

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
S91.018	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership	CL-O1	CL-O1	Support	Retain CL-O1 as notified.	Support the intention of Objective.	Accept	CL - Contaminated Land
S91.019	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership	CL-P1	CL-P1	Support	Retain CL-P1 as notified.	Support intention of Policy.	Accept	CL - Contaminated Land
S91.020	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership	CL-P2	CL-P2	Support	Retain CL-P2 as notified.	Support intention of Policy.	Accept	CL - Contaminated Land
S122.017	Fulton Hogan Limited	CL-O1	CL-O1	Oppose in part	Amend CL-O1 to refer to the intended use of the land: Contaminated land is identified and managed so that it is safe for human health and its intended use.	Considers the phrase 'its intended use' would include human health considerations if this was a component of the intended use of a contaminated site and it is therefore unnecessary to specifically require land to be safe for human health.	Reject	CL - Contaminated Land
S122.018	Fulton Hogan Limited	CL-P2	CL-P2	Oppose in part	Amend CL-P2: Manage the subdivision, change of use, or disturbance of contaminated land to ensure it is safe for human health by...	Considers the phrase 'its intended use' would include human health considerations if this was a component of the intended use of a contaminated site and it is therefore unnecessary to specifically require land to be safe for human health.	Reject	CL - Contaminated Land
S186.018	Wellington Fish and Game Council	CL-O1	CL-O1	Support in part	Amend to include reference to managing contaminated land so it does not contribute further to the pollution of the environment and fresh water.	Contaminated land also needs to be managed so it does not contribute to pollution of further environments, particularly freshwater.	Reject	CL - Contaminated Land
S212.021	Māori Trustee	CL-O1	CL-O1	Support	Retain CL-O1 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Contaminated land' objectives in this chapter.	Accept	CL - Contaminated Land
S212.144	Māori Trustee	CL-P1	CL-P1	Support	Retain CL-P1 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Contaminated land' policies in this chapter.	Accept	CL - Contaminated Land

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
S212.145	Māori Trustee	CL-P2	CL-P2	Support	Retain CL-P2 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Contaminated land' policies in this chapter.	Accept	CL - Contaminated Land
S214.029	Federated Farmers of New Zealand			Support	Retain Contaminated Land chapter as notified.	The submitter supports the planning approach adopted in response to contaminated land.	Accept	CL - Contaminated Land
FS95.134	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia Trust			Oppose	Disallow	Our right to enact kaitiakitanga is through our whakapapa and is reinserted as per Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Many legislation and policies talk to early engagement with mana whenua for kaupapa that impacts whenua, awa, āngi. The principle of tangata whenua exercising kaitiakitanga is part of Section 7(a) of the RMA. There are already protections in place for Landowners in many other legislations and anything discussed or proposed here is not done so outside of the Colonial Framework that has been forced upon us.	Reject	CL - Contaminated Land
S218.040	Transpower New Zealand Limited	CL-P2	CL-P2	Support	Retain Policy CL-P2 as proposed.	Supports Policy CL-P2 to the extent that the Policy directs that contaminated land is managed relative to its intended use.	Accept	CL - Contaminated Land
S218.041	Transpower New Zealand Limited			Support	Retain the reliance on the National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in the Soil to Protect Human Health as notified.	Supports the approach taken to rules (or the absence of rules) in relation to contaminated land and particularly reliance of the Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health) Regulations 2011.	Accept	CL - Contaminated Land
S221.055	Horticulture New Zealand			Support	Retain Contaminated Land chapter as notified.	The submitter supports reliance on the NES-CS. They also support that the Proposed Plan is clear that Clause 5 of the NES-CS sets out the situations in which it applies, which excludes production land that continues to be in production	Accept	CL - Contaminated Land

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
S238.020	bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies')	Introduction	Introduction	Support	Retain the Contaminated Land chapter introduction as notified.	The amendments to the Contaminated Land chapter introduction since the DDP is supported.	Accept	CL - Contaminated Land
S238.021	bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies')	CL-O1	CL-O1	Support	Retain Objective CL-O1 as notified.	Objective CL-O1 is supported.	Accept	CL - Contaminated Land
S238.022	bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies')	CL-P2	CL-P2	Support in part	Amend Policy CL-P2 as follows: Manage the subdivision, change of use, or disturbance of contaminated land to ensure it is safe for human health by: 1. Encouraging a best practice approach to site management for sites land with elevated contaminant levels, which may include remediation, containment, and/or disposal of contaminated soil; and 2. e Ensuring the land is suitable for its intended use.	Policy CL-P2 is supported in principle, however, an amendment is sought to change "sites" under clause (2) to "land" so that it is consistent with the rest of the policy and its references to contaminated land and potentially contaminated land.	Accept	CL - Contaminated Land
S238.058	bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies')	CL-P1	CL-P1	Support in part	Amend CL-P1 to change "sites" under clause (b) to "land".	Policy CL-P1 is supported in principle however an amendment is sought to change "sites" under clause (b) to "land" so that it is consistent with the rest of the policy and its references to contaminated land and potentially contaminated land.	Accept	CL - Contaminated Land
S238.005	bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies')	Definitions	Definitions	Support	Retain the 'contaminated land' definition as proposed.	The 'contaminated land' definition is supported.	Accept	CL - Contaminated Land

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
S186.019	Wellington Fish and Game Council	HAZ-O1	HAZ-O1	Support	Amend HAZ-O1 (b) to take away the term "minimised" and replace with stronger wording.	"Minimised" appears to not be strongly directive enough to speak to the Drinking Water value of the NPS-FM 2020. Hazardous substances should not impact on drinking water quality.	Reject	HAZ - Hazardous Substances
S186.020	Wellington Fish and Game Council	HAZ-P1	HAZ-P1	Support	Retain as notified.	Support Policy.	Accept	HAZ - Hazardous Substances
S212.022	Māori Trustee	HAZ-O1	HAZ-O1	Support	Retain HAZ-O1 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Hazardous substances' objectives in this chapter.	Accept	HAZ - Hazardous Substances
S212.146	Māori Trustee	HAZ-O2	HAZ-O2	Support	Retain HAZ-O2 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Hazardous substances' objectives in this chapter.	Accept	HAZ - Hazardous Substances
S212.147	Māori Trustee	HAZ-P1	HAZ-P1	Support	Retain HAZ-P1 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Hazardous substances' policies in this chapter.	Accept	HAZ - Hazardous Substances
S212.148	Māori Trustee	HAZ-P2	HAZ-P2	Support	Retain HAZ-P2 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Hazardous substances' policies in this chapter.	Accept	HAZ - Hazardous Substances
S212.149	Māori Trustee	HAZ-R1	HAZ-R1	Support	Retain HAZ-R1 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Hazardous substances' rules in this chapter.	Accept	HAZ - Hazardous Substances
S212.150	Māori Trustee	HAZ-R2	HAZ-R2	Support	Retain HAZ-R2 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Hazardous substances' rules in this chapter.	Accept	HAZ - Hazardous Substances
S214.030	Federated Farmers of New Zealand			Support	Retain Hazardous Substances chapter as notified.	The submitter supports the planning approach adopted in response to Hazardous Substances.	Accept	HAZ - Hazardous Substances
FS95.135	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia Trust			Oppose	Disallow	Our right to enact kaitiakitanga is through our whakapapa and is reinserted as per Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Many legislation and policies talk to early engagement with mana whenua for kaupapa that impacts	Reject	

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						whenua, awa, āngi. The principle of tangata whenua exercising kaitiakitanga is part of Section 7(a) of the RMA. There are already protections in place for Landowners in many other legislations and anything discussed or proposed here is not done so outside of the Colonial Framework that has been forced upon us.		
S221.056	Horticulture New Zealand			Support	Retain Hazardous Substances chapter as notified.	The submitter supports the approach in the Hazardous Substances section.	Accept	HAZ - Hazardous Substances
S238.023	bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies')	Introduction	Introduction	Support	Retain the Hazardous Substances chapter introduction as notified.	The Hazardous Substances chapter introduction is supported.	Accept	HAZ - Hazardous Substances
S238.024	bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies')	HAZ-O1	HAZ-O1	Support	Retain Objective HAZ-O1 as notified.	Objective HAZ-O1 is supported.	Accept	HAZ - Hazardous Substances
S238.025	bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies')	HAZ-O2	HAZ-O2	Support	Retain Objective HAZ-O2 as notified.	Objective HAZ-O2 is supported.	Accept	HAZ - Hazardous Substances
S238.026	bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies')	HAZ-P1	HAZ-P1	Support	Retain Policy HAZ-P1	Policy HAZ-P1 is supported.	Accept	HAZ - Hazardous Substances
S238.027	bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies')	HAZ-P2	HAZ-P2	Support	Retain Policy HAZ-P2 as notified.	Policy HAZ-P2 is supported.	Accept	HAZ - Hazardous Substances

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
S238.028	bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies')	HAZ-R1	HAZ-R1	Support	Retain Rule HAZ-R1 as notified.	Rule HAZ-R1 is supported.	Accept	HAZ - Hazardous Substances
S238.029	bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies')	HAZ-R2	HAZ-R2	Support	Retain Rule HAZ-R2 as notified.	Rule HAZ-R2 is supported.	Accept	HAZ - Hazardous Substances
S245.012	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	HAZ-O1	HAZ-O1	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the inclusion of this Objective that activities associated with the use, storage, and disposal hazardous substance are managed so that the unacceptable risk to educational facilities is avoided.	Accept	HAZ - Hazardous Substances
S245.013	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	HAZ-P1	HAZ-P1	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the inclusion of this policy as it encourages significant hazardous facilities to locate in zones/areas away from sensitive activities.	Accept	HAZ - Hazardous Substances
S245.014	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	HAZ-P2	HAZ-P2	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the inclusion of this policy as it recognises the need for sensitive activities, including educational facilities, to avoid locating near significant hazardous facilities.	Accept	HAZ - Hazardous Substances
S245.015	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	HAZ-R1	HAZ-R1	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the requirement for significant hazardous facilities, including additions, to be set back from sensitive activities (including educational facilities). Supports the activity status for the establishment of significant hazardous facilities as a way to avoid and minimise risks to people, property, and the environment.	Accept	HAZ - Hazardous Substances
S245.016	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	HAZ-R2	HAZ-R2	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the noncomplying activity status for sensitive activities locating near significant hazardous facilities. Supports the inclusion of a specific distance which	Accept	HAZ - Hazardous Substances

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						educational facilities must be setback from existing significant hazardous facilities to manage adverse effects on school students and staff and to manage reverse sensitivity effects.		
