

Appendix B. Recommended Responses to Submissions and Further Submissions

Table B 1: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions: Definitions

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
316.56	Environment Canterbury	Community scale natural hazard mitigation works	means <u>the scheme of</u> natural hazard mitigation works that serve multiple properties and are constructed and administered by the District Council, the Crown, the Regional Council or their nominated contractor or	3.3.1	Accept in part	Request helps to clarify that the definition is intended to apply at a larger scale than one-off structures serving individual properties. Alternative wording recommended. This change will require minor consequential changes to the policies and rules that refer to this definition. These changes do not affect the application of the policies or rules.	Yes
419.12	Department of Conservation	Hard engineering natural hazard mitigation	means the construction of, usually artificial, physical structures or resistant barriers, <u>or modification to the seabed, foreshore or coastal land that has the primary purpose or effect of protecting an activity from a coastal hazard, including erosion to avoid flood damage or slow down or prevent erosion or inundation of the coastline.</u> Such structures include stop banks, seawalls, gabions, breakwaters, <u>rock revetments</u> and groynes, <u>or comparable structures</u>	3.3.2	Reject	Changes proposed by DoC to include reference to seabed and foreshore are not relevant to a district plan that has its jurisdiction landward of the coastal marine area. Changes are also coastal specific, whereas the definition also applies to inland rivers.	No
316.54	Environment Canterbury	High hazard	"High hazard areas" are: 1. flood hazard areas subject to inundation events where the water depth (metres) x velocity (metres per second) is greater than or equal to 1, or where depths are greater than 1 metre, in a 0.2% AEP flood event; ... 4.land subject to sea water inundation (excluding tsunami) over the next 100 years. This includes (but is not limited to) the land located within the sea water inundation zone boundary shown on Maps in Appendix 5 of this Regional Policy Statement.	3.3.3	Accept	Amendments are proposed to high hazard definitions to more closely align the PDP and CRPS definitions. Technical advice supports the recommended approach.	Yes
249.12	MainPower	High flood hazard area	Retain the definition as notified	3.3.4	Accept in part	The changes proposed earlier under 'High Coastal Flood Hazard' do not change the intent and meaning of the high flood hazard area definition.	No
FS99	KiwiRail		<i>Allow the submission in part</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
207.3	Summerset Retirement Villages	High flood hazard area	Amend planning maps to identify high flood hazard areas	3.3.4	Reject	Mapping these areas may well result in over and under capture when the modelling and LIDAR information changes (which it will on a regular basis). The proposed use of overlays and a flood assessment certificate is considered a pragmatic approach to identify where flooding may occur but also enable an up-to-date site-specific assessment of flood	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
						risk, including whether the site is high hazard. Indicative high flood hazard areas are identified in the natural hazards interactive viewer which has a link off the natural hazards chapter introduction and the flood assessment certificates.	
162.168	John Stevenson	Natural feature	Insert definition for natural feature to ensure NH-P15 is applied as intended. <u>Natural feature</u> Means: natural ponding areas, wetlands, water body margins and riparian margins, dunes, and beaches. It excludes man-made water races and drainage infrastructure such as swales and Stormwater Management Areas.	3.3.5	Accept in part	Agree with this inclusion as this provides clarity for interpreting the provisions that refer to natural features. However recommend changing 'man-made' to 'artificial' so it is gender neutral.	Yes
111.168	CA and GL McKeever	Natural feature	Insert definition for natural feature to ensure NH-P15 is applied as intended. <u>Natural feature</u> Means: natural ponding areas, wetlands, water body margins and riparian margins, dunes, and beaches. It excludes man-made water races and drainage infrastructure such as swales and Stormwater Management Areas.	3.3.5	Accept in part	Agree with this inclusion as this provides clarity for interpreting the provisions that refer to natural features. However recommend changing 'man-made' to 'artificial' so it is gender neutral.	Yes
418.169	Keith Goodwin	Natural feature	Insert definition for natural feature to ensure NH-P15 is applied as intended. <u>Natural feature Means:</u> natural ponding areas, wetlands, water body margins and riparian margins, dunes, and beaches. It excludes man-made water races and drainage infrastructure such as swales and Stormwater Management Areas.	3.3.5	Accept in part	Agree with this inclusion as this provides clarity for interpreting the provisions that refer to natural features. However recommend changing 'man-made' to 'artificial' so it is gender neutral.	Yes
303.6	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Natural hazard	Retain definition as notified.	3.3.6	Accept	No assessment required as submitter is in support of 'natural hazard' definition.	No
316.55	Environment Canterbury	Natural hazard sensitive activity	Amend definition to ensure all high value buildings are captured.	3.3.7	Accept	Amendments are proposed with reference to recently reviewed plans to better capture high value buildings.	Yes
414.13	Federated Farmers	Overland flow path	Delete	3.3.8	Reject	The definition is intended to apply to areas of land where water moves only in periods of flooding, as opposed to a permanent or intermittent river or stream which are already mapped.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
226.17	199 Johns Road Ltd, Carolina Homes Ltd, Carolina Rental Homes Ltd, Allan Downs Ltd, Claire McKeever	Soft engineering natural hazard mitigation	Seek clarification whether an earth engineered 'bund' is defined as 'soft engineering natural hazard mitigation'	3.3.9	NA	This submission is assessed under NH-R10 where it was also made under submission number 266.16.	NA
249.16	MainPower	Non critical infrastructure	Retain definition of 'non critical infrastructure' as notified.		Accept	No assessment required as submitter is in support of 'non critical infrastructure' definition.	No
414.21	Federated Farmers	Upgrading	Delete	3.3.10	Reject	This definition is limited to the Natural Hazards Chapter as stated in the definition. Unfortunately, no examples of inconsistency were provided in the submission and it is also not clear what the negative effects on landholders are from these activities. It is useful to distinguish between maintenance, upgrading and new mitigation works and infrastructure in different hazard overlays and sensitive environments to help target the rules to the activity.	No
256.168	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	Natural feature definition	Seek to insert a definition for 'natural feature' <i>"Natural feature Means: natural ponding areas, wetlands, water body margins and riparian margins, dunes, and beaches. It excludes man-made water races and drainage infrastructure such as swales and Stormwater Management Areas."</i>	3.3.5	Accept in part	Agree with this inclusion as this provides clarity for interpreting the provisions that refer to natural features. However recommend changing 'man-made' to 'artificial' so it is gender neutral.	Yes

