support	Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards mapping is supported - given that (consistent with Submission of 10 November 2022	That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping proceed.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					and Further Submission of 30 June 2023 on TTPP by Snodgrass Road Residents), the Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay has been removed from 2/75 Snodgrass Road (Sec 2 Orowaiti Blk III Kawatiri SD).	
Tom McGaveston (S731)	S731.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	Concerns 367 Utopia Road (near Westport). Coastal Hazard Overlays should not apply to this property - because it has been subject to extensive coastal protection works, including rock wall armouring (installed under WCRC Consent RC-2017-0090-01 to 04), informed by a Geotechnical Assessment from Tonkin and Taylor.	That any Coastal Hazard Overlays on 367 Utopia Road be removed,
Trevor Reid (S732)	S732.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	Why is the shed at 68 Veale Way included within the Coastal hazard - Severe Overlay, which seems to "kink" onto the property. Neighbours far closer to the sea are outside the Overlay. And the coastline would appear to be building up, c.f. eroding.	That the area of 68 Veale Way that is within the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay be removed from this Overlay.
Vanessa Kingan (S733)	S733.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	A Variation such as this should be put on hold at least until ALL data of relevance is received. Proceeding without areas north of Hector covered by the upgraded data has created confusion (particularly given the letter was sent to many such properties, stating they are "affected"). And the Overlays concerned take no real account of land contours. It is unfair to put property owners at a disadvantage (re: insurance, finance, sales, etc.) ahead of the full picture being available.	That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn. Alternatively, it only apply to those areas where the data is presently available, with the Overlays themselves otherwise removed from the TTPP maps.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Vanessa Kingan (S733)	S733.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	The Submitter's property at 127C Kohaihai Road, Karamea is at the same elevation at the neighbouring Karamea Aerodrome (i.e. 28 feet/9 metres AMSL). Besides a small section of the southern runway (which should also not be included), the property concerned is the only one subject to the Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay. Without accurate data being available, it is unacceptable to have an Overlay of this nature compromising future building options, potential sale and insurability. Realistically, the property concerned is in no danger of flooding, having not done so in the Submitter's 40 years or likely to do so within a similar future period).	That the Coastal Hazard-Alert Overlay be removed from the property at 127C Kohaihai Road, Karamea.
Vicki Stevenson (S734)	S734.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	Has no idea what "all this rubbish" is about. Own home at 75/2 Snodgrass Road has never been flooded. Have never had problems securing Building Permits from the Buller District Council, and home has never flooded. Car shed did once, but a large concrete wall protects the lower part of the property and a pump is on-site. Figures a bit hard to understand, but would appear to be arguing are 700 metres back from coast and 3 metres above sea level. Part of Snodgrass Road is lower, but that can be fixed.	That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn.
William Sage (S735)	S735.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	A Variation such as this should be put on hold at least until ALL data of relevance is received. Proceeding without areas north of	That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn. Alternatively, it only apply to those areas where the data is presently available, with the

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Hector covered by the upgraded data has created confusion (particularly given the letter was sent to many such properties, stating they are "affected"). And the Overlays concerned take no real account of land contours. It is unfair to put property owners at a disadvantage (re: insurance, finance, sales, etc.) ahead of the full picture being available.	Overlays themselves otherwise removed from the TTPP maps.
William Sage (S735)	S735.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	The Submitter has two properties - at 419C and 419D Kohaihai Road, Karamea. 419C has the house and other buildings on it, and has a small corner (without buildings on it) within the Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay. 491D is not yet built on, and has the top end of it within the Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay. The line is a straight one, following neither topography nor relative distance from the coast. Given the elevation of both properties, neither are expected to flood, while the Overlay mapping as it stands relative to them appears without reason or justification.	That the Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay be removed from 191D and 491C Kohaihai Road, Karamea.
Hans Gutenbrunner (S736)	S736.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	Submitter's property is 4589 Karamea Highway, Karamea. Should NOT be subject to any Coastal Hazard Overlays. A consented to seawall has been on the site for 30 years - there having been no inundation of the site since or prior to installation. The property also borders an Estuary, c.f. the open sea which is distant. There is no evidence of the seawall having eroded, while a 6	That any Coastal Hazard Overlays be removed from 4589 Karamea Highway, Karamea.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					metre high sand pit is present beyond the Estuary, which mitigates any high waves.	
Hans Gutenbrunner (S736)	S736.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	It is unclear how the present Coastal Hazard Overlays were arrived at. And it is certainly unclear how methods of modelling can predict levels in 100 years. Given the significant impact of the Overlays in terms of insurance and notations on LIM Reports, this matter needs to be properly addressed before an initiative such as Variation 2 proceeds. Karamea is a tightknit community, and many locals are quite frightened by the implications.	That the methodology behind Variation 2 be reviewed, with the community better informed as to how the Overlays were arrived at and their implications.
Laurie & Marlene Collins (S737)	S737.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	The entire proposal is deceptive - because the erosion concerned is man-made. Information (including the mapping itself) provided has been deceptive, being based on data that is neither conclusive nor credible, with the information confusing and difficult to navigate. The timeframe for submitting was ridiculously short, for something that has high implications and requires professional interpretation. And if allowing for a one metre rise in sea level over 100 years, then the potential for uplift resultant from Alpine Fault activity to counter such an effect must also be considered.	That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards mapping be withdrawn, and the Coastal Hazard Overlays as they were previously be reinstated.
Susan Norgart (S738)	S738.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	The science is not settled. While the LiDAR data may be considered more accurate, there is no historical data to support sea level rise occurring - and certainly at and around Carter's Beach.	That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn - unless and until more accurate data is available, certainly with respect to sea level rise.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Meaning there is nothing to support areas being at risk from coastal erosion or inundation. And to base things on a one metre rise in sea level over 100 years and one in 100 year events is extreme and flawed.	
Susan Norgart (S738)	S738.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	Consistent with Submission point 738.001, there is no evidence to suggest that the Submitter's property at 1A Marine Parade, Carters Beach is at risk from coastal hazards.	That any Coastal Hazard Overlays applying to 1A Marine Parade, Carters Beach be removed - and this reflected in any future LIM Reports for the property.
Susan Norgart (S738)	S738.003	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	Submission points 738.001 and 738.002 are backed up by a letter to the TTPP Committee Chairman, dated 25 August 2024, expressing concerns re: the process for Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping, i.e.: - Origin of the correspondence was unclear; - It appear to have been a "sporadic" mailout - with some at Carters Beach having received the mailout, but others having not done so; - The initial period for submissions (closing 16 August 2024) was inadequate - and only extended out to 30 August 2024 under considerable pressure; - There is no apparent effort on the part of the Council to actively engage with the public (i.e. as part of developing the approach itself); - Compartmentalising the approach to Coastal Natural Hazards MAPPING only limits appreciation of wider implications, e.g. implications of such overlays,	That the Submitter's letter of 25 August 2024, to the TTPP Committee Chairperson, expressing concern about the Variation 2 process overall, be considered as part of the submission itself.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>consistency with reducing Carbon Emissions, etc.;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Councils are supposedly being empowered to consider managed retreat by withdrawing services to certain areas. Yet an initiative such as this particular one is based on extreme climate modelling, which is itself based on little more than guesswork and fantasy; and - Continuing to roll out a framework that effectively forces people off properties without adequate and balanced scientific research is unacceptable. The science supporting the LiDAR data is clearly not yet settled. This letter should be attached to the submission, and considered as part of it. 	
Alan Paxton (S739)	S739.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	Information given is insufficient to enable any informed decision to be made. Needs to be greater attention given to timeframes, costs, priorities and especially repercussions (including property values).	That more detailed information is provided before Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping is allowed to proceed.
Ann Hamplough (S740)	S740.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	Could not understand the letter or information.	That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards mapping be withdrawn - unless and until better informed.
Damer Farrell (S741)	S741.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	<p>The information creates confusion and uncertainty, being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unclear; - Assuming what is fiction to be fact; - Is not consultative or informing; - Is a knee jerk reaction, suggesting the Plan is missing vital information; 	That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn - unless and until an honest and informative meeting takes place, in order to provide greater clarity and consider "knock on" effects (such as impacts on rates, insurance and saleability).