S247.015	Enviro NZ Services Ltd	HAZ-P1	HAZ-P1	Support	Retain HAZ-P1 as notified.	Support policy.	Accept	HAZ - Hazardous Substances
S247.016	Enviro NZ Services Ltd	HAZ-P2	HAZ-P2	Support	Retain HAZ-P2 as notified.	Support Policy.	Accept	HAZ - Hazardous Substances
S247.017	Enviro NZ Services Ltd	HAZ-R1	HAZ-R1	Support	Retain HAZ-R1 as notified.	The proposed rule is considered appropriate.	Accept	HAZ - Hazardous Substances
S247.018	Enviro NZ Services Ltd	HAZ-R2	HAZ-R2	Support in part	Amend HAZ-R2 as follows: 1. Activity status: Non-complying Where: a. The sensitive activity is located within 500m 250m of a significant hazardous facility	It would be beneficial for the distance for sensitive activities to be increased.	Accept	HAZ - Hazardous Substances
S46.004	Mark Jerling	NH-R4	NH-R4	Oppose	Amend NH-R4(a): The building addition is located within the possible liquefaction-prone area or the possible fault hazard area ; or...	The submitter seeks this change as the fault hazard maps have substantial errors.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
S55.001	Toni Demetriou	NH-P1	NH-P1	Oppose	Amend NH-P1 and Fault Mapping to be consistent with the data provided in the submitter supporting docs, named: <i>'Active Fault Mapping for the South Wairarapa, Carterton, and Masterton Districts - GNS Science Consultancy Report 2021/117, October 2022'</i> .	If included, this policy, with mapped Woodside Fault Line and Liquefaction risk areas, will have detrimental impact on development potential of the submitters property.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
S77.002	Daniel Bradley	NH-P13	NH-P13	Oppose	Delete NH-P13.	NH-P13 should be deleted until more detailed research has been conducted to justify mapped flood hazard areas.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
FS83.021	Brookside Development - Featherston Limited			Support	Allow	Agree based reasons provided in the original submission.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
FS90.0010	Greater Wellington Regional Council			Oppose	Disallow	Considers that the provisions in NH-P13 are suitable, justified and underpin a precautionary approach in relation to planning for and adapting to the effects of natural hazards caused by climate change and sea level rise on both the natural environment and existing and future development.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S77.003	Daniel Bradley	NH-P12	NH-P12	Oppose	Delete NH-P12.	NH-P12 should be deleted until more detailed research has been conducted to justify mapped flood hazard areas.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
FS70.014	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership			Oppose	Disallow	It is important natural hazards are provided for using the best information available. While information will improve over time, the proposed flood alert layer is currently the best available information. Retain the flood alert overlay.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
FS83.020	Brookside Development - Featherston Limited			Support	Allow	Agree based reasons provided in the original submission.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
FS90.009	Greater Wellington Regional Council			Oppose	Disallow	Considers that the provisions in NH-P12 are suitable, justified and underpin a precautionary approach in relation to planning for and adapting to the effects of natural hazards caused by climate change and sea level rise on both the natural environment and existing and future development.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S77.004	Daniel Bradley	NH-R7	NH-R7	Oppose	Delete NH-R7.	NH-R7 should be deleted until more detailed research has been conducted to justify mapped flood hazard areas.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
FS83.022	Brookside Development - Featherston Limited			Support	Allow	Agree based reasons provided in the original submission.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
FS90.011	Greater Wellington Regional Council			Oppose	Disallow	Considers that the provisions in NH-R7 are suitable, justified and underpin a precautionary approach in relation to planning for and adapting to the effects of natural hazards caused by climate change and sea level rise on both the natural environment and existing and future development.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S79.041	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	NH-O1	NH-O1	Support	Retain Objective NH-O1 as notified.	Supports Objective NH-O1 as proposed.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S79.042	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	NH-P8	NH-P8	Support	Retain Policy NH-P8 as proposed.	Supports Policy NH-P8 as proposed.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S79.043	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	NH-P9	NH-P9	Support	Retain Policy NH-P9 as notified.	Supports Policy NH-P9 as proposed.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S79.044	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	NH-R8	NH-R8	Support	Retain Rule NH-R8 as notified.	Supports Rule NH-R8 as proposed.	Reject in part	NH – Natural hazards
S90.001	Toka Tū Ake EQC	Introduction	Introduction	Support in part	Amend Table NH-1 to add the following (please refer to original submission for table layout): High hazard area Flood hazard - river corridors. Fault avoidance area - higher recurrence interval faults (≤3500 years). Moderate hazard area Flood hazard - overland flow path. Possible liquefaction-prone area. Fault avoidance area - lower recurrence interval faults (≥3500 years). Low hazard area. Flood hazard - ponding. Possible liquefaction-prone area.	Liquefaction does not pose serious threat to life safety but can severely affect the structural integrity and liveability of properties, as was seen in the aftermath of the 2010 and 2011 Canterbury earthquake sequence. Liquefaction should therefore be considered a moderate hazard risk. Liquefaction is a widespread risk in the Wairarapa, as demonstrated in Appendix 1. Considers the format in the draft district plan for including fault hazards within the risk categorisation table to be preferable to the system in the Proposed district plan. Removing fault hazard from this table creates confusion on the status of fault hazard areas within the plan and is not reflected in other parts of the plan, for example NH-R3 makes reference to low and medium fault hazard zones.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
FS90.126	Greater Wellington Regional Council			Support	Allow in part	Considers that Fault Avoidance areas should be categorised on the basis of definition and recurrence intervals. This is more of risk-based approach in line with direction of the Proposed RPS Change 1 natural hazards Policy 29.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
FS91.003	The Fuel Companies			Oppose in part	Disallow in part	The Fuel Companies' concern over this submission is the reclassification of the "possible liquefaction-prone area" from a low hazard area to a moderate hazard area. The Fuel Companies recognise the importance of managing natural hazard risks; however, they consider that the reclassification of this area and associated amendments to NH-R3 (submission S90.016) and NR-R4 (submission S90.017) do not take an appropriate risk management approach - as set out in the Fuel Companies' further submissions on submissions S90.016 and S90.017. The Fuel Companies oppose the reclassification of the possible liquefaction-prone area under EQC's submission S90.001.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S90.002	Toka Tū Ake EQC			Oppose in part	Amend the fault hazard overlays to be fault avoidance zones, in line with the guidance for planning in fault zones and include degrees of complexity in fault zones (e.g. well defined, distributed, and uncertain fault sections), and the differing hazards associated with these categories, if this information is available.	The categorisation of active fault hazard is not consistent with Ministry for the Environment's 2003 guidance for development of land on or close to active faults. The fault hazard areas in the proposed district plan maps include sections of differing widths, suggesting that the complexity of the fault rupture (e.g. well defined, distributed, and uncertain fault sections) is being taken into account in the mapping of the faults, but these categories	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						should be provided in the text of the plan, along with the associated hazard risk.		
S90.004	Toka Tū Ake EQC	NH-O1	NH-O1	Support in part	Amend NH-O1 to read as follows: "The risk and consequences from natural hazards on people, property, infrastructure, and the environment are reduced or not increased."	Supports the objective of not increasing the risk and consequences from natural hazards on people, property, infrastructure and the environment, but considers it appropriate to include encouraging reduction of risk from natural hazards.	Reject in part	NH – Natural hazards
S90.005	Toka Tū Ake EQC	NH-P1	NH-P1	Support	Retain NH-P1 as notified.	Support accurate and up to date identification and mapping of natural hazards and a risk based approach to risk management of subdivision, use and development.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S90.007	Toka Tū Ake EQC	NH-P2	NH-P2	Support	Retain NH-P2 as notified.	Supports avoiding hazard sensitive and potentially hazard sensitive activities within high hazard areas.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S90.008	Toka Tū Ake EQC	NH-P3	NH-P3	Support	Retain NH-P3 as notified.	Supports avoiding hazard sensitive and potentially hazard sensitive activities within moderate hazard areas except where there is demonstrable evidence that natural hazard risk is minimised, evacuation routes are safeguarded, and the risk to adjacent properties and people is not increased.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S90.009	Toka Tū Ake EQC	NH-P4	NH-P4	Support	Retain NH-P4 as notified.	Support allowing for hazard sensitive and potentially hazard sensitive activities in low hazard areas provided that there is demonstrable evidence that natural hazard risk is low, and the risk to adjacent properties and people is not increased.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S90.010	Toka Tū Ake EQC	NH-P6	NH-P6	Amend	Amend NH-P6 to read as follows: Amend to: "Discourage new buildings in flood hazard –overland flow path and ponding areas unless: ...3. the activity incorporates mitigation measures so that the risk of damage to buildings and structures is not significantly increased;	Unimpeded overland flow paths are important in allowing floodwater to escape and recede. Allowing a path for development within overland flow paths puts more people at risk from flood hazard and may worsen the effects of flooding in the surrounding area. It is appropriate to	Reject in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
					and..." and Add new section to NH-P6: Avoid new buildings in flood hazard-overland flow path areas unless: 1. There is a functional or operational need for the building to be located there.	avoid new buildings within overland flow paths unless a functional or operational need for them to be there. Increase of risk from flood hazard within flood alert areas as a result of new building and development is unacceptable.		
S90.011	Toka Tū Ake EQC	NH-P7	NH-P7	Oppose	Amend NH-P7 to read as follows: " For Avoid new buildings and structures that contain habitable rooms and are located within fault hazard areas as shown on the District Planning Maps: 4. Allow buildings and structures to locate within Fault Hazard Area where it can be demonstrated that the fault hazard risk can be avoided or mitigated to prevent loss of life. 2. Avoid buildings and structures locating within the Fault Hazard Area where the risk to life can not be avoided or mitigated via distance from the fault, building engineering solutions, or other means.	Opposed to allowing a path for development of new buildings within fault hazard areas. MfE's 2003 guidance for development of land on or close to active faults specifies that 20m either side of a fault trace, including any areas of diffuse or distributed fault rupture zones is likely to be an area of intense deformation. Considers that habitable buildings should not be allowed within the Fault Hazard Areas. While life safety risk may be able to be minimized in certain types of building, the deformation and building damage within 20m of a fault rupture is not able to be mitigated by engineering solutions or means other than locating buildings outside of this zone.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
S90.012	Toka Tū Ake EQC	NH-P8	NH-P8	Support	Retain NH-P8 as notified.	Supports allowing for hazard sensitive and potentially hazard sensitive activities in low hazard areas, provided that it has a functional or operational need for the location, is designed to retain functionality during and after a natural hazard event, and the risk to surrounding properties, activities and people is not increased.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S90.013	Toka Tū Ake EQC	NH-P11	NH-P11	Support	Retain NH-P11 as notified.	Supports a precautionary approach to managing risk from hazards.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S90.014	Toka Tū Ake EQC	NH-P12	NH-P12	Support	Retain NH-P12 as notified.	Support avoiding locating hazard sensitive and potentially hazard sensitive activities within flood alert areas except where there	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						is demonstrable evidence that the natural hazard risk is minimised, evacuation routes are safeguarded, and the risk to adjacent properties and people is not increased.		
FS83.001	Brookside Development - Featherston Limited			Oppose	Disallow	Policy NH-P12 should be removed until more detailed research has been done to justify the Flood Alert Areas shown on the planning maps, using all the information available to South Wairarapa District Council, including modelling and preventative measures already in place for site-specific approved subdivisions	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
S90.015	Toka Tū Ake EQC	NH-P13	NH-P13	Support in part	Amend NH-P13: Discourage new buildings in flood alert areas unless:... 3. the activity incorporates mitigation measures so that the risk of damage to buildings and structures is not significantly increased.	Any increase of risk from flood hazard within flood alert areas as a result of new building and development is unacceptable. additionally wat constitutes a significant increase in risk is not defined and is open to interpretation.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
FS83.002	Brookside Development - Featherston Limited			Oppose	Disallow	Policy NH-P13 should be removed until more detailed research has been done to justify the Flood Alert Areas shown on the planning maps, using all the information available to South Wairarapa District Council, including modelling and preventative measures already in place for site-specific approved subdivisions	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
S90.016	Toka Tū Ake EQC	NH-R3	NH-R3	Amend	Amend NH-R3 as follows: ... Permitted where the activity or building is located within the possible liquefaction prone area. Restricted discretionary where: a. Any building located in a flood hazard overlay has a finished floor level above the 1% AEP level; or b. Any building is located within the possible liquefaction prone area; and... "	Considers that hazard sensitive activities should have at a minimum 'restricted discretionary activity status' within possible liquefaction prone areas. Liquefaction does not pose serious threat to life safety but can severely affect the structural integrity and livability of properties, as was seen in the aftermath of the 2010 and 2011 Canterbury earthquake sequence. Liquefaction should therefore be considered a moderate hazard risk, and potentially hazard sensitive activities	Reject	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						should be restricted discretionary within these areas at minimum.		
FS91.004	The Fuel Companies			Oppose	Disallow	The EQC's proposed amendments would make any potentially hazard sensitive activity, and associated buildings, in the possible liquefaction-prone area require consent without any exceptions or permitted activity pathways. This is concerning as the councils' Section 32 Evaluation Topic report on Natural Hazards acknowledges that there is insufficient data to identify the areas of higher liquefaction risk. The PDP's definitions of "potentially hazard sensitive activities" and "buildings" are broad. Given the wide breadth of activities and development these definitions capture, and the wide application of the hazard area overlay across the districts, the amendments could unnecessarily require consents for activities and/or associated buildings that are not vulnerable to, or exacerbate the off-site risks / effects from, liquefaction. In the context of the Fuel Companies' operations and its affected sites, this would apply to changes to existing retail fuel activities or a new retail shop or car wash building. The design and resilience of retail fuel outlets to natural hazards risks is discussed in the Fuel Companies' original submission on the Natural Hazards chapter introduction (submission S238.030). The Fuel Companies consider that a blanket consent requirement applying to activities and development that are not "hazard sensitive" does not reflect an appropriate risk management approach. It is also unclear as to what specific risks effects, that are within the scope of the RMA and not other statutes (e.g., Building Act 2004)	Accept	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						or regulations, the amendments seek to manage. It is also noted that EQC's submission states that liquefaction "does not pose a serious threat to life safety" and its concern is over its effects on the "structural integrity and liveability of properties" (even though "potentially hazard sensitive activities" do not comprise dwellings or residential activities).		
S90.017	Toka Tū Ake EQC	NH-R4	NH-R4	Amend	Amend NH-R4 to: Additions to buildings within all hazard areas Permitted where: a. the building addition is located within the possible liquefaction prone area; or... c. Any building additions located in the identified overland flow path or ponding area of the flood hazard overlay have a finished floor level above the 1% AEP level.	Hazard sensitive activities should have restricted discretionary activity status at minimum, within possible liquefaction prone areas, for the reasons mentioned in previous submission points in relation to liquefaction and overland flow paths.	Reject in part	NH – Natural hazards
FS91.005	The Fuel Companies			Oppose	Disallow	The Fuel Companies concern over this submission point is the same as that for EQC's submission S90.016, as to whether the EQC's proposed amendments, to make any additions to buildings within a potential liquefaction-prone area, reflect an appropriate risk management approach. In the context of the Fuel Companies' outlets affected by this hazard area, simple additions or extensions to buildings such as a service station retail shop or car wash building.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S90.018	Toka Tū Ake EQC	NH-R6	NH-R6	Oppose in part	Amend NH-R6: 1. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Discretionary where: ... b. The subject site is located fully or partially within the Fault Hazard Area; and c. A technical report by a suitably qualified professional is provided	Should not allow a path for development in fault hazard areas. Refer to MfE's 2003 guidance for development of land on or close to active faults, stating 20m either side of a fault trace is likely to be an area of intense deformation. The deformation and building damage within 20m of a fault	Reject in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
					demonstrating that the building is at least 20m away from the identified fault trace. Consequential amendment: Non-compliance with the above standard (c) should be a Non-complying activity.	rupture is not able to be mitigated by engineering solutions or means other than locating buildings outside this zone. If buildings are proposed within this Fault Hazard Area, a report by a suitably qualified professional should be provided to demonstrate the building platform is at least 20m away from the fault.		
FS90.127	Greater Wellington Regional Council			Support	Allow in part	Agrees that the rule needs to be tightened up with regard to the supporting technical evidence and set back from the fault.	Reject in part	NH – Natural hazards
S90.019	Toka Tū Ake EQC	NH-R7	NH-R7	Support	Retain NH-R7 as notified.	Support Restricted Discretionary activity status for hazard sensitive and potentially hazard sensitive activities within flood alert areas, except when there is evidence the risk is minimised, evacuation routes safeguarded and risk to adjacent properties and people is not increased.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
FS83.003	Brookside Development - Featherston Limited			Oppose	Disallow	Rule NH-R7 should be removed until more detailed research has been done to justify the Flood Alert Areas shown on the planning maps, using all the information available to South Wairarapa District Council, including modelling and preventative measures already in place for site-specific approved subdivisions. Paragraph 19 of the section 32 report states "For some hazards (e.g. flood alert areas), a non-regulatory approach is taken, and the hazard is mapped for information only purposes. The mapped data was not considered robust enough to apply rules to these areas".	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
S90.020	Toka Tū Ake EQC	NH-R8	NH-R8	Support in part	Retain NH-R8 as notified IF liquefaction risk is upgraded to moderate status (see earlier submission point).	Support Restricted Discretionary activity status for infrastructure within low hazard areas, noting that we consider liquefaction risk should be upgraded to moderate. We support Discretionary activity status for	Reject in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						infrastructure within moderate hazard areas.		