Table B 2: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions – Introduction

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
316.50	Canterbury Regional Council	Introduction	Amend the Natural Hazard Introduction to read: "...The RPS recognises that development of land for most residential, industrial or commercial purposes is not sustainable in high hazard areas. Therefore, further development within areas of high hazard shall be limited to low-intensity land uses that will not result in loss of life or serious injuries or significant damage. The RPS recognises that for existing urban areas the community has already accepted some natural hazards risk in order to support the ongoing development of the District's existing towns. The RPS	3.4.1	Accepted in part	In the interests of brevity and to avoid the introduction containing policy it is recommended the CRPS content is deleted.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
			accordingly requires development in high hazard areas in these locations to be either avoided or mitigated...."				
325.102	Kainga Ora	Introduction	<p>Amend to give effect to the relief sought in the submission point on the Planning Maps and general submission point for the Natural Hazards Chapter, which seek:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Delete Urban Flood Assessment Overlay and Non-Urban Flood Assessment Overlay and mapped fixed floor level overlays. Include these as non-statutory map layers in the Waimakariri District Natural Hazards Interactive Viewer. - Amend relevant provisions to delete reference to these overlays, instead refer to the specific hazard type that will be identified through a flood assessment. - Recognise that large areas of the urban environment are in High Hazard Areas but as residential and commercial activities are anticipated, sensitive activities should be discretionary rather than noncomplying. 	3.4.1	Reject	Having no overlay or map to geographically identify areas susceptible to flooding will likely result in either under or over capture of properties in a flood assessment or consent pathway. Regarding applying a discretionary activity status to hazard sensitive activities, the chapter provides for many hazard sensitive activities in existing urban areas to be permitted, subject to meeting the floor level requirements and that non-compliance defaults to an RDIS activity status, and not non-complying (e.g. see NH-R1 and NH-R3)). A non-complying status generally only applies to non-urban areas, i.e. areas zoned general rural and rural lifestyle (e.g. NH-R2). A permitted activity pathway with an RDIS status where the standards are not met is appropriate for existing urban areas.	No