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is unclear about WHO is sending the material (the website providing little other detail); and - About something it appears that the Council are trying to "slip over" ratepayers 	
Derek Roberts (S744)	S744.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	The information is inadequate - and over the head of people, making it impossible to make any balanced conclusion or decision (e.g. no idea what "LiDAR means). Realistically, it is yet another "knee-jerk" reaction to unproven theories on land movement.	That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn.
Garry Duckett (S745)	745.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	The property is not affected by flooding.	Remove the Hazard Overlay from 459 Utopia Road
Grant Rowberry (S746)	S746.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	Presence of Coastal Hazard-Severe and Coastal Hazard - Alert on Submitter's property at 10 Main Road Ngakawau is opposed. The boundary line should be shifted to the middle of the Main Road. The Overlays as they stand do not represent a true and accurate picture of erosion or inundation risk. There is no scientific evidence to suggest storm surges or sea level rise will change this, based on 20 years residence - during which time the sea has not come close to, let alone entered, the property. And the house itself was built 70 years ago, and has survived numerous Cyclones (including Fahey) and surges	That the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay be removed from the property at 10 Main Road, Ngakawau.
Grant Rowberry (S746)	S746.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards	Amend	Further to Submission point 746.001, there is also a significant mitigating factor, being a seawall	That both the Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay be removed from the property at 10 Main Road, Ngakawau. Such Overlays should not extend closer

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
			Variation Maps		in front of, and to both sides of, the property at 10 Main Road Ngakawau. Three rows of planted flaxes and a main road fence are also in place, with the house itself 100 metres back from the Beach. And consideration is also being given to a further seawall. Realistically, the closes any Coastal Hazard Overlay should come to the property itself is the middle of Main Road.	to the property than the centre of Main Road.
Jane Abraham (S747)	S747.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	The information is simply not understood - and needs to be made more understandable.	That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards mapping be withdrawn - at least until made more understandable.
Janette Donaldson (S748)	S748.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	Opposition is to BOTH Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping and the TTPP generally. Feeling is that much of the so-called "science" behind the Variation is merely hypothetical - and particularly notion of having to protect against "one in 100 year events". Truth is that such overreaction simply leads to unnecessary destabilising of communities through e.g. managed retreat and the adverse reactions to this healthwise (mental and physical).	That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn.
Janette Donaldson (S748)	S748.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	Somewhat related to Submission point 748.001, the real point is being missed - i.e. the need to better mitigate against such hazards. Argument supported with seven news articles re: problems in achieving such initiatives, plus associated issue of too much being spent on the TTPP itself which is seen to be achieving	That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn, with the TTPP Project stopped and funded no further. Rather, such funding should go into Hazard Mitigation initiatives, such as a Westport Floodwall.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					nothing - and certainly showing no empathy in terms of what the consequences are of the approach being taken.	
Kenneth Wiltshire (S749)	S749.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	<p>Communication has been inadequate and inappropriate. It should have been via letter or email directly to the property owner - not by "word of mouth" or Facebook.</p> <p>There has been "digital exclusion" around the mapping tool. The LiDAR approach is very poor and very user unfriendly as a programme - being virtually impossible to access by lay persons. this effectively excludes over half the interested parties from being properly informed.</p>	Withdraw the Variation
Kenneth Wiltshire (S749)	S749.004	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	<p>Assumptions and propositions are scientifically invalid and untestable. In particular, the one metre rise in sea level over 100 years is hypothetical only. It takes no account of topography, and beyond minimal photographic comparisons, there is little evidence of scientific measurement or research on coastal processes to show erosion and deposition cycles, river change courses and flooding data over time. There have, for instance been NO studies of beach profiles or attrition rates along the Ngakawau Straight between 11 Main Road and Torea Street. Yet this area has been included within the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay, devaluing property and</p>	That risk categorisation - and particularly with respect to Ngakawau Road - be better informed, by taking into account the sea wall constructed by NZTA.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					suggesting both State Highway 67 and the electricity distribution network to Karamea are under threat.	
Paul Reynolds (S756)	S756.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	The proposed maps are based on unreliable data. particularly the claim that sea level will rise by one metre over the next 100 years is unsupported by credible evidence Given this, the consequential economic burdens placed on property owners - due to insurance costs, property values, etc. - cannot be justified. It is essential that the data be more reliable for something with potentially draconian consequences.	That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be deferred - until such time a s more reliable data is available.
Rachael Blick (S758)	S758.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	The property concerned has never flooded in 16 years of residence, and house is built up high. Neighbours didn't get the letter - in fact was only one in the street who got the letter. Has been no inspection, and believes the exercise to be nothing more than a "land grab".	That 153 Peel Street Westport have any of the Coastal Hazard Overlays concerned removed from it.
Charlotte May Treasurer (S762)	S762.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	Re: Northern Buller Museum Granity Trust at 54 Back Road Granity. February 2022 flood did leave silt in grounds and building of Museum, But was due to culvert being blocked with debris, NOT flooding of Granity Creek. And was due to Council and KiwiRail failing to clear culverts. Truth is not being told.	That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn
Charlotte May Treasurer (S762)	S762.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	Answer for Westport is to move it.	That moving affected settlements be looked at.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Anthea Keenan (S763)	S763.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	<p>Has raised concerns about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Cost inefficiencies of TTPP process - i.e. budget of \$1.7m, but spending now \$5m (and across @3,000 rateable properties; and - "Politics" of debt - and feeling that ratepayers received nothing in return <p>Overall point re: Variation 2 is that the mapping has caused further confusion</p>	Not stated

Appendix 2: Submissions on Variation 2 that are Submissions Points Relating to Other Parts of the Plan