S90.021	Toka Tū Ake EQC	NH-R9	NH-R9	Support in part	Retain NH-R9 as notified IF liquefaction risk is upgraded to moderate status (see earlier submission point).	Support Discretionary activity status for hazard sensitive and buildings within moderate hazard areas and low hazard areas noting that we consider liquefaction risk should be upgraded to moderate.	Reject in part	NH – Natural hazards
S90.022	Toka Tū Ake EQC	NH-R10	NH-R10	Support	Retain NH-R10 as notified.	Support non-complying status for hazard sensitive activities and buildings within high hazard areas.	Reject in part	NH – Natural hazards
S91.021	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership	NH-O1	NH-O1	Support	Retain NH-O1 as notified.	Support intention of Objective.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S91.022	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership	NH-P4	NH-P4	Support	Retain NH-P4 as notified.	Support intention of Policy.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S91.023	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership	NH-P12	NH-P12	Support	Retain NH-P12 as notified.	Support intention of Policy.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S91.024	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership	NH-P13	NH-P13	Support	Retain NH-P13 as notified.	Support intention of Policy.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S94.064	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Introduction	Introduction	Support in part	Amend the flood hazard maps to delete the small area shown in Attachment 3. Submitter has provided an updated flood hazard map with original submission.	The submitter supports the inclusion of the flood hazard maps into the Combined District Plan. There is a minor error in the Waiohine flood hazard model used to inform the flood hazard mapping. The blue extent shown in Attachment 3 of the full submission is an error and should be removed.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
FS105.074	Ian Gunn			Support	Allow	Supports submission point, particularly relating to the flood hazard mapping.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S94.066	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Introduction	Introduction	Support	Retain as notified.	The introduction to this chapter discusses the risk-based approach to natural hazards. It is appropriate that the District Plan takes this risk-based approach.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
S94.067	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Introduction	Introduction	Support in part	Insert Table NH-1 in the definitions chapter OR Amend the definition of Hazard Areas to refer to Table NH-1.	It is important to define the hazard categories used in the District Plan, however these should also sit within the definitions section for ease of use. Alternatively, the definition of Hazard Areas could refer to Table NH-1, as suggested in feedback on this definition.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
FS77.001	EQC Toka Tū Ake			Support	Allow	Supports adding Table NH-1 to the definitions chapter or amending the definitions chapter to refer to NH-1 in the interests of retaining consistency within the plan and minimising misinterpretation.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S94.068	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Introduction	Introduction	Support	Retain as notified.	The inclusion of 'Flood hazard - river corridors' as a high hazard area is appropriate.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S94.069	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Introduction	Introduction	Support	Retain as notified.	The inclusion of 'Flood hazard - overland flow path' as a moderate hazard area is appropriate.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S94.070	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Introduction	Introduction	Support	Retain as notified.	The inclusion of 'Flood hazard - overland flow path' as a moderate hazard area is appropriate.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S94.071	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Introduction	Introduction	Support in part	Amend the name: Flood Alert Area to Flood Vulnerability Area Amend as follows: High hazard area Flood hazard - river corridors Fault hazard area - well defined and well defined extended FAZs with Recurrence Interval (RI) classes I-IV (RI ≤10,000 years) Moderate hazard area Flood hazard - overland flow path Fault hazard area - uncertain constrained and distributed FAZs with (RI) class I-II (RI ≤3500 years)	Considers that Fault Avoidance Zones (FAZ's) (based on those mapped and identified by GNS science) should be included in Table NH-1 and that they be categorised on the basis of definition and recurrence intervals. This is more of risk-based approach in line with direction of the RPS natural hazards Policy 29. Agrees that Fault Avoidance Areas (FAA's) should only be provided as information outside the plan.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
					Low hazard area Flood hazard - ponding Possible liquefaction-prone area All other identified Fault Hazard Areas			
FS77.002	EQC Toka Tū Ake			Support	Allow	As noted in EQC's original submission, supports a risk-based approach to fault hazard classification based on MfE and GNS Science 2003 guidance Planning for Development of Land on or Close to Active Faults. Greater Wellington Region Council's submission is aligned with this guidance.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S94.072	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-O1	NH-O1	Support in part	Amend as follows: The risk and consequences from natural hazards on people, property, infrastructure, and the environment are reduced or not increased.	Amend to recognise that hazard mitigation measures can act to reduce the risks from natural hazards.	Reject in part	NH – Natural hazards
FS77.003	EQC Toka Tū Ake			Support	Allow	Consider it appropriate to encourage reduction of the risk from natural hazards where this is possible.	Reject in part	NH – Natural hazards
S94.073	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-O2	NH-O2	Support in part	Amend as follows: Natural features, nature-based solutions and hazard mitigation measures are used to reduce the susceptibility of people, communities, property, and infrastructure to damage from natural hazards.	The wording of this objective is generally consistent with the expectations of the submitter in respect to the use of natural features to reduce susceptibility to damage from natural hazards. Amend to recognise that a range of mitigation measures are available to reduce risk from natural hazards consistent with RPS Change 1.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
FS77.004	EQC Toka Tū Ake			Support	Allow	Support the inclusion of nature-based solutions and hazard mitigation measures into this clause, as they both contribute to reducing risks	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S94.074	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-P1	NH-P1	Support	Retain as notified	The submitter supports a risk-based approach to manage subdivision, use, and development within the identified areas,	Accept	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						specifically sensitivity to impacts and the hazard poses to lives and wellbeing.		
S94.075	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-P2	NH-P2	Support	Retain as notified	This policy aims to avoid locating hazard sensitive and potentially hazard sensitive activities within areas of high hazard unless there is an operational or functional need, which is acceptable.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S94.076	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-P3	NH-P3	Support	Retain as notified	This policy aims to only allow hazard sensitive and potentially hazard sensitive activities within areas of moderate hazard where the circumstances listed in the policy can be met, which is acceptable.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S94.077	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-P4	NH-P4	Support	Retain as notified	This policy aims to provide for hazard sensitive and potentially hazard sensitive activities within areas of low hazard where mitigation is provided and the risk to other properties and activities is not increased, which is acceptable.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S94.078	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-P5	NH-P5	Support	Retain as notified	Allowing for less hazard sensitive activities to occur within all hazard areas, where appropriate, is considered acceptable. The requirements listed in the policy are appropriate.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S94.079	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-P6	NH-P6	Support	Retain as notified	Discouraging new buildings in the overland flow path and ponding areas is generally appropriate, where the requirements listed in the policy can be met.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S94.080	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-P8	NH-P8	Support	Retain as notified	Infrastructure sometimes needs to be established in areas where a hazard is present. It is appropriate this is provided for, where there is an operational or functional need, is appropriately designed and significant adverse effects can be mitigated.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
S94.081	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-P9	NH-P9	Support	Retain as notified	It is appropriate to provide for earthworks undertaken within flood hazard areas, where they do not impede flood pathways and the risk is not increased as a result of the activity.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S94.082	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-P10	NH-P10	Support in part	Amend and insert two new clauses: Enable natural hazard mitigation or stream and river management works provided: (a) works are undertaken by a statutory agency or their nominated contractors or agents within hazard areas where these will significantly decrease the existing risk to people's safety and wellbeing, property, and infrastructure; (b) adverse effects on the natural environment are minimised, and; (c) the use of soft-engineering or nature-based solutions is considered where appropriate.	It is important to enable natural hazard mitigation works within hazard overlays when undertaken by relevant authorities, as these works significantly decrease the existing risk of these hazards to people's lives, wellbeing, property, and infrastructure. Amend to include direction to minimise impacts on the natural environment from hazard mitigation measures and consider the use of a range of hazard mitigation measures including soft-engineering or nature-based solutions to give effect to direction in operative and proposed RPS Policy 52.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S94.083	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-P11	NH-P11	Support	Retain as proposed	It is appropriate to adopt a precautionary approach when planning for and adapting to the effects of natural hazards caused by climate change and sea level rise.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S94.084	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-P12	NH-P12	Support in part	Amend the name: Flood Alert Area to Flood Vulnerability Area	Allowing for hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities to occur within flood alert areas, where appropriate, is considered acceptable. The requirements listed in the policy are appropriate. Please replace the name 'Flood Alert Area' with 'Flood Vulnerability Area'. This is to reduce any confusion that may arise around the possibility of emergency warning during an event.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
FS83.004	Brookside Development - Featherston Limited			Oppose	Disallow	Policy NH-P12 should be removed until more detailed research has been done to	Reject	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						justify the Flood Alert Areas shown on the planning maps, using all the information available to South Wairarapa District Council, including modelling and preventative measures already in place for site-specific approved subdivisions		
S94.085	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-P13	NH-P13	Support in part	Amend the name: Flood Alert Area to Flood Vulnerability Area	Discouraging new buildings in flood alert areas is generally appropriate, where the requirements listed in the policy can be met. Please replace the name 'Flood Alert Area' with 'Flood Vulnerability Area'. This is to reduce any confusion that may arise around the possibility of emergency warning during an event.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
FS83.005	Brookside Development - Featherston Limited			Oppose	Disallow	Policy NH-P13 should be removed until more detailed research has been done to justify the Flood Alert Areas shown on the planning maps, using all the information available to South Wairarapa District Council, including modelling and preventative measures already in place for site-specific approved subdivisions	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
S94.086	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-R1	NH-R1	Support	Retain as notified	It is appropriate to provide for flood mitigation or stream or river management works within any of the flood hazard overlays as a permitted activity, where these works are undertaken by a statutory agency or their nominated agency.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S94.087	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-R2	NH-R2	Support	Retain as notified	It is appropriate to provide for less hazard sensitive activities within hazard areas as a permitted activity, where buildings are located outside of the identified overlays. The wording of this rule is generally consistent with the example contained within the draft Flood Hazard Planning Guidance document prepared by Greater Wellington.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
S94.088	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-R2	NH-R2	Support	Retain as notified	It is appropriate to require resource consent be obtained as a restricted discretionary activity where the requirements of the permitted activity rule NH-R2(1) are not met	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S94.089	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-R2	NH-R2	Support	Retain as notified	The proposed matters of discretion for resource consents associated with Rule NH-R2(2) are considered appropriate as they refer back to the matters in Policy NH-P5.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S94.090	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-R3	NH-R3	Support	Retain as notified	For any potentially hazard sensitive activity and associated buildings within moderate hazard areas and low hazard areas, it is appropriate to require resource consent be obtained as a restricted discretionary activity where a building located in a flood hazard overlay has a finished floor level above the 1% AEP level.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S94.091	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-R2	NH-R2	Support	Retain as notified	It is appropriate to require that the finished floor level of any potentially hazard sensitive activity and associated buildings be above the 1% Flood AEP level where the building is located in a moderate or low hazard area.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S94.092	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-R3	NH-R3	Support	Retain as notified	The proposed matters of discretion for resource consents associated with Rule NH-R3(2) are considered appropriate as they refer back to the matters in Policy NH-P3 for activities in the moderate hazard area.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S94.093	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-R3	NH-R3	Support	Retain as notified	The proposed matters of discretion for resource consents associated with Rule NH-R3(2) are considered appropriate as	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						they refer back to the matters in Policy NH-P4 for activities in the low hazard area.		
S94.094	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-R3	NH-R3	Support	Retain as notified	The proposed matters of discretion for resource consents associated with Rule NH-R3(2) are considered appropriate as they refer back to the matters in Policy NH-P4 for activities in the low hazard area.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S94.095	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-R4	NH-R4	Support in part	Amend as per requests against specific clauses listed below.	It is appropriate to provide for additions to buildings within all hazard areas where the permitted activity conditions are met. Permitted conditions are proposed to ensure that additions to buildings within moderate hazard areas and high hazard areas are appropriately assessed	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S94.096	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-R4	NH-R4	Support	Retain as notified.	It is appropriate to require, as a permitted activity condition, that additions to buildings do not increase the gross floor area of a hazard sensitive activity or potentially hazard sensitive activity by more than 20m2.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S94.097	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-R4	NH-R4	Support in part	Amend as follows: c. Any building additions located in the identified overland flowpath or ponding area of the flood hazard overlay have a finished floor level above the 1% AEP level. d. The additions are not located within a moderate hazard area / overland flow path area. e. The additions are not located within a high hazard area / river corridor.	It is appropriate to require, as a permitted activity condition, that the finished floor level of any addition to a building located within an identified ponding area of the flood hazard overlay, to be above the 1% Flood AEP level where the building is located in an inundation area. As an overland flowpath is identified as a moderate hazard area, it is not appropriate to provide for additions within these overlays as a permitted activity and instead, resource consent should be obtained.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
FS77.005	EQC Toka Tū Ake			Support	Allow	Support a risk-based planning framework for natural hazard risk reduction, which includes avoiding building and building additions in moderate and high hazard	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						areas such as overland flow paths and river corridors. Flooding is a common and often severe natural hazard in New Zealand. During a flood event if overland flow paths and river corridors are obstructed, the floodwaters are less able to escape through their natural paths, which can deepen floods and extend their duration, increasing the risk to people and properties.		