Table B 3: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions – General

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
147.5	Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board	General	Support the Natural Hazard provisions, but should be extended to include brownfield sites in Southbrook.	3.2	Reject	The natural hazards provisions only apply to changes to existing dwellings as they are not retrospective. As such, they do not protect existing dwellings from flooding, except where they manage flood risk transference from new developments. Regarding extending floor levels to include other brownfield areas such as Southbrook, in response to an ECan submission the Kaiapoi FFFL approach is replaced by the Flood Assessment Certificate approach.	No
148.4	Rangiora-Ashley Community Board	General	Support proposed natural hazards provisions.	3.2	Accepted in part	Given the recommended changes, this submission in support of the provisions is accepted in part.	No
226.8	McAlpines Ltd	General	Amend the Natural Hazards Chapter (objectives, policies and rules) so that Southbrook is subject to fixed minimum finished	3.2	Reject	In response to an ECan submission the Kaiapoi FFFL approach is replaced by the Flood Assessment Certificate approach.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
			floor level provisions similar to those provisions that apply at Kaiapoi.				
249.162	MainPower	General	MainPower seek to ensure that relevant natural hazards provisions applicable to infrastructure are hyperlinked from the EI Chapter back to the Natural Hazards Chapter, to ensure plan users can navigate to the relevant parts of the Natural Hazards Chapter with ease.	3.2	Reject	Hyperlinks are not required as the EI Chapter introduction states that the natural hazards chapter contains provisions that may be relevant to managing the risk to energy and infrastructure from natural hazards.	No
249.176	MainPower	General	Insert the following new rule: <u>NH-R4 Above ground linear critical infrastructure and support structures</u> <u>Fault Awareness Overlay</u> <u>Urban Flood Assessment Overlay</u> <u>Kaiapoi Fixed Minimum Finished Floor Level Overlay</u> <u>Non-Urban Flood Assessment Overlay</u> <u>Activity status: PER</u>	3.2	Reject	NH-R6 is proposed to be amended such that the proposed new NH-R4 rule is not required.	No
260.3	Andrea & William 'Rob' Thomson	General	Ensure the Flood Assessment Certificate is as accurate as practically possible and/or any such further or other relief as may be necessary to address the issues or concerns outlined above.	3.2	Reject	The certificates are based on the most up-to-date information the Council holds. The modelled flood depths are based off a hydraulic model that has been fully peer reviewed and is based off Lidar ground levels.	No
316.49	Canterbury Regional Council	General	Align policies and rules to manage offsite flood effects, including the conveyance of floodwaters or reduction in flood storage capacity.	3.2	Accept	There are some misalignments amongst the identified policies that are recommended to be aligned.	Yes
316.51	Canterbury Regional Council	General	Amend the Urban and Non-Urban Flood Assessment Overlays to address any gaps or limitations.	3.2	Accept	A JWS has been prepared which introduces amended overlays to addresses gaps and limitations.	No
FS88	<i>Kainga Ora</i>		<i>Oppose the submission</i>		Reject		
316.52	Canterbury Regional Council	General	Amend so that Kaiapoi Fixed Minimum Finished Floor Levels in this overlay are determined in accordance with the proposed approach for the remainder of the district.	3.2	Accept	Technical evidence supports this approach to provide additional flexibility in Kaiapoi if the modelling changes.	Yes
316.53	Canterbury Regional Council	General	Reduce the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay so that it only captures the gold coloured "liquefaction damage possible" area and is limited to areas within the Waimakariri district.	3.2	Accept	The liquefaction overlay incorrectly included map data from outside the District and the 'liquefaction unlikely layer'.	Yes
325.101	Kainga Ora	General	Delete Urban Flood Assessment Overlay and Non-Urban Flood Assessment Overlay and mapped fixed floor level overlays. Include these as non-statutory map layers in the Waimakariri District Natural Hazards Interactive Viewer. Amend relevant provisions to delete reference to these overlays, instead refer to the specific hazard type that will be identified through a flood assessment. Recognise that large areas of the urban environment are in High Hazard Areas but as residential and commercial activities are	3.2	Reject	The approach taken in the PDP is to identify an area that is susceptible to flooding based on current modelling (the flood hazard overlays) and to rely on a flood assessment certificate to provide the most up-to-date flood modelling advice. The overlays are the tool to achieve this approach. The PRP recognises that large areas are high hazard and provides a permitted pathway for these in existing urban areas via a flood assessment certificate.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
			anticipated, sensitive activities should be discretionary rather than non-complying.				
414.98	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc.	General	Amend advisory notes to provide for a statutory process for processing the flood certificates.	3.2	Reject	Consistency and clarity in the development of Flood Assessment Certificates is beneficial. It is understood that both the Council and ECan already provide guidance on required minimum floor levels and that for the Council this is based on an internal practice note to ensure consistency. As such, the provision of minimum floor level guidance is not new and there is already a level of formality applying.	No