Submissions on Policies

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.046	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Policies	Amend	Further to Submission point S467.045, Policies NH_P1 to NH-P3, plus any new Policies recommended that will have relevance to the Coastal Hazard Overlays affected by Variation 2 should be able to be commented on when and where the Overlay has changed relative to a given property.	That when and where Variation 2 has altered the Coastal Natural Hazard Overlay applying to a given property, persons so affected be able to comment on Policies NH-P1 to NH-P3 plus any new policies of relevance, in addition to the change in mapping itself.
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.050	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Policies	Amend	As Variation 2 has altered the extent of the hazard overlays, and in some cases which hazard overlay applies it is appropriate for people who have properties affected by Variation 2 to be able to address all of the relevant provisions on the Plan that apply.	Create a new policy for natural hazards alert overlay. Ensure that the policy recognises that the appropriate management response in the policies applying in the Coastal Hazard Alert areas is mitigation, not avoidance.
Desna Bruce Walker (S692)	S692.005	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Policies	Oppose	All individual owners have had thus far is the notice, the public meeting in Westport (with a Carters Beach Meeting of 28 July 2024 not attended, despite invitation), and extension of the initial closing date for submissions to 30 August 2024. Initial communication (via letter) was very poor, with insufficient information contained. Many are concerned about effects on property values and insurance costs, transition and relocation costs, do not favour a regulatory approach, and believe more should be spent on coastal protection works. And such feedback has not been listened to.	That engagement with the community, especially owners of affected properties, be more thorough, transparent and clear (informing owners individually), with "managed retreat" removed as an option unless a property is in immediate danger..
Michael Rogers (S709)	S709.001	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Policies	Support	Overall, the provisions for Natural Hazards - and particularly the Policies - are supported. But the Natural Hazard Overlays and their generation is not.	That the Natural Hazard Policies - of the TTPP, as originally notified in the natural Hazards Chapter, be retained.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Mitchell Rogers (S710)	S710.001	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Policies	Support in part	The Natural Hazards Policies provide for existing structures to be maintained, but guidance is lacking as to how protection measures should be designed and what thresholds make a property uninhabitable. Local communities have already taken action to prevent inundation - including seawalls, enhanced drains and pumps. The process needs to be formalised.	That existing protection structures and provision for their maintenance are included in the Planning.
Mitchell Rogers (S710)	S710.002	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Policies	Amend	National guidance is required on how to incorporate the effects of climate change into development. The Environmental Defence Society has drafted some documents, providing a good plan for this. This should be incorporated into the Policies, applying both national directions and local solutions, to give communities clear guidance on what can and should be done, e.g: - Where to put protective structures; -Where to adapt properties; -When to abandon properties; -How to be compensated, etc.	That Climate Change planning be incorporated into the Natural Hazards policies.
Paparoa Track Services Ltd, Craig and Sue Findlay, Tim Findlay, Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd (S605)	S605.045	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Policies	Oppose	Assumptions and propositions are scientifically invalid and untestable. In particular, the one metre rise in sea level over 100 years is hypothetical only. It takes no account of topography, and beyond minimal photographic comparisons, there is little evidence of scientific measurement or research on coastal processes to show erosion and deposition cycles, river change courses and flooding data over time. There have, for instance been NO studies of beach profiles or attrition rates along the Ngakawau Straight between 11 Main Road and Torea Street. Yet this area has	That submissions on the objectives and policies that relate to the Coastal Natural Hazards are further considered alongside the Rules and Variation 2 at the same hearing.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					been included within the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay, devaluing property and suggesting both State Highway 67 and the electricity distribution network to Karamea are under threat.	
Kenneth Wiltshire (S749)	S749.006	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Policies	Amend	Mitigation plans and damage minimisation, including progressive, proactive retreat, receive very brief mention only. There is certainly no discussion as to HOW such outcomes are to be achieved, with no real guidance offered to local Councils. This is arguably a nationwide problem, requiring Government commitment and support to address. Certainly there is nothing to suggest HOW such matters should be addressed going forward, despite arguably \$ billions in costs with potentially millions affected. There are potentially NUMEROUS options to better protect properties and infrastructure from coastal erosion and inundation.	That the Plan text include mitigation plans for national hazards, so as to guide both Councils and ratepayers/owners as to what remedial action may be undertaken in the short, medium and long terms.
Mary Stewart (S222)	S222.004	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Policies	Oppose	Is concerned about the impact of the coastal hazards identification on rates, and the amount of protection provided for Karamea. I have a number of questions about how this will be managed in the future - how will access to Karamea be maintained, will protection works be upgraded, will we be required to retreat.	That proactive measures be implemented to ensure that Karamea area is future proofed with adequate seawalls and river stop banks.
Mandy Deans (S549)	S549.004	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Policies	Oppose	There is really no need for such an Overlay - or certainly to the extent that it imposes such penalties and constrains residents. Rather, ratepayers should be facilitated in their ability to respond to the erosion threat by carrying out mitigation works - such as the bund installed by ratepayers in 2016. The WCRC should ideally grant a West Coast-wide resource consent for erosion protection works, which would enable e.g. works to alter the	We have been asking WCRC for a number of years for a Resource Consent to be set up for changing the Arawhata River mouth, should it be necessary. We ask now that you continue to explore the implementation of one Resource Consent for the whole of the West Coast, for doing works to reduce erosion. We see this as a logical and timely application that would assist all coastal communities.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Arawhata River mouth (to align the outlet in a manner that promotes beach accretion, c.f. erosion) at Neils Beach and various other such works elsewhere.	
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.047	Natural Hazards	NHP1	Amend	As Variation 2 has altered the extent of the hazard overlays, and in some cases which hazard overlay applies it is appropriate for people who have properties affected by Variation 2 to be able to address all of the relevant provisions on the Plan that apply.	Ensure that the policies recognise that the appropriate management response in the policies applying in the Coastal Hazard Alert areas is mitigation, not avoidance.
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.048	Natural Hazards	NHP3	Amend	As Variation 2 has altered the extent of the hazard overlays, and in some cases which hazard overlay applies it is appropriate for people who have properties affected by Variation 2 to be able to address all of the relevant provisions on the Plan that apply.	Ensure that the policies recognise that the appropriate management response in the policies applying in the Coastal Hazard Alert areas is mitigation, not avoidance.
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.049	Natural Hazards	NHP5	Amend	As Variation 2 has altered the extent of the hazard overlays, and in some cases which hazard overlay applies it is appropriate for people who have properties affected by Variation 2 to be able to address all of the relevant provisions on the Plan that apply.	Ensure that the policies recognise that the appropriate management response in the policies applying in the Coastal Hazard Alert areas is mitigation, not avoidance.

Submissions on Rules

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Forest Habitats Limited (S186)	S186.005	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Support in part	It is in fact clear that properties outside the hazard mapped areas are not being thoroughly assessed - e.g. Golf Links Road subdivision, which a subsequent assessment by a Registered Engineer confirms is in fact at risk of flooding. This is consistent with submission point S488.020 in the WCRC submission on the TTPP, which concludes that hazard maps do not follow contours and need further refinement to determine which areas are in fact subject to natural hazard risk. Reliance on general studies alone is placing undue restrictions on some property owners.	That the Natural Hazards Rules make it clear that site specific investigations by a registered Engineer - assessing flood levels and proposing mitigation measures such as minimum floor levels, and based on detailed topographical information - should take precedence over hazard mapping, which is based on high level, often out of date, modelling.
Michael Snowden (S492)	S492.015	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	While Variation 2 concerns Coastal Natural Hazards MAPPING, Rules relevant to the Variation require greater clarification - particularly in terms of legal effect/operative status, in relation to consents given effect to, previous subdivisions and existing use rights. Clarity is required as to what "lawfully established" means, while certain rules are unnecessarily restrictive. Particular Changes to Rules sought are set out in submission points 492.016 to 492.019 below. Should these not be possible, then additional, alternative, consequential or otherwise necessary changes to the Rules generally may be sought.	That the Rules in the Natural Hazards Chapter that are of relevance to Variation 2 are given greater clarity with respect to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Legal effect/operative effect of the Rule; - Savings/exemptions when resource consents are granted and/or implemented ahead of the Rule itself becoming Operative; - Existing use rights apply; and The meaning of "lawfully established (with that to be consistent with such terminology in the RMA).
Neils Beach Special Rating District Committee John Sutton (S669)	S669.003	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	Driftwood on beaches also aids dune rebuilding. The WCRC and Westland DC should work together to ensure that driftwood gathering (principally undertaken to provide firewood) is	Address the possible regulation of Driftwood gathering in an appropriate section of the TTPP to ensure it does not undermine the dune rebuilding process. Identify a specific driftwood collection area or alternatively a driftwood collection