S94.098	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-R4	NH-R4	Support in part	Amend as follows: a. Compliance is not achieved with NH-R4(1)(a)-(d).	It is appropriate to require resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity where the additions to buildings within all hazard areas do not meet NH-R4(1).	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
FS77.006	EQC Toka Tū Ake			Support	Allow	Support the submitter's additions to NH-R4	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S94.099	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-R4	NH-R4	Support	Retain as notified	Rule NH-R4(2)(1) The proposed matters of discretion for resource consents associated with Rule NH-R4(2) are considered appropriate as they refer back to the matters in Policy NH-P3 for activities in the moderate hazard area. This is supported provided that the proposed additions to Rule NH-R4(1) are included.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S94.100	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-R4	NH-R4	Support	Retain as notified.	Rule NH-R4(2)(2) The proposed matters of discretion for resource consents associated with Rule NH-R4(2) are considered appropriate as they refer back to the matters in Policy NH-P4 for activities in the low hazard area.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S94.101	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-R4	NH-R4	Oppose	Amend as follows: Delete: 3. For additions in the high hazard area, the matters in Policy NH-P2.	Rule NH-R4 (2) (3) The proposed matters of discretion for	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
					Add new rule: 3. Activity status: Discretionary Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with NH-R4(1)(e).	resource consents associated with Rule NH-R4(2) are inappropriate for high hazard areas as they refer back to the matters in Policy NH-P2 for activities in the high hazard area. That policy seeks to "avoid locating hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities within high hazard areas unless the activity has an operational need or functional need to locate within the high hazard area". The restricted discretionary activity status is misleading as any additions to buildings for hazard sensitive activities or potentially hazard sensitive activities would not be able to meet the policy if there was no functional or operational need. For additions to buildings in the high hazard area which do not comply with the conditions under Rule NH-R4(1), the activity status should be amended to discretionary.		
FS77.007	EQC Toka Tū Ake			Support	Allow	Consider that the amendment of NH-R4 is clearer and gives more scope to control building and development in higher hazard areas.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S94.102	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-R5	NH-R5	Support	Retain as notified.	It is appropriate to provide for earthworks in flood hazard areas as a permitted activity where the permitted activity conditions are all met.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S94.103	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-R5	NH-R5	Support	Retain as notified.	NH-R5(1)(a) It is appropriate to provide for earthworks in flood hazard areas as a permitted activity where the earthworks are not located in a river corridor or overland flowpath.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
S94.104	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-R5	NH-R5	Support	Retain as notified	NH-R5(1)(a) It is appropriate to require resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity where the earthworks in flood hazard areas do not meet NH-R5(1).	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S94.105	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-R5	NH-R5	Support	Retain as notified	NH-R5(2)(1) The proposed matters of discretion for resource consents associated with Rule NH-R5(2) are considered appropriate as they refer back to the matters in Policy NH-P9.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S94.106	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-R7	NH-R7	Support in part	Amend the name: Flood Alert Area to Flood Vulnerability Area	The submitter supports the inclusion of this flood hazard information, please replace the name 'Flood Alert Area' with 'Flood Vulnerability Area'. This is to reduce any confusion that may arise around the possibility of emergency warning during an event	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
FS83.006	Brookside Development - Featherston Limited			Oppose	Disallow	Agree that the suggested name change provides more clarity, but this does not address the issue that the inclusion of site-specific flood alert areas on the planning maps contradicts the information presented on the Greater Wellington Regional Council's website. All references to flood alert areas should be removed until more robust data is available.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
S94.107	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-R7	NH-R7	Support	Retain as notified	NH-R7(1) Potentially hazard sensitive or hazard sensitive activities and buildings within flood alert area. It is appropriate to provide for new potentially hazard sensitive or hazard sensitive activities and associated	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						buildings within flood vulnerability areas as a restricted discretionary activity.		
FS83.007	Brookside Development - Featherston Limited			Oppose	Disallow	Rule NH-R7 should be removed until more detailed research has been done to justify the Flood Alert Areas shown on the planning maps, using all the information available to South Wairarapa District Council, including modelling and preventative measures already in place for site-specific approved subdivisions. Paragraph 19 of the section 32 report states "For some hazards (e.g. flood alert areas), a non-regulatory approach is taken, and the hazard is mapped for information only purposes. The mapped data was not considered robust enough to apply rules to these areas".	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
S94.108	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-R7	NH-R7	Support	Retain as notified	NH-R7(1)(a) It is appropriate to require, as a restricted discretionary condition, a flood hazard assessment to determine the nature and scale of the flood hazard on the property.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
FS83.008	Brookside Development - Featherston Limited			Oppose	Disallow	Rule NH-R7 should be removed until more detailed research has been done to justify the Flood Alert Areas shown on the planning maps, using all the information available to South Wairarapa District Council, including modelling and preventative measures already in place for site-specific approved subdivisions. Paragraph 19 of the section 32 report states "For some hazards (e.g. flood alert areas), a non-regulatory approach is taken, and the hazard is mapped for information only purposes. The mapped data was not considered robust enough to apply rules to these areas".	Reject	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
S94.109	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-R7	NH-R7	Support in part	Amend as follows: b. The risk of flooding to people, and the property, and surrounding properties is not increased;	It is appropriate to require, as a restricted discretionary condition, that the risk of flooding to people and property is not increased. It is important to clarify that this includes both the subject property and surrounding properties.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
FS77.008	EQC Toka Tū Ake			Support	Allow	Support including the effects of development on flood risk to surrounding properties in considerations for NH-R7. Building and development can increase the flood risk of surrounding properties by displacing flood water and decreasing the drainage potential of land.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
FS83.009	Brookside Development - Featherston Limited			Oppose	Disallow	Rule NH-R7 should be removed until more detailed research has been done to justify the Flood Alert Areas shown on the planning maps, using all the information available to South Wairarapa District Council, including modelling and preventative measures already in place for site-specific approved subdivisions. Paragraph 19 of the section 32 report states "For some hazards (e.g. flood alert areas), a non-regulatory approach is taken, and the hazard is mapped for information only purposes. The mapped data was not considered robust enough to apply rules to these areas".	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
S94.110	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-R7	NH-R7	Support	Retain as notified.	NH-R7(1)(c) It is appropriate to require, as a restricted discretionary condition, that the flood hazard is not worsened.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
FS83.0010	Brookside Development - Featherston Limited			Oppose	Disallow	Rule NH-R7 should be removed until more detailed research has been done to justify the Flood Alert Areas shown on the planning maps, using all the information	Reject in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						available to South Wairarapa District Council, including modelling and preventative measures already in place for site-specific approved subdivisions. Paragraph 19 of the section 32 report states "For some hazards (e.g. flood alert areas), a non-regulatory approach is taken, and the hazard is mapped for information only purposes. The mapped data was not considered robust enough to apply rules to these areas".		
S94.111	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-R7	NH-R7	Support	Retain as notified.	The proposed matters of discretion for resource consents associated with Rule NH-R7(1) are considered appropriate as they include measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate flooding effects on the buildings and refer back to the matters in Policies NH-P12 and NH-P13 for buildings and activities in flood vulnerability areas.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
FS83.011	Brookside Development - Featherston Limited			Oppose	Disallow	Rule NH-R7 should be removed until more detailed research has been done to justify the Flood Alert Areas shown on the planning maps, using all the information available to South Wairarapa District Council, including modelling and preventative measures already in place for site-specific approved subdivisions. Paragraph 19 of the section 32 report states "For some hazards (e.g. flood alert areas), a non-regulatory approach is taken, and the hazard is mapped for information only purposes. The mapped data was not considered robust enough to apply rules to these areas".	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
S94.112	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-R7	NH-R7	Support	Retain as notified.	NH-R7(2) It is appropriate to require resource consent as a discretionary activity where	Accept	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						new potentially hazard sensitive or hazard sensitive activities and associated buildings within flood alert areas do not meet NH-R7(1)(a), (b) or (c).		
FS83.012	Brookside Development - Featherston Limited			Oppose	Disallow	Considers it inappropriate to require resource consent under NH-R7 based on preliminary data. Considers this unfairly restricts or complicates development on land that has already addressed the issue to the satisfaction of South Wairarapa District Council via approved resource consent applications. Paragraph 19 of the section 32 report states "For some hazards (e.g. flood alert areas), a non-regulatory approach is taken, and the hazard is mapped for information only purposes. The mapped data was not considered robust enough to apply rules to these areas".	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
S94.113	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-R8	NH-R8	Support	Retain as notified	NH-R8(1)(a) It is appropriate to require resource consent for infrastructure within a low hazard area as a restricted discretionary activity.	Reject in part	NH – Natural hazards
S94.114	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-R8	NH-R8	Support in part	Amend introductory text to clarify the hazard sensitivity of infrastructure and amend matters of discretion as necessary.	It is unclear whether infrastructure is considered to be a hazard sensitive, potentially hazard sensitive or less hazard sensitive activity. Based on the introductory text for the Natural Hazards chapter, infrastructure is not listed and therefore would be considered a less sensitive activity. However, the reference to Policy NH-P4 within the matters of discretion would indicate that it is not a less sensitive activity. The matters of discretion for resource consents associated with Rule NH-R8(1)	Reject in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						referring back to Policies NH-P8 and NH-P11 are appropriate.		
S94.115	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-R8	NH-R8	Support	Retain as notified.	NH-R8(2)(a) It is appropriate to require resource consent as a discretionary activity for infrastructure located within a moderate or high hazard area.	Reject in part	NH – Natural hazards
S94.116	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-R9	NH-R9	Support	Retain as notified.	NH-R9(1) Hazard sensitive activities and associated buildings within moderate hazard and low hazard areas. It is appropriate to require resource consent as a discretionary activity for any hazard sensitive activity and associated buildings within moderate hazard areas and low hazard areas.	Reject in part	NH – Natural hazards
S94.117	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-R10	NH-R10	Support	Retain as notified.	NH-R10(1) Hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities and associated buildings within high hazard areas. It is appropriate to require resource consent as a non-complying activity for any hazard sensitive activity or potentially hazard sensitive activity and associated buildings within high hazard areas.	Reject in part	NH – Natural hazards
S95.001	Brookside Developments - Featherston Limited	NH-R7	NH-R7	Oppose	Delete NH-R7 until Flood Alert Areas can be fully justified.	Rules applying to Flood Alert Areas should be removed until more detailed research has been done to justify the Flood Hazard Areas shown on the planning maps. This "regulatory" tool directly contradicts the claim on page 19 of the S32 report that the Flood Alert information is only used for "information purposes only".	Reject	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
FS5.002	Karthik Soundararajan			Support	Allow	Considers the lack of accurate flood mapping and data accuracy should be noted and considers that until complete and comprehensive mapping for Featherston and South Wairarapa is completed, it should not be part of the District Plan as it differs greatly from the current hazard maps.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
FS77.014	EQC Toka Tū Ake			Oppose	Disallow	Flood alert areas and flood hazard areas should continue to be updated and mapped at an appropriate scale when improved modelling is available. EQC considers it is good practice to be cautious where detailed modelling is not yet available. Restricted discretionary status of buildings which contain hazard sensitive activities is appropriate in flood alert areas, as is requiring a supporting flood hazard assessment to further determine the nature of the risk.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
FS90.004	Greater Wellington Regional Council			Oppose	Disallow	Considers that the mapping used for the flood alert area is the best available information and has been validated in recent flood events. The provisions in NH-R7 are suitable, justified and underpins a precautionary approach in relation to planning for and adapting to the effects of natural hazards caused by climate change and sea level rise on both the natural environment and existing and future development	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S95.002	Brookside Developments - Featherston Limited	NH-P13	NH-P13	Oppose	Delete NH-P13 until Flood Alert Areas can be fully justified with robust, evidence-based mapping data.	Policy should be removed until more detailed research has been done to justify the Flood Alert Areas shown on the planning maps, using all the information available to SWDC, including modelling and preventative measures already in	Reject	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						place for site specific, approved subdivisions.		
FS77.013	EQC Toka Tū Ake			Oppose	Disallow	Flood alert areas and flood hazard areas should continue to be updated and mapped at an appropriate scale when improved modelling is available. EQC considers it is good practice to be cautious where detailed modelling is not yet available. NH-P13 is appropriate in discouraging building in areas which are in flood alert areas and may be at risk from flood hazard unless it can be demonstrated that risk to safety is low, the building will not exacerbate flood risk, and the risk to buildings and structures is not significantly increased.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
FS90.003	Greater Wellington Regional Council			Oppose	Disallow	Considers that the mapping used for the flood alert area is the best available information and has been validated in recent flood events. The provisions in NH-P13 are suitable, justified and underpins a precautionary approach in relation to planning for and adapting to the effects of natural hazards caused by climate change and sea level rise on both the natural environment and existing and future development	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S95.003	Brookside Developments - Featherston Limited	NH-P12	NH-P12	Oppose	Delete NH-P12 until Flood Alert Areas can be fully justified with robust, evidence-based mapping data.	Policy should be removed until more detailed research has been done to justify the Flood Alert Areas shown on the planning maps, using all the information available to SWDC, including modelling and preventative measures already in place for site specific, approved subdivisions.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
FS70.015	Canoe Wines Limited Partnership			Oppose	Disallow	It is important natural hazards are provided for using the best information available. While information will improve over time,	Accept	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						the proposed flood alert layer is currently the best available information. Retain Policy NH-P13 as notified.		