Table B 4: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions – Objective NH-O1 Risks from natural hazards

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.55	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-01	Neutral on NH-01.	3.5.1	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-01, this submission is accepted in part	No
162.59	John Stevenson	NH-01	Neutral on NH-01.	3.5.1	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-01, this submission is accepted in part	No
207.10	Summerset Retirement Villages (Rangiora)	NH-01	Amend NH-01: New subdivision, land use and development, <u>other than new critical infrastructure</u> : 1. manages natural hazard risk, including coastal hazards, in the existing urban environment to ensure that any increased risk to people and property is low is avoided in areas where the risks from natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure are assessed as being unacceptable; and in all other areas, is undertaken in a manner that ensures that the risks of natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure are appropriately mitigated; ...	3.5.1	Accept in part	The introduction of 'other than new critical infrastructure' to the chapter is supported as critical infrastructure is captured in Objective NH-02(3). This clause is intended to apply a 'manage' approach in the existing urban environment, as opposed to a stronger 'avoid' approach outside of the existing urban environment. The proposed amendment removes the explicit reference to existing urban environments and therefore results in an overlap with existing NH-01 clause 3 which covers non-urban areas.	Yes
FS99	KiwiRail		Allow submission in part		Accept		
249.163	MainPower	NH-01	Retain NH-01 as notified.	3.5.1	Accepted in part	Given recommended changes to NH-01, this submission is accepted in part	No
256.55	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-01	Neutral on NH-01.	3.5.1	Accepted in part	Given recommended changes to NH-01, this submission is accepted in part	No
FS2	Mark McKitterick		Oppose the submission		Reject		
277.25	Beca - Hugh Loughnan	NH-01	Retain NH-01 as notified.	3.5.1	Accepted in part	Given recommended changes to NH-01, this submission is accepted in part	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
284.553	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-01	Retain NH-01 as notified.	3.5.1	Accepted in part	Given recommended changes to NH-01, this submission is accepted in part	No
295.87	Horticulture New Zealand	NH-01	Retain NH-01 as notified.	3.5.1	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-01, this submission is accepted in part	No
316.57	Canterbury Regional Council	NH-01	NH-01 lacks clarity and certainty – it would be improved by setting direction for: - High hazard areas outside of the urban area (avoid) - High hazards areas inside the urban area (avoid or mitigate) - Other hazards	3.5.1	Accept in part	Restructuring Objective NH-01 along the lines ECan is suggesting better aligns it with CRPS Policy 11.3.1 and provides greater clarity.	Yes
325.103	Kainga Ora	NH-01	Retain NH-01 as notified.	3.5.1	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-01, this submission is accepted in part	No
326.144	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-01	Retain NH-01 as notified.	3.5.1	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-01, this submission is accepted in part	No
414.92	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc.	NH-01	Amend chapter to: "New subdivision, land use and development".	3.5.1	Reject	The deletion of the word 'land' in the chapter would not affect Objective NH-01's interpretation as the word 'use' is proposed to remain.	No
418.61	Keith Godwin	NH-01	Neutral on NH-01.	3.5.1	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-01, this submission is accepted in part	No

Table B 5: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions – NH-02 Infrastructure in natural hazards overlays