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					regulated to ensure it takes place away from areas where its presence is vital to dune rebuilding. This would be as part of the Regional Land and Water Plan and existing Westland District Plan, with the latter carrying through to the TTPP.	exclusion zone.
Allison Sutton (S672)	S672.003	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	The Arawata River mouth acts as a natural, ongoing provider of replenishment material at Neils Beach. The NIWA Report of 2016 confirms that this is providing the mouth is aligned north/northwest (as typically occurring following floods) c.f. a tendency to veer east over time. Allowing river realignment works to "correct" such an unfavourable veering eastwards as a Permitted Activity would facilitate dune rebuilding. And this should be a Permitted Activity, because any need to apply for resource consent would be costly, while facilitating such an exercise would be a cost-effective means of hazard mitigation for ratepayers.	That the TTPP provide a new permitted activity for special rating districts for river realignment works including at the Arawata River mouth to support erosion mitigation and accretion facilitation at Neils Beach.
Barbara Clark (S673)	S673.002	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	Aware from a previous talk in Nelson on Climate Change that "triggers" can be used to decide when properties are at risk. Feeling is that present approach is somewhat of a "blunt hammer" (i.e. too undifferentiated and too harsh)	That a triggered, stage and conditional process for when land must be abandoned is adopted.
Biggles Limited (S685)	S685.002	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	- There are significant changes introduced by the Variation; and It is therefore essential that all affected landowners, including the Submitter, can participate in discussions to provide input on what are significant modifications. In particular, such Rules need to be clear and unambiguous in relation to lawfully established activities (including by subdivision consents partially given effect	That the respective Rules are amended to protect existing and consented residential activities and buildings, including extensions and modifications to existing residential buildings, by providing for them as a Permitted Activity; And That any additional or consequential relief necessary to properly address the issues raised in this submission is granted. This includes alternative, consequential, or necessary amendments to both the proposed TTPP and the

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>to and other existing use rights, while some Rules are unnecessarily restrictive, specifically:</p> <p>This is consistent with Policy 25 of the NZCPS, that avoiding increasing risk, c.f. blanket risk avoidance or risk reduction, should be the approach.</p> <p>-</p>	District Plan, as required to fully implement the requested changes and ensure that all relevant matters are adequately addressed.
Finn Lindqvist (S694)	S694.001	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	<p>Recognise no modelling is "perfect"(in fact proving only 40% reliable during 2022 New Zealand storms), while sea level rise estimates themselves take no note of land rise via tectonic processes (which has been documented at Neils Beach). Want to see stringent, somewhat draconian Rules applying to such overlays modified (e.g. along lines of Tasman District Council approach in Ruby Bay. That refers to "adaptation building" - applying floor levels above sea level and encouraging use of relocatable buildings. Approach as it stands threatens to "wipe out" small coastal communities like Neils Beach.</p>	That Rules NH-R38 to NH-R46, applying to the Coastal Natural Hazard Overlays concerned be modified by a more nuanced approach, consistent with the Government's Coastal Hazards and Climate Change Guidance" Document (2024). Additional rooms and new dwellings with floor heights above sea level and relocatable buildings should be permitted within the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay.
MTP Limited (S711)	S711.002	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	<p>The associated Coastal Hazard Overlay Rules applying to those Overlays affected by Variation 2 are opposed, because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The mapping concerned has fundamentally altered the planning framework for property owners so affected; - The Rules themselves are directly derived from the overlays, which are now themselves being revised; - There are significant changes introduced by the Variation; and <p>It is therefore essential that all affected landowners, including the Submitter, can</p>	<p>That the respective Rules are amended to protect existing and consented residential activities and buildings, including extensions and modifications to existing residential buildings, by providing for them as a Permitted Activity;</p> <p>And</p> <p>That any additional or consequential relief necessary to properly address the issues raised in this submission is granted. This includes alternative, consequential, or necessary amendments to both the proposed TTPP and the District Plan, as required to fully implement the requested changes and ensure that all relevant</p>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					participate in discussions to provide input on what are significant modifications. In particular, such Rules need to be clear and unambiguous in relation to lawfully established activities (including by subdivision consents partially given effect to and other existing use rights, while some Rules are unnecessarily restrictive, specifically:	matters are adequately addressed.
Murray & Rachel Petrie (S712)	S712.002	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	That erosion is occurring is not in dispute - but 100 years is a time in which much can change. Such Overlays effectively apply Rules which constrain development, but do nothing to protect people and properties (including their values)	Such Rules need to be refocussed - and through community engagement - so that they ensure community viability and sustainability, c.f. "chasing people out" That feedback on the sources of information be provided, confirming its accuracy and how it could be better responded to.
Rod Thornton (S724)	S724.001	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	Effects of Climate Change are acknowledged, and no issue is raised with respect to mapping alterations, BUT RULES APPLYING TO the Coastal Hazard - Severe and Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlays are opposed. Specifically, the Rules as they stand: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impinge on personal choice and property rights to too great an extent; - Create a scenario in which technical evidence to support proposals is unknown, and can easily burgeon out; - Don't consider possible mitigation measures or alternative uses; - Create potential "vested interests" for some pushing particular agendas (e.g. "managed retreat"); - Are based on questionable assumptions (e.g. 100 year events, one metre rise in sea level); - Have been justified by some on a "don't panic" or "doesn't effect existing use 	That the Rules applying to the Overlays concerned are further investigated and amended accordingly.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					rights" basis - but that hides the real truth; and - Doesn't allow for possible changes in processes, cycles, etc. Further investigation of the Rules applying is necessary.	
Rod Thornton (S724)	S724.002	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Oppose	Rules Applying to the Coastal Hazard - Severe and Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlays are opposed. Specifically, the Rules as they stand: - Impinge on personal choice and property rights to too great an extent; - Create a scenario in which technical evidence to support proposals is unknown, and can easily burgeon out; - Don't consider possible mitigation measures or alternative uses; - Create potential "vested interests" for some pushing particular agendas (e.g. "managed retreat"); - Are based on questionable assumptions (e.g. 100 year events, one metre rise in sea level); - Have been justified by some on a "don't panic" or "doesn't effect existing use rights" basis - but that hides the real truth; and - Doesn't allow for possible changes in processes, cycles, etc. Further investigation of the Rules applying is necessary.	That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping not proceed - with the status quo to remain.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.0514	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Neutral	Given the topography of the Region, it is inevitable that elements of Westpower's 2,229 circuit kilometres of lines, cables and other infrastructure needs to be sited within areas subject to Natural Hazard Overlays. Westpower supports the use of up to date data to inform hazard risk, and this has no problems with the Variation	That notwithstanding any Changes to Overlays resulting from Variation 2: Coastal natural Hazards mapping, the TPPP continue to encourage and provide for the continued distribution of electricity to the community and Westpower's other activities associated with this as "Regionally Significant Infrastructure".