FS90.002	Greater Wellington Regional Council			Oppose	Disallow	Considers that the mapping used for the flood alert area is the best available information and has been validated in recent flood events. The provisions in NH-P12 are suitable, justified and underpins a precautionary approach in relation to planning for and adapting to the effects of natural hazards caused by climate change and sea level rise on both the natural environment and existing and future development.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S95.005	Brookside Developments - Featherston Limited	NH-P1	NH-P1	Oppose	Delete the Flood Alert Areas from Proposed District Plan until sufficient robust and evidence-based data is available.	The submitter notes that there is a lack of technical evidence to justify having Flood Alert Areas. Section 32 report states "For some hazards (e.g. Flood Alert Areas) a non-regulatory approach is taken, and the hazard is mapped for information only purposes. The mapped data was not considered robust enough to apply rules to these areas." Therefore, there is no current justification for rules to apply to these areas.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
FS5.001	Karthik Soundararajan			Support	Allow	Considers the proposed flood hazard alert area is incorrect. References the inclusion of their home at 144 Fitzherbert Street, which they note has existed from 1962 without any flooding and is currently in a no flooding zone. Considers their property has been included in a high flood alert area without due diligence, site visit, or accurate data. Considers that the only problem on Fitzherbert Street (SH2) has been the broken main pipelines, and notes camera and smoke testing has shown a main water line leak emptying into the sewer line.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
FS90.001	Greater Wellington Regional Council			Oppose	Disallow	Considers that the mapping used for the flood alert area is the best available information and has been validated in recent flood events.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S122.019	Fulton Hogan Limited	New provision request	New provision request	Support	Insert a new policy that recognises the role of activities that allow communities to recover from the adverse effects of natural hazards and climate change in providing for social, economic, and cultural resilience: NH-PXProvide for activities that enhance social, economic and cultural resilience in response to the adverse effects of natural hazards and climate change including activities that enhance the community's ability to recover.	Considers that having systems and facilities in place to enable recovery is a key part of building resilience to natural hazards and climate change risk given that avoidance is not always practicable. This includes access to material for rebuild and recovery.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
FS13.043	Horticulture New Zealand			Support	Allow	This policy will help build resilience for communities and primary industry in the Wairarapa.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
S149.023	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	NH-P3	NH-P3	Support in part	Amend NH-P3: ... 3. The risk to other properties, infrastructure including state highways, activities, and people is not increased as a result of the activity proceeding.	SH2 and SH53 both traverse identified flood hazard areas in the high, moderate, and low hazard zones; management of stormwater and flood hazards in these locations is an ongoing maintenance issue which can be made worse by developments on property flanking the state highway. Requests stormwater neutral development when new activities establish involving the displacement of stormwater (from new hard stand or buildings), the effects on state highway infrastructure needs to be recognised and provided for as a matter of assessment across several of the proposed policies. These policies are important because they form the matters of discretion in assessment of restricted discretionary activities.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
FS77.009	EQC Toka Tū Ake			Support	Allow	Support including the effects of activities on the natural hazard risk to surrounding infrastructure in Natural Hazard Policies 3, 4, and 5. While EQC does not have a direct contingent liability for infrastructure, maintaining functionality of and access to key infrastructure in the wake of a natural hazard event is a key aspect of resilience.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S149.024	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	NH-R1	NH-R1	Support in part	Amend NH-R1: Flood mitigation or stream or river management works undertaken by a statutory agency for their nominated agent within any of the flood hazard areas or where roads have been affected by ponding or flooding. (subject to relief sought for inserting a definition for "statutory agency")	Both state highways in the Wairarapa are within flood hazard areas and susceptible to flooding. It is important that NZTA can effectively undertake flood mitigation works to support highway resilience. The term 'statutory agency' is not defined by the proposed plan, and it is therefore unclear if this rule applies to them or their activities. Some flood prone locations on SH2 and SH53 are not located in any of the flood hazard areas. The submitter seeks that flood mitigation works affecting state highways, but which fall outside the designation boundary of a state highway, be included as permitted activities.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
S149.056	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	NH-P4	NH-P4	Support in part	Amend NH-P4: ... 3. The risk to other properties, infrastructure including state highways , activities, and people is not increased as a result of the activity proceeding.	SH2 and SH53 both traverse identified flood hazard areas in the high, moderate, and low hazard zones; management of stormwater and flood hazards in these locations is an ongoing maintenance issue which can be made worse by developments on property flanking the state highway. Requests stormwater neutral development when new activities establish involving the displacement of stormwater (from new hard stand or buildings), the effects on state highway infrastructure needs to be recognised and provided for as a matter of assessment across several of the proposed policies. These policies are important because they	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						form the matters of discretion in assessment of restricted discretionary activities.		
FS77.0010	EQC Toka Tū Ake			Support	Allow	Support including the effects of activities on the natural hazard risk to surrounding infrastructure in Natural Hazard Policies 3, 4, and 5. While EQC does not have a direct contingent liability for infrastructure, maintaining functionality of and access to key infrastructure in the wake of a natural hazard event is a key aspect of resilience.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
FS77.015	EQC Toka Tū Ake			Support	Allow	Support including the effects of activities on the natural hazard risk to surrounding infrastructure in Natural Hazard Policies 3, 4, and 5. While EQC does not have a direct contingent liability for infrastructure, maintaining functionality of and access to key infrastructure in the wake of a natural hazard event is a key aspect of resilience.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S149.057	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	NH-P5	NH-P5	Support in part	Amend NH-P5: ... 3. The risk to other properties, infrastructure including state highways , activities, and people is not increased as a result of the activity proceeding.	SH2 and SH53 both traverse identified flood hazard areas in the high, moderate, and low hazard zones; management of stormwater and flood hazards in these locations is an ongoing maintenance issue which can be made worse by developments on property flanking the state highway. Requests stormwater neutral development when new activities establish involving the displacement of stormwater (from new hard stand or buildings), the effects on state highway infrastructure needs to be recognised and provided for as a matter of assessment across several of the proposed policies. These policies are important because they form the matters of discretion in assessment of restricted discretionary activities.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
FS77.011	EQC Toka Tū Ake			Support	Allow	Support including the effects of activities on the natural hazard risk to surrounding infrastructure in Natural Hazard Policies 3, 4, and 5. While EQC does not have a direct contingent liability for infrastructure, maintaining functionality of and access to key infrastructure in the wake of a natural hazard event is a key aspect of resilience.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S149.058	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	NH-P6	NH-P6	Support in part	Amend NH-P6: Discourage new buildings and extensive areas of hard stand in flood hazard - overland flow path and ponding areas unless: 1. There is no increase in stormwater discharge , flood flow or level on adjoining sites, or roads .	SH2 and SH53 both traverse identified flood hazard areas in the high, moderate, and low hazard zones; management of stormwater and flood hazards in these locations is an ongoing maintenance issue which can be made worse by developments on property flanking the state highway. Requests stormwater neutral development when new activities establish involving the displacement of stormwater (from new hard stand or buildings), the effects on state highway infrastructure needs to be recognised and provided for as a matter of assessment across several of the proposed policies. These policies are important because they form the matters of discretion in assessment of restricted discretionary activities.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
FS77.012	EQC Toka Tū Ake			Support	Allow	Large areas of hard stand (paved areas to support heavy loads) can exacerbate flood risk by decreasing the amount of permeable ground that is available to drain flood water and can impede the flow of flood waters, increasing both the depth and longevity of the flood. We support restricting areas of hard stand in overland flow paths unless there is demonstrably no increase in flood risk to adjacent sites or roads.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
FS90.109	Greater Wellington Regional Council			Support	Allow	Considers that this is consistent with risk-based approach to flooding and hydraulic neutrality in the proposed RPS change 1. Will require definition of 'extensive' - for example is this a percentage or a minimum area?	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S149.059	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	NH-P9	NH-P9	Support in part	Amend NH-P9: ... 2. the risk to other properties, the state highway , activities and people is not increased as a result of the activity proceeding.	SH2 and SH53 both traverse identified flood hazard areas in the high, moderate, and low hazard zones; management of stormwater and flood hazards in these locations is an ongoing maintenance issue which can be made worse by developments on property flanking the state highway. Requests stormwater neutral development when new activities establish involving the displacement of stormwater (from new hard stand or buildings), the effects on state highway infrastructure needs to be recognised and provided for as a matter of assessment across several of the proposed policies. These policies are important because they form the matters of discretion in assessment of restricted discretionary activities.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S149.060	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA)	NH-P13	NH-P13	Support in part	Amend NH-P13: ... 1. There is no increase in flood flow or level of adjoining sites or the state highway .	SH2 and SH53 both traverse identified flood hazard areas in the high, moderate, and low hazard zones; management of stormwater and flood hazards in these locations is an ongoing maintenance issue which can be made worse by developments on property flanking the state highway. Requests stormwater neutral development when new activities establish involving the displacement of stormwater (from new hard stand or buildings), the effects on state highway infrastructure needs to be recognised and provided for as a matter of assessment	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						across several of the proposed policies. These policies are important because they form the matters of discretion in assessment of restricted discretionary activities.		
FS83.019	Brookside Development - Featherston Limited			Oppose	Disallow	Policy NH-P13 should be removed until more detailed research has been done to justify the Flood Alert Areas shown on the planning maps, using all the information available to South Wairarapa District Council, including modelling and preventative measures already in place for site-specific approved subdivisions	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
S172.027	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	NH-O1	NH-O1	Support	Retain NH-O1 as notified.	Supports NH-O1 insofar as it promoted not increasing the risks and consequences from natural hazards on people, property, infrastructure, and the environment.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S172.028	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	NH-P2	NH-P2	Support	Retain NH-P2 as notified.	Supports NH-P2 insofar as it allows for hazard sensitive activities to locate in high hazard areas where the activity has an operational need or functional need to locate within the high hazard area. There are existing fire stations located in hazard areas and may have an operational and/or functional need to locate new stations in areas subject to hazard overlays.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S172.029	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	NH-P3	NH-P3	Support	Retain NH-P3 as notified.	Supports NH-P3 insofar as it allows for hazard sensitive activities to locate in these hazard areas providing it is demonstrated that the risks associated with the hazard are appropriately mitigated.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S172.030	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	NH-P4	NH-P4	Support	Retain NH-P4 as notified.	Supports NH-P4 insofar as it allows for hazard sensitive activities to locate in these hazard areas providing it is demonstrated that the risks associated with the hazard are appropriately mitigated.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
S186.021	Wellington Fish and Game Council	NH-O1	NH-O1	Support	Retain as notified.	Support objective.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S186.022	Wellington Fish and Game Council	NH-P8	NH-P8	Support in part	Amend NH-P8 (3) as follows: "...3. the risk to properties, activities, the environment , and people is not increased..."	Needs provision for environmental health.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
FS97.117	Transpower New Zealand			Oppose	Disallow	Opposes the submission on the basis that the rationale and consequences of the addition of "the environment" are not set out in the submission. Concerned that, given the broad RMA definition of 'environment', the relief sought may inappropriately prevent activities in situations where (for example) there may be a temporary inconsequential increase in risk to an element of the environment.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S186.023	Wellington Fish and Game Council	NH-P9	NH-P9	Support in part	Amend NH-P9 (2) as follows: "...2. the risk to properties, activities, the environment , and people is not increased..."	To provide for environmental health as far as practicable.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
FS97.118	Transpower New Zealand			Oppose	Disallow	Opposes the submission on the basis that the rationale and consequences of the addition of "the environment" are not set out in the submission. Concerned that, given the broad RMA definition of 'environment', the relief sought may inappropriately prevent activities in situations where (for example) there may be a temporary inconsequential increase in risk to an element of the environment.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S186.024	Wellington Fish and Game Council	NH-P10	NH-P10	Neutral	Amend to give effect to Te Mana o te Wai and the NPS-FM (2020), and activities which degrade the ecosystem and mauri	Noting giving effect to Te Mana o te Wai and the NPS-FM (2020).	Reject in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
					of the waterbody (such as gravel extraction, ripping and raking, and control and command flood works) should be minimised where possible and better solutions for people and communities to co-exist with waterways should be actively explored now and into the future			
S187.025	New Zealand Frost Fans	Introduction	Introduction	Support in part	Amend the introduction to include a fifth bullet point as follows: - Fences, machinery and equipment for land based primary production.	The introduction would benefit from additional clarity when used in the Natural Hazard rule framework. The addition of fences, machinery and equipment for land based primary production to the definition both recognises the appropriate level of sensitivity to natural hazards for those matters and also their impact on the effects of natural hazards.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
FS13.039	Horticulture New Zealand			Support	Allow	Fences, machinery and equipment for primary production are less sensitive to natural hazard risk.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S187.026	New Zealand Frost Fans	NH-P5	NH-P5	Support in part	Retain NH-P5 Less hazard sensitive activities in all hazard areas as notified subject to the amendment proposed in this submission to the definition of 'less hazard sensitive activities' or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	The policy has an appropriate framework to manage less hazard sensitive activities, subject to minor matters being included in the definition, including fencing, machinery and equipment for land based primary production.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S187.027	New Zealand Frost Fans	NH-R2	NH-R2	Support in part	Amend NH-R2 Less hazard sensitive activities within all hazard areas as follows: All Zones 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Any buildings must not be located in the overland flow path or river corridor of the flood hazard overlays. b. Fences, machinery and equipment used for	The addition of fences, machinery and equipment for land based primary production to the rule both recognises the appropriate level of sensitivity to natural hazards for those matters and also their impact on the effects of natural hazards.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
					land based primary production activities are located in any hazard areas. 2. Activity status: Restricted: Restricted discretionary Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with NH-R2(1)(a) Matters of discretion: 1. the matters in Policy NH-P5.			