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.56	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-02	Neutral on NH-02.	3.5.2	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-02, this submission is accepted in part	No
162.60	John Stevenson	NH-02	Neutral on NH-02.	3.5.2	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-02, this submission is accepted in part	No
195.56	Transpower New Zealand Limited	NH-02	Retain NH-02 as notified.	3.5.2	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-02, this submission is accepted in part	No
210.3	Waimakariri Irrigation Ltd	NH-02	Retain NH-02 as notified.	3.5.2	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-02, this submission is accepted in part	No
249.164	MainPower	NH-02	Retain NH-02 as notified.	3.5.2	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-02, this submission is accepted in part	No
256.56	Chloe Chai and Mark McKittrick	NH-02	Neutral on NH-02.	3.5.2	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-02, this submission is accepted in part	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
275.21	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	NH-O2	Retain NH-O2 as notified.	3.5.2	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-O2, this submission is accepted in part	No
284.554	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-O2	Retain NH-O2 as notified.	3.5.2	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-O2, this submission is accepted in part	No
303.29	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	NH-O2	Retain NH-O2 as notified.	3.5.2	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-O2, this submission is accepted in part	No
316.58	Canterbury Regional Council	NH-O2	Retain NH-O2 as notified.	3.5.2	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-O2, this submission is accepted in part	No
325.104	Kainga Ora	NH-O2	Retain NH-O2 as notified.	3.5.2	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-O2, this submission is accepted in part	No
326.145	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-O2	Retain NH-O2 as notified.	3.5.2	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-O2, this submission is accepted in part	No
373.46	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	NH-O2	Retain NH-O2 as notified.	3.5.2	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-O2, this submission is accepted in part	No
414.93	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc.	NH-O2	Amend NH-O2(1): <u>Existing infrastructure, including critical infrastructure can be upgraded, maintained, or replaced</u> Amend NH-O2(3): <u>Avoid new critical infrastructure in high flood hazard areas and high coastal flood hazard areas, unless there is a functional or operational need for the location or route</u>	3.5.2	Accept in part	The proposed addition to NH-O2(1) helps to clarify the application of the objective and is recommended to be accepted. The proposed re-wording on NH-O3(3) is slightly clearer wording, however, constructing the clause in this way would make it inconsistent with the drafting of the preceding two clauses which begin with a statement of what is to be managed and it is therefore recommended this proposed change is rejected.	Yes
418.62	Keith Godwin	NH-O2	Neutral on NH-O2.	3.5.2	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-O2, this submission is accepted in part	Yes

Table B 6: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-O3 Natural hazard mitigation

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.57	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-O3	Neutral on NH-O3.	3.5.3	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment.	No
162.61	John Stevenson	NH-O3	Neutral on NH-O3.	3.5.3	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment.	No
249.165	MainPower	NH-O3	Retain NH-O3 as notified.	3.5.3	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
256.57	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-03	Neutral on NH-03.	3.5.3	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment.	No
284.555	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-03	Retain NH-03 as notified.	3.5.3	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment.	No
316.59	Canterbury Regional Council	NH-03	Retain NH-03 as notified.	3.5.3	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment.	No
325.105	Kainga Ora	NH-03	Retain NH-03 as notified.	3.5.3	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment.	No
326.146	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-03	Retain NH-03 as notified.	3.5.3	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment.	No
418.63	Keith Godwin	NH-03	Neutral on NH-03.	3.5.3	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment.	No
419.49	Department of Conservation	NH-03	Retain NH-03 as notified.	3.5.3	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment.	No

Table B 7: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-O4 Natural defences

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.58	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-04	Neutral on NH-04.	3.5.4	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-04, this submission is accepted in part	No
162.62	John Stevenson	NH-04	Neutral on NH-04.	3.5.4	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-04, this submission is accepted in part	No
249.166	MainPower	NH-04	Retain NH-04 as notified.	3.5.4	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-04, this submission is accepted in part	No
256.58	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-04	Neutral on NH-04.	3.5.4	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-04, this submission is accepted in part	No
284.556	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-04	Retain NH-04 as notified.	3.5.4	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-04, this submission is accepted in part	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
316.60	Canterbury Regional Council	NH-O4	Retain NH-O4 as notified, but consider clarifying what "natural defences" are.	3.5.4	Accept in part	To improve alignment between the objectives and policies it is recommended that NH-O4 refers to 'natural features' instead of 'natural defences'. This amendment will resolve the submitter's concerns as Policy NH-15 identifies what natural features are.	Yes
325.106	Kainga Ora	NH-O4	Retain NH-O4 as notified.	3.5.4	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-O4, this submission is accepted in part	No
326.147	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-O4	Retain NH-O4 as notified.	3.5.4	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-O4, this submission is accepted in part	No
418.64	Keith Godwin	NH-O4	Neutral on NH-O4.	3.5.4	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-O4, this submission is accepted in part	No
419.50	Department of Conservation	NH-O4	Retain NH-O4 as notified.	3.5.4	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-O4, this submission is accepted in part	No
316.61	Canterbury Regional Council	All / Objective	Amend the current objectives or include new objectives to give effect to Canterbury Regional Policy Statement objectives 11.2.3.	3.5.5	Accept	The natural hazards chapter includes consideration of the effects of climate change as evidenced by the flood modelling which includes allowances for changes in rainfall intensity, and in NH-S1 and NH-S2, which calculate minimum finished floor levels with reference to sea level rise. However, as climate change is not explicitly referred to at the objective level it is considered that this would be appropriate.	Yes

Table B 8: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-P1 Identification of natural hazards and a risk-based approach