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					itself - just that this network could be potentially further impacted by the Variation modifying the Coastal Hazard-type Overlays. Westpower therefore seeks a comprehensive, integrated and strategic approach to the distribution and supply of electricity throughout the West Coast, including the ability to continue such supply, notwithstanding any such changes. It is understood that no changes have been made to the Natural Hazard Rules, with Westpower's earlier submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter itself remaining unchanged.	
Charlotte May Treasurer (S762)	S762.003	Natural Hazards	All Natural Hazard Overlays	Oppose	Approach to Natural Hazard threats is excessive - and driving people away from the region.	That the overall approach/response to coastal erosion and inundation be reconsidered.
Neils Beach Special Rating District Committee John Sutton (S669)	S669.002	Natural Hazards	Permitted Activities	Amend	Consistent with the above, the Neils Beach Special Rating District Committee has in fact asked the WCRC to consider allowing river mouth realignment works to be undertaken as a Permitted Activity (in accordance with the Regional Land and Water Plan) - so as to ensure any movement of the mouth eastwards can be "corrected", thereby enabling beach replenishment to continue.	Include a new Permitted Activity to allow river out realignment works for Special Rating Districts.
John Sutton (S704)	S704.003	Natural Hazards	Permitted Activities	Amend	Driftwood on beaches also aids dune rebuilding. The WCRC and Westland DC should work together to ensure that driftwood gathering (principally undertaken to provide firewood) is regulated to ensure it takes place away from areas where its presence is vital to dune rebuilding. This would be as part of the Regional Land and Water Plan and existing Westland District Plan, with the latter carrying through to the TTPP.	Address the possible regulation of Driftwood gathering in an appropriate section of the TTPP. This could include either the identification of areas for collection, or exclusion zones.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
MTP Limited (S711)	S711.006	Natural Hazards	Permitted Activities	Amend	This is consistent with Policy 25 of the NZCPS, that avoiding increasing risk, c.f. blanket risk avoidance or risk reduction, should be the approach.	Permitted Activities under Rules NH-R1 and NH-R38 should be expanded to include provision for existing structures.
P & A Horrell (S715)	S715.006	Natural Hazards	Permitted Activities	Amend	This is consistent with Policy 25 of the NZCPS, that avoiding increasing risk, c.f. blanket risk avoidance or risk reduction, should be the approach.	Permitted Activities under Rules NH-R1 and NH-R38 should be expanded to include provision for existing structures.
Vance & Carol Boyd (S447)	S447.018	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Amend	the statuses of some activities under proposed TTPP rules relevant to the Variation are unnecessarily restrictive and should be reduced.	Amend NH - R1 as follows: Reconstruction and Replacement of Lawfully Established Buildings in all Natural Hazard Overlays Activity Status Permitted Where: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7. This is the reconstruction/replacement of a building lawfully established at the time of notification of the Plan; 8. <u>This is the reconstruction, replacement, or reasonable extension of an existing structure which has either obtained resource consent, or been lawfully established at the time the Plan becomes operative; and</u> 9. The building has been destroyed or substantially damaged due to fire, natural disaster or Act of God; 10. The destroyed/damaged building is reconstructed or replaced within 5 2 years in the Westport Hazard, Coastal Severe and Flood Severe Overlays; 11. The destroyed/damaged building is reconstructed or replaced within 5 years in all other natural hazard overlays; and 12. The reconstructed/replaced building is similar in character, intensity and scale to the building that it replaces.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Michael Snowden (S492)	S492.016	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Amend	Consistent with Submission point S492.015, Rule NH-R1 should be expanded to include rebuilds and reasonable extensions of existing structures (as of the date the proposed TTPP Rule gains legal effect or becomes operative) as a Permitted Activity.	That Rule NH-R1 be expanded to include rebuilds and reasonable extensions of existing structures (as of the date the proposed TTPP Rule gains legal effect or becomes operative) as a Permitted Activity.
Biggles Limited (S685)	S685.006	Natural Hazards	Permitted Activities	Support	Rules need to be clear and unambiguous in relation to lawfully established activities (including by subdivision consents partially given effect to and other existing use rights, while some Rules are unnecessarily restrictive	Permitted Activities under Rules NH-R1 and NH-R38 should be expanded to include provision for existing structures.
John Sutton (S704)	S704.002	Natural Hazards	Permitted Activities	Amend	Consistent with the above, the Neils Beach Special Rating District Committee has in fact asked the WCRC to consider allowing river mouth realignment works to be undertaken as a Permitted Activity (in accordance with the Regional Land and Water Plan) - so as to ensure any movement of the mouth eastwards can be "corrected", thereby enabling beach replenishment to continue.	That a Permitted Activity that allows for river mouth realignment works undertaken by a Special Rating District Committee be included in the Plan.
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.042	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	The five year timeframe for building a home on properties subject to the Coastal Hazard - Severe and Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlays is unduly restrictive. It is unduly restrictive, given there are transportable or tiny home options.	That the five year restriction on building within the Coastal Hazard - Severe and Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlays be removed.
Vance & Carol Boyd (S447)	S447.019	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	the statuses of some activities under proposed TTPP rules relevant to the Variation are unnecessarily restrictive and should be reduced.	Amend the rule as follows: Where: 4. For repairs and maintenance there is no increase in the area of the building;

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>5. <u>For the rebuild or reasonable extension of an existing structure which has either obtained resource consent or been lawfully established at the time the Plan becomes operative;</u></p> <p>6. For reconstruction of a building lawfully established at the time of notification of the Plan where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The building has been destroyed or substantially damaged due to fire, natural disaster or Act of God; 2. The destroyed/damaged building is reconstructed within 5 years in the Coastal Alert overlay and 2 years in the Coastal Severe overlay; 3. The reconstructed building is similar in character, intensity and scale to the building it replaces.
Michael Snowden (S492)	S492.017	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	Consistent with Submission point S492.015, Rule NH-R38 should be expanded to include rebuilds and reasonable extensions of existing structures (as of the date the proposed TTPP Rule gains legal effect or becomes operative) as a Permitted Activity.	That Rule NH-R38 be expanded to include rebuilds and reasonable extensions of existing structures (as of the date the proposed TTPP Rule gains legal effect or becomes operative) as a Permitted Activity.
Vance & Carol Boyd (S447)	S447.020	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Amend	the statuses of some activities under proposed TTPP rules relevant to the Variation are unnecessarily restrictive and should be reduced.	Amend to be a Restricted Discretionary Activity
Vance & Carol Boyd (S447)	S447.021	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Amend	the statuses of some activities under proposed TTPP rules relevant to the Variation are unnecessarily restrictive and should be reduced.	Alternative Relief - amend as follows: <u>Activity Status Restricted Discretionary</u> Where: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>These are located within a single title subdivided for lifestyle or residential purposes at the time the Plan becomes operative.</u>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Biggles Limited (S685)	S685.004	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Oppose	Rules need to be clear and unambiguous in relation to lawfully established activities (including by subdivision consents partially given effect to and other existing use rights, while some Rules are unnecessarily restrictive	Rule NH-R43 should be Restricted Discretionary Activities
MTP Limited (S711)	S711.004	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Oppose	Rules are unnecessarily restrictive	Rule NH-R43 should be a Restricted Discretionary Activity
P & A Horrell (S715)	S715.004	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Oppose	Rules are unnecessarily restrictive,	Rules NH-R43 should be Restricted Discretionary Activity
Vance & Carol Boyd (S447)	S447.022	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Amend	the statuses of some activities under proposed TTPP rules relevant to the Variation are unnecessarily restrictive and should be reduced	Amend to Restricted Discretionary Activity
Vance & Carol Boyd (S447)	S447.023	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Amend	the statuses of some activities under proposed TTPP rules relevant to the Variation are unnecessarily restrictive and should be reduced	Alternative Relief: Amend as follows: <u>Activity Status Restricted Discretionary Where:</u> <u>1. These are located within a single title subdivided for lifestyle or residential purposes at the time the Plan gains legal effect.</u>
Michael Snowden (S492)	S492.019	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Amend	Consistent with Submission point S492.015, Rule NH-R44 should move from a Non-Complying Activity to a Restricted Discretionary Activity. Alternatively, Rule NH-44 should exclude single titles already subdivided for lifestyle or residential purposes as of the date that the proposed Rule gains legal effect or becomes operative.	That Rule NH-R44 move from a Non-Complying Activity to a Restricted Discretionary Activity. Alternatively, Rule NH-44 exclude single titles already subdivided for lifestyle or residential purposes as of the date that the proposed Rule gains legal effect or becomes operative.
Biggles Limited (S685)	S685.005	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Oppose	Rules need to be clear and unambiguous in relation to lawfully established activities (including by subdivision consents partially given effect to and other existing use rights, while some Rules are unnecessarily restrictive	Rule NH-R44 should be a Restricted Discretionary Activity
MTP Limited (S711)	S711.005	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Oppose	Rules are unnecessarily restrictive	Rule NH-R44 should be a Restricted Discretionary Activity