S187.028	New Zealand Frost Fans	NH-R5	NH-R5	Support in part	Amend NH-R5 as follows: NH-R5 Earthworks within flood hazard areas All Zones 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The earthworks are not located in a river corridor or overland flow path. b. The earthworks are solely that necessary for the installation of farm fencing, machinery and equipment for land based primary production. 2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with NH-R5(1) Matters of discretion: 1. The matters in Policy NH-P9	As written, the rule does not give effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land. fences, machinery and equipment for land based primary production where this would have no effects or effects are less than minor should be exempt from compliance.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
S189.036	Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Tower Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) and Spark New	NH-R1	NH-R1	Oppose	Insert the following to the introduction to the chapter: The provisions in this chapter do not apply to telecommunication network utility structures and activities. NOTE: This request applies to Rules NH-R1, NH-R2, NH-R3 and NH-R4.	Given the direction provided in the NESTF (as explained in the cover letter to the submission) a clear exclusion to telecommunication network utility structures from the chapter is sought.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
	Zealand Trading Limited (Spark)							
S191.012	David Ian McGuinness	NH-O1	NH-O1	Support	Retain NH-O1 as notified	Support intention of Objective	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
FS86.012	Brian John McGuinness			Support	Allow	Supports the reasoning in the original submission.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S191.013	David Ian McGuinness	NH-P1	NH-P1	Support	Retain NH-P1 as notified.	Support intention of the policy.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
FS86.013	Brian John McGuinness			Support	Allow	Supports the reasoning in the original submission.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S191.039	David Ian McGuinness	NH-O2	NH-O2	Support	Retain NH-O2 as notified	Supports intention of the objective	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
FS86.039	Brian John McGuinness			Support	Allow	Supports the reasoning in the original submission.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S191.040	David Ian McGuinness	NH-P4	NH-P4	Support	Retain NH-P4 as notified	Supports the intention of the policy	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
FS86.040	Brian John McGuinness			Support	Allow	Supports the reasoning in the original submission.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S191.041	David Ian McGuinness	NH-P11	NH-P11	Support	Retain NH-P11 as notified	Supports intention of the policy	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
FS86.041	Brian John McGuinness			Support	Allow	Supports the reasoning in the original submission.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S191.042	David Ian McGuinness	NH-P12	NH-P12	Support	Retain NH-P12 as notified.	Supports intention of the policy	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
FS83.013	Brookside Development - Featherston Limited			Oppose	Disallow	Policy NH-P12 should be removed until more detailed research has been done to justify the Flood Alert Areas shown on the planning maps, using all the information available to South Wairarapa District Council, including modelling and preventative measures already in place for site-specific approved subdivisions	Reject	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
FS86.042	Brian John McGuinness			Support	Allow	Supports the reasoning in the original submission.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S191.043	David Ian McGuinness	NH-P13	NH-P13	Support	Retain NH-P13 as notified	Supports intention of the policy	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
FS86.043	Brian John McGuinness			Support	Allow	Supports the reasoning in the original submission.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
FS83.028	Brookside Development - Featherston Limited			Oppose	Disallow	Policy NH-P13 should be removed until more detailed research has been done to justify the Flood Alert Areas shown on the planning maps, using all the information available to South Wairarapa District Council, including modelling and preventative measures already in place for site specific, approved subdivisions.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
S209.036	Powerco Limited	NH-R8	NH-R8	Oppose	Amend the rule so that infrastructure within hazard areas is a permitted activity. Where: a. The alterations are only undertaken in the interior of the scheduled heritage building or item where the interior is not specifically listed in SCHED1 Heritage Buildings and Items. b. The works are for a customer connection line	Submitter is opposed to a blanket rule requiring resource consent for all infrastructure within hazard areas. Our assets need to be located in all environments including hazard areas. As prudent asset owners, we assess risk to determine the best location for our infrastructure.	Reject in part	NH – Natural hazards
FS90.111	Greater Wellington Regional Council			Oppose	Disallow	Considers the infrastructure needs to be resilient. The relief sought weakens the purpose of the rule.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S212.023	Māori Trustee	NH-O1	NH-O1	Support	Retain NH-O1 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Natural Hazard' objectives in this chapter.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S212.024	Māori Trustee	NH-P1	NH-P1	Support in part	Insert a provision to identify 'wildfire' as a natural hazard risk in the Natural Hazard chapter.	The submitter notes that the natural hazard risk to people and property from 'Wildfire' is not identified and that no statement about the assessed level of risk is made.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						'Wildfire' is a natural hazard that is likely to be exacerbated by climate change and is identified in the publicly notified GWRC RPS PC 1. The submitter considers that there should be an explanation or discussion of the level of risks from 'wildfire' to the Wairarapa. This needs to be addressed in the introduction to the chapter before the objectives. Furthermore, Wildfire is a natural hazard risk that should be assessed using the framework that is within this chapter to categorise natural hazards.		
FS81.049	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			Support	Allow	Agrees that the proposed plan fails to address the impact of wildfires. Considers that the plan change process provides the Council with an opportunity to address the prevention and management of wildfires in the region.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
S212.025	Māori Trustee	NH-P2	NH-P2	Support in part	Amend as follows: Avoid locating hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities within high hazard areas unless the activity has an operational need or functional need to locate within the high hazard area.	The submitter does not support the use of an 'operational need' test for locating hazard sensitive activities or potentially hazard sensitive activities within areas of high natural hazard risk, particularly on Māori land. The submitter is concerned that the use of such a test will result in the approval of development or land uses that would put people and property at risk for purely economic reasons. The submitter acknowledges that there may be instances where activities will need to be located in these areas, however, a 'functional need' test, though also not perfect, will be available for these cases. The submitter considers that the removal of 'operational need' is important to provide	Reject	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						a consistent framework for assessing natural hazard risks for new development.		
FS97.071	Transpower New Zealand			Oppose	Disallow	Opposes the submission on the basis that the relief sought is contrary, and does not give effect to, Policy 3 of the NPSET insofar as the Policy relates to the National Grid.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S212.026	Māori Trustee	NH-P8	NH-P8	Support in part	Amend as follows: Allow for the upgrade of existing infrastructure, and only allow new infrastructure to be established in hazard areas where: 1. it has an operational need or functional need for the location;	The submitter does not support the use of an 'operational need' test under clause 1 of policy NH-P8. The submitter is concerned that the use of such a test will promote the maintenance or location of infrastructure in areas with ongoing or increased risks from natural hazards (and exacerbated by climate change) that will not support people or communities to enhance their resilience from the risks of natural hazard events. The submitter acknowledges that there may be instances where existing infrastructure activities will need to be located in these areas however, a 'functional need' test, though also not perfect, will be available for these cases.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
FS97.072	Transpower New Zealand			Oppose	Disallow	Opposes the submission on the basis that the relief sought is contrary, and does not give effect to, Policy 3 of the NPSET insofar as the Policy relates to the National Grid.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S212.027	Māori Trustee	NH-P11	NH-P11	Support in part	Amend as follows: Ensure a precautionary approach that includes the application of mātauranga Māori , is taken in relation to planning for and adapting to the effects of natural hazards caused by climate change and sea level rise on both the natural environment and existing and	The submitter considers that landowners want to be empowered with information on natural hazard risk to make their own decisions in managing effects upon their communities and whenua from natural hazards, climate change and sea level rise. The submitter would support the use of a precautionary approach that encourages the use of mātauranga Māori when	Reject	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
					future development.	assessing natural hazard risk and mitigation measures to avoid negative impacts on the surrounding lands. They consider that decision-makers should apply a precautionary, but adaptive, approach when encountering uncertainty. This would ensure that each development proposal is dynamically assessed and responsive to changing situations. The submitter also considers that if decision-makers are to adopt a precautionary approach, that this recommendation does not unintentionally undermine the use of mātauranga Māori to inform decisions, as research in this area has historically been underfunded.		
S212.028	Māori Trustee	NH-P12	NH-P12	Support in part	Amend to reassign 'Flood alert' as a layer within 'Flood Hazard'. Amend the level of hazard risk for the Flood Alert Area from 'low / moderate / high' to one level of hazard risk (and one colour) for all locations identified within the Flood Alert Area. Amend to assign a commonly understood measure of height for 'flood alert areas' which will assist landowners when future development is considered either within themap layer or in the Natural Hazards chapter.	The submitter considers that this policy creates uncertainty where a 'Flood Alert Area' is partially identified over land and the magnitude of the Flood Alert hazard ranges from 'low-moderate-high'. To better manage this uncertainty and provide clarity for landowners, the overlay display of the Flood Alert Area should be amended. It is also considered that the policy should be re-written to refer to the suggested changes.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
FS83.014	Brookside Development - Featherston Limited			Support in part	Allow in part	Agree that the policy creates uncertainty. However, considers the issue is greater than described in the original submission, as the flood alert areas are not based on robust data and should not be included in the District Plan until further study has been completed.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
FS90.096	Greater Wellington Regional Council			Oppose	Disallow	Considers that flood hazard is not just depth (as the submitter has called it height), it is also velocity which is why the mapping is presented as high/medium/low hazard. Shallow fast flowing water is as dangerous and, in some cases, more so than deep still water.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S212.029	Māori Trustee	NH-P13	NH-P13	Support in part	Amend as follows: Discourage new buildings in flood alert areas unless: 1. there is no increase in flood flow or level on adjoining sites; 2. risk to people's safety will be low; 3. the activity incorporates mitigation measures so that the risk of damage to buildings and structures is not significantly increased; and 4. people can safely evacuate the property during a natural hazard event; and 5. there is no history of natural hazard (flood) occurrence.	The submitter considers that NH-P13 does not currently recognise the limitation that Māori freehold landowners encounter in developing their whenua. Due to the nature of Māori freehold land ownership and the barriers to accessing capital for risk mitigation, owners could face an inability to develop within tolerable areas of high risk. Therefore, if a property is located within a 'Flood Alert Area' but has no history of a natural hazard (flood) occurrence, development should still be possible of evidence is provided. The submitter also considers that further information needs to be provided on how the 'Flood Alert Area' modelling determined the susceptibility of properties and buildings to an identified flood event.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
FS83.016	Brookside Development - Featherston Limited			Support in part	Allow in part	Agree that map notations present limitations. Policy NH-P13 should be removed until more detailed research has been done to justify the Flood Alert Areas shown on the planning maps, using all the information available to South Wairarapa District Council, including modelling and preventative measures already in place for site-specific approved subdivisions.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
FS90.097	Greater Wellington Regional Council			Oppose	Disallow	Considers that no history of natural hazard event does not necessarily mean there is not a hazard. Additionally, there is not	Accept	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						sufficient/reliable data to say if an area has no history of flooding.		
S212.030	Māori Trustee	NH-R1	NH-R1	Support in part	Amend NH-R1 to allow landowners to undertake works for flood mitigation or stream/river management on their own property as a permitted activity.	The submitter considers that there should be an accompanying rule as part of the PDP NH-R1 that provides for landowners to undertake works for flood mitigation or stream/river management on their own property as a permitted activity. Rural land can include streams or rivers which is not managed may exacerbate that areas flood risk. These streams or rivers may not be prioritised for flood mitigation or river management works by Council. Therefore, provided that landowners meet minimum standards, works for the purpose of flood mitigation, streams or river management should be a permitted activity. This rule could have permitted standards in terms of the works being in accordance with standards set by Council for managing any adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity, and water quality.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
S212.031	Māori Trustee	NH-P9	NH-P9	Oppose	Amend activity status of NH-R9 from Discretionary to Restricted Discretionary.	The submitter considers that this rule should be a 'restricted discretionary' rather than a discretionary activity. This would put the proposed NH-R9 on the same basis as the proposed NH-R7. If both of these proposed rules are 'restricted discretionary', this would reflect the severity of the (moderate or low) hazard which can be mitigated through risk assessment and physical measures as a basis for an acceptable development (using the criteria listed under NH-P3 and NH-R7). Retaining NH-R9 as 'discretionary' is considered inconsistent when this might	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						be the only reason that resource consent is required.		
S212.151	Māori Trustee	NH-O2	NH-O2	Support	Retain NH-O2 as notified.	The submitter is generally comfortable with the 'Natural Hazard' objectives in this chapter.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S214.031	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NH-O2	NH-O2	Support	Delete NH-O2.	The submitter does not understand how using natural features will reduce the susceptibility of people, communities, property, and infrastructure to damage from natural hazards. Using natural features is not a risk-based approach to managing the effects of natural hazards on people and communities.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
FS87.053	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Incorporated			Oppose in part	Allow in part	Agree that 'natural features' is objective wording and needs amendment, however, an objective to provide for natural defences and encourage their use over hard protection is useful direction and consistent with NZCPS policies 25 and 26.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
FS95.136	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia Trust			Oppose	Disallow	Our right to enact kaitiakitanga is through our whakapapa and is reinserted as per Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Many legislation and policies talk to early engagement with mana whenua for kaupapa that impacts whenua, awa, āngi. The principle of tangata whenua exercising kaitiakitanga is part of Section 7(a) of the RMA. There are already protections in place for Landowners in many other legislations and anything discussed or proposed here is not done so outside of the Colonial Framework that has been forced upon us.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S214.032	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NH-P1	NH-P1	Support in part	Amend NH-P1 as follows: Identify and map areas affected by natural hazards using a risk-based approach and take a risk-based approach to the management of	The submitter supports identifying and mapping areas affected by natural hazards provided a risk-based approach is used to identify these areas. They also encourage the Councils to engage with the relevant	Reject	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
					subdivision use and development based on: 1. the sensitivity of the activities to the impacts of natural hazards and 2. The hazard posed to people's lives and wellbeing and property by considering the likelihood and consequences of differing natural hazard events	impacted landowners who are located within those areas. The submitter supports the management of subdivision use and development in these areas based on the sensitivity of the activities to the impacts of natural hazards posed to people's lives, wellbeing, and property. The submitter believes that NH-P1 would be better split into two separate policies.		
FS95.137	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia Trust			Oppose	Disallow	Our right to enact kaitiakitanga is through our whakapapa and is reinserted as per Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Many legislation and policies talk to early engagement with mana whenua for kaupapa that impacts whenua, awa, āngi. The principle of tangata whenua exercising kaitiakitanga is part of Section 7(a) of the RMA. There are already protections in place for Landowners in many other legislations and anything discussed or proposed here is not done so outside of the Colonial Framework that has been forced upon us.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S214.033	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	New provision request	New provision request	Support	Insert new policy as follows: NH-PX - Subdivision Use and Development of Natural Hazard areas Take a risk based approach to the management of subdivision, use, and development based on: 1. the sensitivity of the activities to the impacts of natural hazards; and 2. The hazard posed to people's lives and wellbeing and property by considering the likelihood and consequences of differing natural hazard events.	The submitter supports identifying and mapping areas affected by natural hazards provided a risk-based approach is used to identify these areas. They also encourage the Councils to engage with the relevant impacted landowners who are located within those areas. The submitter supports the management of subdivision use and development in these areas based on the sensitivity of the activities to the impacts of natural hazards posed to people's lives, wellbeing, and property.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						The submitter believes that NH-P1 would be better split into two separate policies.		