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
P & A Horrell (S715)	S715.005	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Oppose	Rules are unnecessarily restrictive,	Rule NH-R44 should be Restricted Discretionary Activity

Submissions on Westport Hazard Overlay

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Barbara Clark (S673)	S673.001	Natural Hazards	Westport Hazard Overlay	Oppose in part	<p>Initiatives like Westport NBS meeting appreciated and believe those working on TTPP well intentioned, but public typically lack technical knowledge and skills, so many groups are involved, and concerns about properties cannot be overlooked. Various conditions for managing impacts of climate change need to be differently managed.</p> <p>Own situation is one of having lived in Westport since June 2020, having moved into new home in July 2021 - just before big flood. Information on hazards had been lacking, and situation not helped by COVID-19.</p> <p>Many variables can affect a build or rebuild. Costs of inflation, updates to the Building Code, neighbourhood aesthetics and family requirements also need factoring in. Any restrictions need to be more "nuanced", e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Building on flood-prone land could be subject to a bond: and/or - Options can be looked at for provisions of services; and - Opportunity exists to include statements on LIMs and in Property Files. 	Remove all building conditions relating to the Buller Hazard Zone

Appendix 3



10 October 2024

Dear Sir/Madam

**Proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan: Variation 2 – Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping:
Summary of Submissions and Opportunity to Make Further Submissions**

Thank you for your submission on Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping to the Te Tai o Poutini Plan (TTPP).

A total of 112 submissions were received. The TTPP Committee has now summarised these submissions and is inviting further submissions to be made.

Further submissions may only be lodged by:

- A person or organisation representing a relevant aspect of the public interest;
- A person or organisation that has an interest in the Variation greater than that of the general public. This includes all persons who lodged submissions on the Variation; and
- All local authorities affected by the Variation.

You are receiving this notice about further submissions, because you submitted on Variation 2, or meet one of the three categories above and are entitled to lodge a further submission.

Attached are:

- A copy of the public notice;
- The summary of submissions received; and
- A further submission form.

Please note if you are making a further submission, it can only be about the points raised in one or more of the submissions in the summary table and can only be to express your support or opposition to all or any part of the submission(s). There is no opportunity to raise new points or support/oppose points not identified in the summary of submissions received. If you make a further submission, you can be heard in support of it, and you also have the opportunity to present a joint case with others who make similar submissions if you wish.

Further submissions close **5.00pm, Friday 25 October 2024**. If you make a further submission on Variation 2, within the following five days you must also send a copy of your further submission to the relevant person who made the original submission.

Further details are available on the attachments or on the TTPP website: [Variation 2 - Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping - Te Tai o Poutini Plan | West Coast District Plan \(ttpp.nz\)](https://www.ttpp.nz/variation-2-coastal-natural-hazards-mapping-te-tai-o-poutini-plan-west-coast-district-plan). The TTPP Team can be contacted at info@ttpp.nz or phone: 03 768 0466 / 0508 800 118.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Rex Williams', written over a horizontal line.

Rex Williams
Chair Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee



Summary of Submissions on Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping to the Proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan (TTPP)

This Variation was subject to Public Notification in accordance with Clause 5 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). A Public Notice was placed in the Westport News, Greymouth Star and Hokitika Guardian, calling for submissions. In addition, notice of the Variation was served on 4,000 coastal properties across the West Coast Region, plus the following:

- Ministry for the Environment
- Department of Conservation
- Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Waewae
- Te Rūnanga o Makaawhio
- West Coast Regional Council
- Buller District Council
- Grey District Council
- Westland District Council

Copies of the Variation documents were placed in the Buller, Grey and Westland District Council Offices, the Westport, Greymouth and Hokitika Public Libraries and the West Coast Regional Council Offices. This included a set of the maps at each location. The Variation 2 page on the TTPP Website included access to a Map Viewer, enabling the Coastal Hazard Overlays concerned, and whether or not they had been altered by the Variation to be viewed relative to individual properties.

The Variation affected the following three Natural Hazard Overlays in the TTPP:

- Coastal Hazard – Severe
- Coastal Hazard – Alert
- Coastal Hazard – Setback

The closing date for submissions was Friday 30 August 2024 at 5.00pm. 112 Submissions were received. These are summarised by Submission point in the following two Attachments:

- Appendix 1: Plan Sections: Natural Hazards, Natural Hazards Maps – Coastal Hazards Variation Maps
- Appendix 2: Submissions on Variation 2 that are Submission Points Relating to Other Parts of the Plan

Submission points in the latter Attachment did not specifically address the Variation (i.e. Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping) itself, and so could not be accepted as submissions on Variation 2 itself. The TTPP Committee has, however agreed to accept these as “late submissions” to the TTPP itself, meaning that further submissions on these submissions can also be made.

Further submissions may now be lodged on the above submissions received. The following persons or organisations may lodge further submissions:

- Any person or organisation representing a relevant aspect of the public interest;

- Any person or organisation that has an interest in the Variation that is greater than that of the general public. This includes anyone who lodged an initial submission; and
- The four local authorities involved – being the Buller, Grey and Westland District Councils and the West Coast Regional Council

Further submissions can only be about the points raised in one or more of the above submissions and must be limited to supporting or opposing the submission(s) either in whole or in part. Any persons or organisations lodging a further submission may request to be heard in support of it, and will also have the opportunity to present a joint case with others who make similar submissions.

Further submissions close **at 5.00pm on Friday 25 October 2024**. Within five days of a further submission being lodged, any further submitter must also serve a copy of it on the submitter whose points that were supported or opposed. Contact details for the initial submitters are as follows:

- Mary Stewart (Submitter 222) – mary.ada.stewart@gmail.com
- David and Janice McMillan (Submitter 670) – gidday2U@xtra.co.nz
- Dee Deaker (Submitter 691) – deakerdeanaccounts@mail.com
- Mark Vanstone (Submitter 708) – sundogsurf@gmail.com
- Kenneth Wiltshire (Submitter 749) – ken.wiltshire@yahoo.co.nz
- Jane Whyte and Jeff Page (Submitter 467) – jane@responseplanning.co.nz
- Mandy Deans (Submitter 549) – mandydeans@yahoo.com
- Paparoa Track Services Ltd, Craig and Sue Findlay, Tim Findlay, Punakaiki Beach Camp (Submitter 605) – Jorja.Hunt@tpri.co.nz
- Dave Henderson (Submitter 742) – 12 Russell Street Westport 7825
- David Hughes (Submitter 743) – 322 Palmerston Street Westport 7825
- Les and Kathy McManaway (Submitter 751) – lesmcmanaway@outlook.com
- Lynda Reynolds (Submitter 752) – 294 Utopia Road Westport
- Marilyn McKinney (Submitter 753) – 171B Peel Street Westport 7825
- Maxmillion Donnelly (submitter 754) – beachcoast9@gmail.com
- Patricia Paxton (Submitter 755) – p.a.paxton@gmail.com
- Piet and Alison Geldenhuys (Submitter 757) – pietg@xtra.co.nz
- Ray Karl (Submitter 759) – raykarl@xtra.co.nz
- Ronald Williams (Submitter 760) – 105 Domett Street Westport 7825
- Wendy Sheenan (Submitter 761) – wendyandleesa@hotmail.com
- Desna Bruce-Walker (Submitter 692) – desnabruce@gmail.com
- Michael Rogers (Submitter 709) – rockiesmining@hotmail.co.nz
- Mitchell Rogers (Submitter 710) – mitchellrrogers@hotmail.com
- Forest Habitats Ltd (Submitter 186) – barry@macdonellconsulting.co.nz
- Michael Snowden (Submitter 492) – rosie.hill@toddandwalker.com and ben.russell@toddandwalker.com
- Barbara Clark (Submitter 673) – luapema90@gmail.com
- Biggles Ltd (Submitter 685) – brett@townplanning.co.nz
- Neils Beach Special Rating District Committee (Submitter 669) – john.allisonsutton@xtra.co.nz
- Allison Sutton (Submitter 672) – suttonoffice@xtra.co.nz
- Finn Lindqvist (Submitter 694) – suelind.nz@gmail.com
- MTP Ltd (Submitter 711) – brett@townplanning.co.nz
- Murray and Rachel Petrie (Submitter 712) – murray@mcarthurridge.co.nz
- Rod Thornton (Submitter 724) – rodthornton663@gmail.com
- Westpower Ltd (Submitter 547) – MartinK@xtra.co.nz
- Charlotte May (Submitter 762) – maylord@xtra.co.nz
- John Sutton (Submitter 704) – john.allisonsutton@xtra.co.nz

- P & A Horrell (Submitter 715) – brett@townplanning.co.nz
- Vance and Carol Boyd (Submitter 447) – rvcnb@xtra.co.nz
- Karen Lippiatt (Submitter 439) – kairlippiat@gmail.com
- Chris Reynolds (Submitter 362) – c.w.reynolds@xtra.co.nz
- Laurence Rueter (Submitter 381) – jlymaneric@gmail.com
- Richard Arlidge (Submitter 419) – whitecube1@gmail.com
- Lyn McIntosh (Submitter 469) – lynmcintosh@xtra.co.nz
- Frank O’Toole (Submitter 595) – anna@blg.nz
- Grey District Council (Submitter 608) – michael.mcenaney@greydc.govt.nz
- Gary Clarke (Submitter 667) – jacken@connorslegal.co.nz
- Anna Leary (Submitter 668) – anna@annaleary.com
- Brette & Irene-Sharel Kokshoorn (Submitter 671) – sharel.kockshoorn@jamesprint.co.nz
- Helen & Tom Sawyers (Submitter 674) – h.tsawyers@xtra.co.nz
- Joshua Tranter (Submitter 675) – joshmarkt@gmail.com
- Mike MacMillan (Submitter 677) – PO Box 141 Karamea 7864
- Adriana James (Submitter 678) – adriana.james59@gmail.com
- Adrienne Fraser (Submitter 679) – elizafraser275@gmail.com
- Alexa Kliebenstein (Submitter 680) – alexa.a.kliebenstein@gmail.com
- Andrew Dempster (Submitter 681) – sherwoodrabbit42@gmail.com
- Andrew Lisseman (Submitter 682) – andylissemann@gmail.com
- Andrew Wiffen (Submitter 683) – wiffendairying@gmail.com
- Ash Oldham (Submitter 684) – 1928chord@gmail.com
- Brian McFarlane (Submitter 686) – bdmcfarlane@xtra.co.nz
- Christine Carter (Submitter 687) – 080026well@gmail.com
- Colman Creagh (Submitter 688) – 2 Anderson Street Rapahoe 7803
- Craig Hipson (Submitter 689) – craig.hipson@icloud.com
- David Gourlay (Submitter 690) – davegourlay@yahoo.com.au
- Elizabeth Duncan (Submitter 693) – ejaneaustin@hotmail.com
- Daniel Reynolds (Submitter 695) – danreynoldsconsulting@gmail.com
- George Field (Submitter 696) – georgefield86@gmail.com
- Glen Kingan (Submitter 679) – office@karameahelicharter.co.nz
- Jason Jacobs (Submitter 698) – sharkjas@yahoo.co.nz
- Jim and Anne Murray (Submitter 699) – glenmorestation@xtra.co.nz
- Jocelyn Billet (Submitter 700) – joel.luzanne@outlook.com
- Joey Keen (Submitter 701) – njkeens@gmail.com
- John and Suzanne Willetts (Submitter 702) – s.willetts@xtra.co.nz
- John Phillips (Submitter 703) – 78 Domett Esplanade Greymouth 7802
- Karamea Aerodrome Inc (Submitter 705) – karameaaeroinc@gmail.com
- Irene and Ken Tiller (Submitter 706) – tillerbay7@gmail.com
- Kevin Smith (Submitter 707) – kevinsmith.kiwi@gmail.com
- Murray Gibson (Submitter 713) – mrgibson@xtra.co.nz
- Nicholas Keen (Submitter 714) – nicholas.keen@police.govt.nz
- Paul Drake (Submitter 716) – ekard@slingshot.co.nz
- Paul Fraser (Submitter 717) – outtarange12@gmail.com
- Paul Murray (Submitter 718) – paulm@pb.co.nz
- Paul Scott (Submitter 719) – scottptgy@xtra.co.nz
- Prue and Daimon Schawalger (Submitter 720) – prue55@hotmail.com
- Punakaiki Farm Ltd (Submitter 721) – info@pancake-rocks.co.nz
- Rae Reynolds (Submitter 722) – rae.reynolds@gmail.com

- Rebecca Blackhurst (Submitter 723) – rebecca_blackst@hotmail.com
- Ros Bradley (Submitter 725) – rosb17@outlook.com
- Sam Carter (Submitter 726) – samcarter2013@gmail.com
- Stephen and Pauline Tranter (Submitter 727) – paulinetranter7@gmail.com
- Steve Miller (Submitter 728) – solak9@yahoo.com
- Stuart Liddicoat (Submitter 729) – sliddicoat@electronet.co.nz
- Tania Reynolds (Submitter 730) – tania.reynolds@outlook.com
- Tom McGaveston (Submitter 731) – tom.mcgaveston@inforceglobal.com
- Trevor Reid (Submitter 732) – trevreid5@hotmail.com
- Vanessa Kingan (Submitter 733) – nesslewis@gmail.com
- Vicki Stevenson (Submitter 734) – michaelandvic@xtra.co.nz
- William Sage (Submitter 735) – wsage@xtra.co.nz
- Hans Gutenbrunner (Submitter 736) – h.gut@xtra.co.nz
- Laurie and Marlene Collins (Submitter 737) – lauriecollins42@gmail.com
- Susan Norgart (Submitter 738) – susannorgart@yahoo.co.uk
- Alan Paxton (Submitter 739) – p.a.paxton@gmail.com
- Ann Hamplough (Submitter 740) – 158B Peel Street Westport 7825
- Damer Farrell (Submitter 741) – damer@xtra.co.nz
- Derek Roberts (Submitter 744) – derekroberts119@gmail.com
- Grant Rowberry (Submitter 746) – grant.david.rowberry@gmail.com
- Jane Abraham (Submitter 747) – 133/1 Powerhouse Road Fairdown Westport 7891
- Janette Donaldson (Submitter 748) – janettekydd123@gmail.com
- Paul Reynolds (Submitter 756) – jfhoney56@gmail.com
- Rachael Blick (Submitter 758) – 153 Peel Street Westport 7825
- Hamish Macbeth – hlmacbeth@yahoo.com.au
- Garry Duckett – 459 Utopia Road Westport 7892
- Kerera Corbett-Manera – kereracorbettmanga@gmail.com
- Anthea Keenan (Submitter 759) – keenanr@kinect.co.nz

The Hearing for Variation 2 is scheduled to take place during the week 17 to 21 March 2025, and will include specific Hearings in Westport, at the NBS Theatre, Monday 17 to Tuesday 18 March 2025, and in Hokitika at the RSA on Thursday 20 and at the St Johns Room Friday 21 March 2025. All submitters and further submitters will be kept updated about the further submissions received and the scheduled hearing.