FS95.138	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia Trust			Oppose	Disallow	Our right to enact kaitiakitanga is through our whakapapa and is reinserted as per Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Many legislation and policies talk to early engagement with mana whenua for kaupapa that impacts whenua, awa, āngi. The principle of tangata whenua exercising kaitiakitanga is part of Section 7(a) of the RMA. There are already protections in place for Landowners in many other legislations and anything discussed or proposed here is not done so outside of the Colonial Framework that has been forced upon us.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S214.034	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NH-P2	NH-P2	Support in part	Retain NH-P2 where the definition of 'potentially sensitive activities' is amended to exclude buildings associated with primary production and rural industry activities.	The submitter supports in part NH-P2. They agree that hazard sensitive activities should not be located in high hazard areas and that hazard sensitive activities should be allowed in moderate hazard areas provided the requirements in NH-P3 are met. The submitter opposes defining potentially hazard sensitive activities to include buildings associated with primary production activities and rural industry activities. The respective activities are non-habitable and do not pose a 'potential' level of risk to people and communities. As such, they should be permitted to locate within all natural hazard areas.	Reject in part	NH – Natural hazards
FS13.040	Horticulture New Zealand			Support	Allow	Rural primary production activities carry a lower sensitivity than activities involving a dense or vulnerable population and should be designated as such.	Reject in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
FS95.139	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia Trust			Oppose	Disallow	Our right to enact kaitiakitanga is through our whakapapa and is reinserted as per Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Many legislation and policies talk to early engagement with mana whenua for kaupapa that impacts whenua, awa, āngi. The principle of tangata whenua exercising kaitiakitanga is part of Section 7(a) of the RMA. There are already protections in place for Landowners in many other legislations and anything discussed or proposed here is not done so outside of the Colonial Framework that has been forced upon us.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S214.035	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NH-P5	NH-P5	Support in part	Retain NH-P5 where the definition of 'potentially sensitive activities' is amended to exclude buildings associated with primary production and rural industry activities.	The submitter supports this policy subject to the amended definition of 'potentially hazard sensitive activities'.	Reject in part	NH – Natural hazards
FS95.140	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia Trust			Oppose	Disallow	Our right to enact kaitiakitanga is through our whakapapa and is reinserted as per Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Many legislation and policies talk to early engagement with mana whenua for kaupapa that impacts whenua, awa, āngi. The principle of tangata whenua exercising kaitiakitanga is part of Section 7(a) of the RMA. There are already protections in place for Landowners in many other legislations and anything discussed or proposed here is not done so outside of the Colonial Framework that has been forced upon us.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S214.036	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NH-P10	NH-P10	Support in part	Amend NH-P10 as follows: Enable natural hazard mitigation or stream and river management works undertaken by a statutory agency or their nominated contractors or agents within hazard areas where these will significantly decrease the existing risk to	The submitter seeks to ensure that mitigation works involving private land within natural hazard areas undertaken by a statutory agency, or their nominated contractors or agents, are undertaken in a manner that is compliant with section 181 of the Local Government Act 2002. Seeks	Reject	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
					people's safety and wellbeing, property, and infrastructure in accordance with powers in relation to construction of works on private land under the Local Government Act 2002.	to clarify that this policy will not limit the landowners' rights to carry out natural hazard mitigation or stream and river management works on their land.		
FS95.141	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia Trust			Oppose	Disallow	Our right to enact kaitiakitanga is through our whakapapa and is reinserted as per Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Many legislation and policies talk to early engagement with mana whenua for kaupapa that impacts whenua, awa, āngi. The principle of tangata whenua exercising kaitiakitanga is part of Section 7(a) of the RMA. There are already protections in place for Landowners in many other legislations and anything discussed or proposed here is not done so outside of the Colonial Framework that has been forced upon us.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S214.037	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NH-R1	NH-R1	Support in part	Amend NH-R1 so that flood mitigation, or stream and river management works, prior to extreme weather events is a permitted activity for landowners.	The submitter supports the purpose of this rule, but objects to the requirement that flood mitigation, or stream and river management works, are only permitted when done by or on behalf of a statutory agency or their nominated agent. There are often extenuating circumstances (e.g. extreme weather events) that see members of the community (e.g. farmers) having to undertake flood mitigation (e.g. drainage works) without permission from Council.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
FS90.069	Greater Wellington Regional Council			Oppose	Disallow	Considers this amendment is too vague and could create perverse outcomes, potentially allowing for a lot of works to occur without any checks.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
FS95.142	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia Trust			Oppose	Disallow	Our right to enact kaitiakitanga is through our whakapapa and is reinserted as per Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Many legislation and	Accept	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						policies talk to early engagement with mana whenua for kaupapa that impacts whenua, awa, āngi. The principle of tangata whenua exercising kaitiakitanga is part of Section 7(a) of the RMA. There are already protections in place for Landowners in many other legislations and anything discussed or proposed here is not done so outside of the Colonial Framework that has been forced upon us.		
S214.038	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NH-R3	NH-R3	Support in part	Retain NH-R3 provided the buildings associated with primary production and rural industry activities are deleted from the definition of 'potentially hazard sensitive activities'.	One of the consequences of including buildings associated with primary production and rural industry activities in the definition of 'potentially hazard sensitive activities' is that farmers would have to comply with finished floor level requirements as stated in NH-R3. This is unreasonable for farmers and an onerous mitigation measure that is not relative to the risk to people's lives or wellbeing because of the non-habitable nature of these buildings.	Reject in part	NH – Natural hazards
FS95.143	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia Trust			Oppose	Disallow	Our right to enact kaitiakitanga is through our whakapapa and is reinserted as per Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Many legislation and policies talk to early engagement with mana whenua for kaupapa that impacts whenua, awa, āngi. The principle of tangata whenua exercising kaitiakitanga is part of Section 7(a) of the RMA. There are already protections in place for Landowners in many other legislations and anything discussed or proposed here is not done so outside of the Colonial Framework that has been forced upon us.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S214.152	Federated Farmers of New Zealand			Support in part	Retain the Natural Hazards chapter, incorporating the amendments sought by	An important function of territorial authorities under section 31(1)(b)(i) of the RMA is the control of land use for the	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
					the submitter in subsequent submission points.	purpose of avoiding or mitigating adverse effects from natural hazards such as floods and earthquakes. It is important that the council exercise this function in a way that adequately balances allowing people and communities to use their property and undertake activities while also ensuring that lives and significant assets are not harmed or lost as a result of a natural hazard event. The submitter supports the risk-based approach to natural hazards that the council has taken.		
FS95.257	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia Trust			Oppose	Disallow	Our right to enact kaitiakitanga is through our whakapapa and is reinserted as per Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Many legislation and policies talk to early engagement with mana whenua for kaupapa that impacts whenua, awa, āngi. The principle of tangata whenua exercising kaitiakitanga is part of Section 7(a) of the RMA. There are already protections in place for Landowners in many other legislations and anything discussed or proposed here is not done so outside of the Colonial Framework that has been forced upon us.	Reject in part	NH – Natural hazards
S214.153	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NH-P3	NH-P3	Support in part	Retain NH-P3 where the definition of 'potentially sensitive activities' is amended to exclude buildings associated with primary production and rural industry activities.	The submitter supports in part NH-P3. They agree that hazard sensitive activities should not be located in high hazard areas and that hazard sensitive activities should be allowed in moderate hazard areas provided the requirements in NH-P3 are met. The submitter opposes defining potentially hazard sensitive activities to include buildings associated with primary production activities and rural industry activities. The respective activities are non-habitable and do not pose a 'potential' level	Reject in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						of risk to people and communities. As such, they should be permitted to locate within all natural hazard areas.		
FS13.041	Horticulture New Zealand			Support	Allow	Rural primary production activities carry a lower sensitivity than activities involving a dense or vulnerable population and should be designated as such.	Reject in part	NH – Natural hazards
FS95.258	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia Trust			Oppose	Disallow	Our right to enact kaitiakitanga is through our whakapapa and is reinserted as per Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Many legislation and policies talk to early engagement with mana whenua for kaupapa that impacts whenua, awa, āngi. The principle of tangata whenua exercising kaitiakitanga is part of Section 7(a) of the RMA. There are already protections in place for Landowners in many other legislations and anything discussed or proposed here is not done so outside of the Colonial Framework that has been forced upon us.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S218.042	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Introduction	Introduction	Support in part	Amend the definition of 'Less hazard sensitive activities' as follows: "Means activities that are less sensitive to natural hazards, which are: a. accessory buildings used for non-habitable purposes; b. Park management activity; and c. Buildings and structures associated with temporary activities; and d. not defined as Hazard sensitive activities or potentially hazard sensitive activities. "	Notes that infrastructure and network utilities have not been explicitly classified in terms of risk or consequence of natural hazards and, as such, defaults to the 'less hazard sensitive activities' category because the introduction to the Natural Hazards chapter states that "any activity that is not specifically listed below is considered a less hazard sensitive activity". As set out earlier in this submission, seeks that the definition of 'less hazard sensitive activities is amended to align with the introductory statement.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S218.043	Transpower New Zealand Limited	NH-P8	NH-P8	Support in part	Amend Policy NH-P8 as follows: "Allow for the Enable the operation, maintenance and upgrading of existing infrastructure, and only allow provide for new infrastructure to be established in	Supports the approach of including a specific policy that addresses infrastructure in hazard areas, but considers that, when compared to the policy direction in Policies NH-P4 and NH-P5, the approach to	Accept	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
					hazard areas where new infrastructure : 1. it has an operational need or functional need for the location; 2. it will be designed to maintain its integrity and function during and after a natural hazard event, or it will be able to be immediately re-instated after a natural hazard event, and 3. does not increase the risk to properties, activities, and people is not increased ."	infrastructure in hazards areas is inconsistent and inappropriately stringent. Seeks that the Policy is amended to align with Policies NH-P4 and NH-P5 in order to appropriately address the characteristics of infrastructure including its locational requirements and ability to be designed to be resilient to the potential effects of natural hazard events.		
S218.044	Transpower New Zealand Limited	NH-R8	NH-R8	Support in part	Amend Rule NH-R8 as follows: "NH-R8 Infrastructure in hazard areas All zones 1. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Permitted Where: a. New infrastructure is located outside of a moderate or high hazard area within a low hazard area . b. Any buildings must not be located in the overland flowpath or river corridor of the flood hazard overlays. Matters of discretion:1. The matters set out in NH-P4, NH-P8, and NH-P11: All zones 2. Activity status: Restricted dDiscretionary Where: a. Infrastructure is located within moderate or high hazard areas. Compliance is not achieved with NH-R8(1). Matters of discretion:1. The matters set out in NH-P4, NH-P8, and NH-P11.	Supports the approach of including a specific rule that addresses infrastructure in hazard areas, but considers that, when compared to Rule NH-R2, the approach to infrastructure in hazard areas is inconsistent and inappropriately stringent. Seeks that Rule NH-R8 is amended to be generally consistent with Rule NH-R2.	Reject in part	NH – Natural hazards
FS90.135	Greater Wellington Regional Council			Oppose	Disallow	Considers that specific rules for infrastructure in the coastal environment is not appropriate flexibility to allow full discretion of matters that may not be covered in NH-P4, 8 & 11.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
S221.057	Horticulture New Zealand	Introduction	Introduction	Oppose in part	Amend Natural Hazards Introduction as follows: Potentially hazard sensitive activities comprise the following: Buildings associated with primary production; - Commercial activities; and - Industrial activities; and Rural industry activities. Less hazard sensitive activities comprise the following: - Buildings associated with primary production; - Rural industry activities; - Accessory buildings used for non-habitable purposes...	Buildings associated with primary production and rural industry activities pose minimal risk to human life and safety. People do not sleep at primary production businesses, which means they are more alert to hazards than people in residential dwellings. Primary production involves fewer people on more land than urban activities. The Building Code has Building Importance categories, and non-habitable buildings are importance level 1 (the lowest) as they are buildings which pose low risk to human life or the environment, or a low economic cost. Unnecessary restrictions on where horticulture can operate is a risk to local food supply. Horticultural businesses need to operate close to their ancillary activities like packhouses and greenhouses due to the perishable nature of fresh produce.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
FS90.094	Greater Wellington Regional Council			Oppose	Disallow	Considers that it is appropriate for buildings associated with primary production and rural industry activities to be potentially hazard sensitive.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S221.058	Horticulture New Zealand	NH-P1	NH-P1	Support	Retain NH-P1 as notified.	The submitter supports an approach that considers vulnerability/sensitivity of activities, likelihood and consequences when determining natural hazard risk. They caution that rural primary production activities carry a lower sensitivity than activities involving a dense or vulnerable population and should be designated as such.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S221.059	Horticulture New Zealand	NH-P5	NH-P5	Support in part	Retain NH-P5 as notified.	The submitter supports this approach to allowing less sensitive activities to proceed where they do not pose additional risk to other people or activities. Rural primary	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						production like fruit and vegetable growing is best suited to this hazard designation, including the non-habitable associated structures and buildings.		
S221.060	Horticulture New Zealand	NH-P8	NH-P8	Support in part	Retain NH-P8 as notified.	The submitter supports the need for continued infrastructure upgrade and establishment in hazard areas, especially roads to support rural communities to evacuate during emergencies. Roads are also needed to continue to move fresh produce efficiently when primary production continues in high natural hazard risk areas.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S221.062	Horticulture New Zealand	NH-R2	NH-R2	Support in part	Retain NH-R2 as notified	The submitter supports less hazard sensitive activities being permitted in all hazard areas and considers that primary production activities, including associated structures and non-habitable buildings, should be included under this rule.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S221.063	Horticulture New Zealand	NH-R3	NH-R3	Support in part	Amend the definition of 'less hazard sensitive activities' to include buildings for primary production.	The submitter supports this approach, but buildings associated with primary production should fall under NH-R2 as less hazard sensitive activities due to their low risk to human wellbeing.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
S221.064	Horticulture New Zealand	NH-R5	NH-R5	Support in part	Amend NH-R5 as follows: NH-R5 Earthworks (including ancillary rural earthworks) within flood hazard areas	There should be provision for earthworks for normal rural production activities in the General Rural Zone within flood hazard areas as long as they do not increase flood risk.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
FS81.044	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			Support	Allow	Support the amendment sought. It is important that ancillary rural earthworks that are not located in a river corridor or overland flow path is a permitted activity.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
S225.011	New Zealand Defence Force	NH-P5	NH-P5	Support	Retain NH-P5 as notified.	This policy provides direction that less hazard sensitive activities (i.e., buildings	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						and structures associated with temporary activities) should be enabled in all hazard areas. Given their lower risk this is appropriate.		