Further details are available on the attachments or at <https://tppp.nz/coastal-hazards-variation/> on the TTPP Website. The TTPP Team may be contacted at info@tppp.nz, 03 768 0466, or 0508 800 118.



Project Manager Update

1 August 2024 – 30 September 2024

Prepared By: Jo Armstrong
Date Prepared: 30 September 2024

Accomplishments this Period

- Section 42A officer’s reports for Natural Hazards, and the Coastal Environment have been commented on by the TAT, finalised and sent to submitters six weeks ahead of the scheduled hearings in October.
- August and September each had 2 days of hearings:
 - Rural Zones began in late July and concluded on 1 and 2 August. 12 people spoke on the final 2 days in Greymouth. An additional hearing for this topic was held in Christchurch on 26 August to hear experts present on one of the submissions.
 - The Signs and Noise hearing was held at WCRC on 4 and 5 September with 13 submitters and experts speaking to submissions.
- The next hearing topics are:
 - South Westland Natural Hazards (excluding coastal hazards) and Franz Josef zoning to be heard in Franz Josef on 8 and 9 October.
 - Natural Hazards (excluding coastal hazards) will continue to be heard along with the Coastal Environment in Westport on 22 and 23 October, and in Hokitika on 30 and 31 October.
- The Hearing Panel continue to undertake site visits to inform their recommendations reports to the Committee. Sites in Franz Josef and the Haast area will be visited in early October.
- The Hearing panel issues Minutes throughout the hearing and report writing process to update information about hearings and schedule changes, and to request further information to aid their decision making.
- The following Minutes have been issued since the last Report:

Minute Number	Topic
36	Postponement of the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity hearing to the week of 18 November 2024.
37	Following legal advice on two outstanding matters relating to methods and a permitted activity rule for SASM, planners were directed to provide a joint witness statement on the matters.
38	The West Coast Regional Council was directed to provide information about the

	potential cumulative effects of onsite wastewater disposal at proposed subdivisions at Moana and Cape Foulwind, if the zoning changes being sought by submitters were accepted.
39	Members of Resilient Westport are requested to attend a reconvened Residential and Rural Zones hearing in Westport on 19 or 20 November, to inform the panel about the Master-Planning process and how it overlaps with a number of rezoning requests in Buller.
40	Confirmed the change of hearing dates for Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity to 18-22 November 2024, and rescheduling of other hearings.
41	This Minute set out the updated timetable for the remaining hearings.
42	An extension for expert caucusing and provision of the joint witness statement for Mining and Mineral Extraction was granted.
43	Six submitters were granted an extension for providing evidence on Natural Hazards, as a report referred to in the S42A was not available on the TTPP website from the day the S42A was released.
44	Expert conferencing on the Noise topic was requested, with the joint witness statement due by 4 October 2024.
45	An extension was granted for delivery of the information on the cumulative effects of onsite wastewater disposal requested in Minute 38.

- All hearing panel Minutes can be found here: [Hearing of Submissions - Te Tai o Poutini Plan | West Coast District Plan \(tppp.nz\)](#)
- The further submissions period for Proposed Variation 1 to the TTPP: Commercial Activities on the Surface of Water (the 'Ports Variation') closed on 13 September 2024. No further submissions were received on this topic.
- Proposed Variation 2 to the TTPP: Coastal Natural Hazard Mapping submission period closed on 30 August 2024. The 112 submissions received have been summarised, and a 2-week further submissions period will be open in October.
- An update on TTPP hearings has been provided for a report to the West Coast Regional Council Resource Management Committee.
- Contract variations have been signed for the final stages of existing contracts, to bring the Natural Hazards and Coastal Environment to hearing and provide Rights of Reply.
- The Committee Chair has received a response to your time extension request from the Ministry for the Environment. The Ministry are seeking further information, including why the request was submitted late, the impacts of the delay on users and more detailed reasons for asking for an additional 18 months to produce an operative plan. A response will be drafted for your input.

Plans for Next Period





- Preparation and attendance at three sets of hearings in October
- Receive further submissions on Variation 2 – Coastal Natural Hazard Mapping
- Complete Rights of Reply for Rural Zone, SASM and Landscape topics
- Update WCRC Resource Management Committee

Key Issues, Risks & Concerns

Item	Action/Resolution	Responsible	Completion Date
Decision makers can't agree	Get agreement on pieces of work prior to plan completion	Chairman	Ongoing

Item	Action/Resolution	Responsible	Completion Date
Budget insufficient for timely plan delivery	Work with TTPPC to recommend budget, and with WCRC to raise rate to achieve deliverables	Project Manager TTPP Committee CE WCRC	Annually Jan/Feb
Changes to national legislation	Planning team keep selves, Committee and Community updated on changes to legislation and the implications for TTPP	Project Manager Planning Team	Ongoing
Staff safety at public consultation	Committee members to proactively address & redirect aggressive behavior towards staff	TTPP Committee	Ongoing
National emergencies such as Covid-19 lock down and weather events	Staff and Committee ensure personal safety and continue to work remotely as able. Work with contractors to expedite work.	Project Manager TTPP Committee	Ongoing
Time and Cost of Appeals Process	A realistic budget was set for best case costs. Awareness that contentious issues such as SNAs, natural hazards, mineral extraction and landscape provisions could see an extended appeals process, increasing costs to reach operative plan status	TTPP Committee TTPP Steering Group Project Manager	Ongoing
Community concerns over proposed Plan content	Respond to queries by phone, email and public meetings. Update information.	TTPP Committee Project Manager	Ongoing

Status

Overall		
Schedule		Some delays under discussion
Resources		Future budgets required to cover hearings and mediation
Scope		Schedule 1 processes leading to updates to Plan to achieve operative status

Schedule

Stage	Target for Completion	Comments
Hearings for Te Tai o Poutini Plan	March 2025	Coastal hazard rules to be heard 17-21 March with Variation 2 Coastal Natural Hazard Mapping
Decisions Te Tai o Poutini Plan	2025	Indicative time only
Appeals/Mediation	2025-2026	Indicative time only. Any parts of the Plan not appealed are operative from the end of the Appeal Period.
Environment or High Court	2025 onward	Indicative time only.
Ongoing Decision Making for TTPP	2025 onward	TTPPC is a permanent Committee. Once the Plan is adopted the ongoing Committee role includes monitoring implementation and the need for any amendments, undertaking plan changes and reviews, or ensuring these are undertaken as required.



Te Tai o Poutini PLAN

A combined district plan for the West Coast