S225.012	New Zealand Defence Force	NH-R2	NH-R2	Support in part	Amend Rule NH-R2 as follows: ... a. Any buildings must not be located in the overland flowpath, or river corridor of the flood hazard overlays, with the exception of temporary buildings associated with temporary military training activities.	TMTA may require the placement of temporary buildings and structures in flood hazard areas to enable realistic training. It is appropriate that these temporary structures are provided for as a permitted activity.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
S226.020	Brian John McGuinness	NH-P13	NH-P13	Support	Retain as notified.	Support intention of Policy.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S226.021	Brian John McGuinness	NH-P12	NH-P12	Support	Retain as notified.	Support intention of Policy.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
FS83.018	Brookside Development - Featherston Limited			Oppose	Disallow	Policy NH-P12 should be removed until more detailed research has been done to justify the Flood Alert Areas shown on the planning maps, using all the information available to South Wairarapa District Council, including modelling and preventative measures already in place for site-specific approved subdivisions	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
S226.022	Brian John McGuinness	NH-P11	NH-P11	Support	Retain as notified.	Support intention of Policy.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S226.023	Brian John McGuinness	NH-P4	NH-P4	Support	Retain as notified.	Support intention of Policy.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S226.024	Brian John McGuinness	NH-P1	NH-P1	Support	Retain as notified.	Support intention of Policy.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S226.025	Brian John McGuinness	NH-O2	NH-O2	Support	Retain as notified.	Support intention of Objective.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S226.030	Brian John McGuinness	NH-O1	NH-O1	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the intention of Objective.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
S231.002	Maureen Hyett and Jenny Wheeler	NH-P7	NH-P7	Oppose in part	Amend the wording of Policy NH-P7 as follows: For new buildings and structures that contain habitable rooms hazard sensitive activities or potentially hazard sensitive activities and are located within a fault hazard areas as shown on the District Planning maps: 1. Allow buildings and structures to locate within Fault Hazard Areas where it can be demonstrated that the fault hazard risk the risk from ground deformation from fault rupture can be avoided or mitigated to prevent loss of life and damage to buildings : 2. Avoid buildings and structures locating within the Fault Hazard Area where the risk to life from ground deformation from fault rupture cannot be avoided or mitigated via distances from the fault, building engineering solutions, or other means	NH-P7 is unclear about what particular fault hazards the Fault Hazards Areas are dealing with. Typically, Fault Hazard Areas are intended to address fault rupture as opposed to ground shaking, liquefaction, laterally spread, slope instability or other fault induced natural hazards. The submitter assumes this is the intention for Policy NH-P7 and therefore seek for the policy to be amended to reflect that it is dealing with fault rupture.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S231.003	Maureen Hyett and Jenny Wheeler	NH-R4	NH-R4	Oppose in part	Amend the wording of Rule NH-R4 as follows: NH-R4: Additions to buildings within all hazard areas All Zones 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The building addition is located within the possible liquefaction prone area; or b. The additions do not increase the gross floor area of a hazard sensitive activity or potential hazard sensitive activity within any fault hazard area or flood hazard area by more than 20m2. c. Any building additions located in the identified overland flowpath, or ponding	Rule NH-R4 Additions to buildings within all hazard areas requires all additions over 20m2 to a hazard sensitive and potentially hazard sensitive activity in a natural hazard overall to obtain resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity. However, the matters of discretion have no relevance to fault hazard areas as these areas are not identified as either a low, moderate or high hazard area. This issue needs to be rectified, by identifying fault hazard areas as either high or moderate hazard areas.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
					area of the flood hazard overlay have a finished floor level above the 1% AEP flood level. All Zones 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance is no achieved with NH-R4(1). Matters of discretion: 1. For additions in the moderate hazard areas, the matters in Policy NH-P3 2. For additions in the low hazard areas, the matters in Policy NH-P4 3. For additions in the high hazard area, the matters in Policy NH-P2. 4. For additions in the fault hazard areas, the matters in Policy NH-P7			
S231.004	Maureen Hyett and Jenny Wheeler	NH-R6	NH-R6	Oppose in part	Amend: NH-R6 New Buildings and structure in Fault Hazard Area All Zones 1. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: a. Building or structure contains habitable room(s) The new building will contain a hazard sensitive or potentially hazard activity; and b. The subject site building is located fully or partially within the Fault Hazard Area. Matters of discretion 1. The proximity to any identified fault as demonstrated supporting geotechnical evidence; 2. Engineering measure incorporated into the building or structures to prevent loss of life or reduce the damage to a building from anticipated effects of aseismic event fault rupture; and 3. The matters set out NH-P1, NH-P8 and NH-P11.	Rule NH-R6 applies to any building or structure on a site that is located or partially within a Fault Hazard Area. This means that if a Fault Hazard Area clips a small portion of a site, then any habitable building on the site requires resource consent, regardless of whether it is within the Fault Hazard Area or not. This is a different approach to other natural hazard provisions, where the rules only apply within the identified natural hazard overlay. There is no rational to why resource consent would be required on a site, when the works themselves are not within the natural hazard overlay. This rule needs to be amended so that it directly applies to new works within a natural hazard overlay. The matters of discretion under Rule NH-R6 require predominately the consideration of the impacts on the loss of life. Current planning practice should also require the	Reject	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						consideration of the potential for building damage from fault rupture. This is to ensure the economic risks associated with developing in Fault Hazard Areas are addressed.		
S231.006	Maureen Hyett and Jenny Wheeler			Oppose in part	Insert a risk-based approach to the fault hazard areas as per the Ministry for the Environment Guidelines to ensure there is a regionally consistent approach to fault hazards.	The Proposed District Plan approach does not follow the Ministry for the Environment Guidelines as the mapping, policy and rule framework do not distinguish between any of the aforementioned factors. The policy and rule framework should be changed to align with the guidance. The submitter notes that this would make the fault hazards provisions more consistent with other recent reviews and proposals in the region. The submitter notes that the fault hazard overlay has not been classified as being either a low, moderate or high hazard area and therefore there is uncertainty regarding the activity status for land use activities (other than new structures and buildings and infrastructure within the fault hazard area) since the related policies and rules refer back to these categories.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards
S236.026	-Director-General of Conservation Penny Nelson	NH-O2	NH-O2	Support in part	Amend NH-O2 as follows: NH-O2 Natural features defences Natural features defences are used to reduce the susceptibility of people, communities, property, and infrastructure to damage from natural hazards.	The submitter supports the intent of the proposed objective but considers it necessary to amend the wording to make it clearer.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
FS87.019	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Incorporated			Support	Allow	Agree that the amended wording is clearer and consistent with the NZCPS	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
FS95.021	Te Tini o Ngāti Kahukuraawhitia Trust			Support	Allow	Agree that the amended wording is clearer and consistent with the NZCPS	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
S238.030	bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies')	Introduction	Introduction	Oppose in part	Amend the Natural Hazards chapter introduction as follows: [...] To assist with determining the consequences associated with natural hazards, buildings and activities have been categorised according to the potential consequences to life and property as a result of those activities occurring within a natural hazard area. Any activity that is not specifically listed below is considered a less hazard sensitive activity. Activities are categorised as hazard sensitive activities, potentially hazard sensitive activities or less hazard sensitive activities. Hazard sensitive activities comprise the following: - Community facilities; - Marae; - Healthcare facilities; - Emergency service facilities; - Educational facilities; - Entertainment activities; - Retirement villages; - Residential activities and residential units; and - Service stations. Potentially hazard sensitive activities comprise the following: - Buildings associated with primary production; - Commercial activities; - Industrial activities; and - Rural industry activities. Less hazard sensitive activities comprise of the following: - Accessory buildings used for non-habitable purposes; - Parks, facilities; - Parks furniture; and - Buildings and structures associated with temporary activities.	Under the notified definitions, service stations are captured as "commercial activities" and are therefore, "potentially hazard sensitive activities". Service stations are not listed under the notified "hazard sensitive activities" definition. The activity classifications in the Natural Hazards chapter introduction, however, contradict the definitions, as service stations are included in the "hazard sensitive activities" list on page 2. It is inappropriate to list service stations as "hazard sensitive activities". Additionally, doing so would be contradictory to the PDP's definitions and inconsistent with the classification of all other commercial and industrial activities (irrespective of the quantity of hazardous substances involved, where they are stored and how they are used) as being "potentially hazard sensitive activities".	Reject in part	NH – Natural hazards
FS81.003	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			Support in part	Disallow in part	Agree with the points raised by the submitter and would like to add that there are other inconsistencies including Buildings Associated with primary production but does not support the relief	Reject in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						sought by the submitter. Considers it would be better to list examples of Hazard Sensitive Activities, Less Hazard Sensitive Activities and Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities in the NH-Natural Hazard Introduction so that they are consistent with their respective definition in the definitions chapter, to assist plan users with interpretation.		
S238.031	bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies')	NH-P4	NH-P4	Support	Retain Policy NH-P4 as notified.	Policy NH-P4 is supported.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S238.032	bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies')	NH-P6	NH-P6	Support	Retain Policy NH-P6 as notified.	Policy NH-P6 is supported.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S238.033	bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies')	NH-P9	NH-P9	Support	Retain Policy NH-P9 as notified.	Policy NH-P9 is supported.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S238.034	bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies')	NH-R2	NH-R2	Support	Retain Rule NH-R2 as notified.	Rule NH-R2 is supported. Considers it appropriate that less hazard sensitive activities are afforded a general permitted activity status in all hazard areas.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S238.035	bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies')	NH-R3	NH-R3	Support in part	Amend Rule NH-R3 as follows: "NH-R3 Any potentially hazard sensitive activity and associated buildings within moderate hazard areas and low hazard areas All zones 1. Activity Status: Permitted Where:	Support the Rule NH-R3 in principle, on the basis that its only applied to new activities and associated buildings but seek some amendments.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
					a. The activity or building is located within the possible liquefaction-prone area.; or b. The building is located within a flood hazard overlay and does not have a footprint greater than 10m2. All zones 2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: a. any building located in a flood hazard overlay has a finished floor level above the 1% AEP level; and a. The building is located within a flood hazard overlay and has: i. a footprint greater than 10m2; and ii. a finished floor level above the 1% AEP level. b. The activity is not located within a low to moderate fault hazard areas. Matters of discretion: 1. For activities in the moderate hazard area, the matters in Policy NH-P3. 2. For activities in the low hazard area, the matter in Policy NH-P4. All zones 3. Activity status: Discretionary Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with NH-R3(2)."			
FS90.125	Greater Wellington Regional Council			Oppose	Disallow	Considers that permitted activity status for buildings within the flood hazard overlay is inconsistent with Policy 51 of Proposed RPS Change 1.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
S238.036	bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies')	NH-R4	NH-R4	Support	Retain Rule NH-R4 as notified.	Rule NH-R4 is supported.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S238.037	bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New	NH-R5	NH-R5	Support	Retain Rule NH-R5 as notified	Rule NH-R5 is supported.	Accept	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
	Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited ('the Fuel Companies')							
S240.001	Ryan Malone	NH-R3	NH-R3	Oppose in part	Amend Rule NH-R3 to improve the accuracy and interpretation of the data that underpins risk levels assigned to Woodside properties.	Given the concerns raised about the evidential basis for the new liquefaction and earthquake risks assigned to a wide range of Woodside properties (as detailed in submissions from other local residents), it seems prudent that these levels of risks not be assigned at this point until such time as a broader consensus can be reached on the accuracy and interpretation of the data.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards
S245.017	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	NH-P2	NH-P2	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this policy as it recognises that although the submitter would prioritise locating schools out of high hazard areas, the submitter may have an operational need to locate an educational facility in a hazard areas.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S245.018	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	NH-P3	NH-P3	Support	Retain as notified.	Acknowledges the risk which natural hazards can pose on people, property and the environment and supports the management of development in hazard areas.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S245.019	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	NH-P4	NH-P4	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the inclusion of this policy as it recognises that hazard sensitive activities (including educational facilities) can locate in areas with low risk, provided appropriate mitigation measures are incorporated. The adoption of these measures will ensure that the potential natural hazards do not jeopardize the health and safety of people and properties.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S245.020	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	NH-R3	NH-R3	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports NH-R3 to allow for the construction of hazard sensitive activities	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards

Submission Point / Further Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Panel Decision	Topic
						(such as educational facilities) in moderate and low hazard areas.		
S245.021	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	NH-R7	NH-R7	Support	Retain as proposed.	Supports NH-R7 to allow for the construction of hazard sensitive activities (such as educational facilities) to be constructed in within flood alert areas as a restricted discretionary activity. Considers the matters of discretion appropriate.	Accept in part	NH – Natural hazards
S251.023	Masterton, Carterton, and South Wairarapa District Councils	Introduction	Introduction	Support in part	Amend the paragraph in the introductory text in the Natural Hazards chapter below Table NH-1 as below: ".... Flood hazard areas are categorised as comprehensive flood hazard modelling and mapping has been undertaken for these areas. In other areas, more broad-scale flood hazard modelling and mapping has been undertaken which has not been categorised - flood mapping in these areas is called Flood Alert Area recognising the broad-scale nature of this modelling and mapping. For areas subject to risk of fault rupture, these areas are called Fault hazard risk areas as they are also not categorised due to the variable level of spatial definition of the active fault lines. Flood Alert Areas and Fault Risk Areas are not Hazard Areas in the District Plan...."	There is potential for confusion between categorised hazard areas and the fault hazard areas and flood alert areas which are not categorised as high, moderate, or low hazard areas. To clarify these terms and categorised/non-categorised hazards, amendments to the introductory text in the Natural Hazards chapter and associated terms is suggested.	Reject	NH – Natural hazards