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.59	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-P1	Retain NH-P1 as notified.	3.6.1	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
162.63	John Stevenson	NH-P1	Retain NH-P1 as notified.	3.6.1	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment.	No
207.11	Summerset Retirement Villages (Rangiora)	NH-P1	Retain intent of NH-P1 to ensure that life and property is protected from natural hazard risks but amend to provide clarity of what is intended by the policy and how it will be applied. Amend Planning Maps to show all high hazard areas.	3.6.1	Reject	Policy NH-P1 essentially applies a risk-based approach to the management of natural hazards. Consistency can be achieved through the application of the specified standards and activity standards. It is therefore considered that there is sufficient clarity across the provisions as a whole to interpret and apply a risk-based approach. Regarding identifying all hazards and high hazard areas, it is not possible to map all natural hazards in the District. The Policy does not state all natural hazards are mapped but that mapping is a tool that will be used. Regarding identifying high hazard areas on the overlays, this matter was discussed earlier under the 'high flood hazard' definition in response to a submission from Summerset [207.3].	No
249.167	MainPower	NH-P1	Supports NH-P1.	3.6.1	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment.	No
256.59	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-P1	Retain NH-P1 as notified.	3.6.1	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment.	No
284.140	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-P1	Retain NH-P1 as notified.	3.6.1	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment.	No
295.88	Horticulture New Zealand	NH-P1	Retain NH-P1 as notified.	3.6.1	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment.	No
316.62	Canterbury Regional Council	NH-P1	Retain NH-P1 as notified.	3.6.1	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment.	No
325.107	Kainga Ora	NH-P1	Retain NH-P1 as notified.	3.6.1	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment.	No
326.148	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-P1	Retain NH-P1 as notified.	3.6.1	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment.	No
414.94	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc.	NH-P1	Retain NH-P1 as notified.	3.6.1	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
418.65	Keith Godwin	NH-P1	Retain NH-P1 as notified.	3.6.1	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment.	No
419.51	Department of Conservation	NH-P1	Retain NH-P1 as notified.	3.6.1	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment.	No

Table B 9: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-P2 Activities in high hazard areas for flooding within urban areas

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.60	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-P2	Retain NH-P2 as notified.	3.6.2	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P2, this submission is accepted in part	No
162.64	John Stevenson	NH-P2	Retain NH-P2 as notified.	3.6.2	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P2, this submission is accepted in part	No
207.12	Summerset Retirement Villages (Rangiora) Ltd	NH-P2	Retain the intent of NH-P2 but amend to ensure that higher tests are applied to the high hazard areas. Suggest swapping 'mitigate' with 'avoid'.	3.6.2	Accept in part	Amending NH-P4(2) to refer to 'mitigate' would resolve the inconsistency identified in the submission. It is not considered appropriate to apply an avoid approach in Policy NH-P2(1) for the reasons provided in response to ECan's submission on Policy NH-P2.	Yes
256.60	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-P2	Retain NH-P2 as notified.	3.6.2	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P2, this submission is accepted in part	No
284.141	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-P2	Retain NH-P2 as notified.	3.6.2	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P2, this submission is accepted in part	No
316.63	Canterbury Regional Council	NH-P2	Amend NH-P2 to require avoidance of risk in the first instance.	3.6.2	Accept in part	The submission by ECan seeking 'avoidance' in the first instance is consistent with their comments on NH-O1. To be more consistent with the CRPS it is recommended that NH-P2 should be reworded to also enable an 'avoidance approach' if the circumstances warrant it.	Yes
325.108	Kainga Ora	NH-P2	Retain NH-P2 as notified.	3.6.2	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P2, this submission is accepted in part	No
326.149	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-P2	Retain NH-P2 as notified.	3.6.2	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P2, this submission is accepted in part	No
418.66	Keith Godwin	NH-P2	Retain NH-P2 as notified.	3.6.2	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P2, this submission is accepted in part	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
419.52	Department of Conservation	NH-P2	Retain NH-P2 as notified.	3.6.2	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P2, this submission is accepted in part	No

Table B 10: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-P3 Activities in high hazard areas for flooding outside of urban areas

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.61	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-P3	Retain NH-P3 as notified.	3.6.3	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P3, this submission is accepted in part	No
162.65	John Stevenson	NH-P3	Retain NH-P3 as notified.	3.6.3	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P3, this submission is accepted in part	No
256.61	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-P3	Retain NH-P3 as notified.	3.6.3	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P3, this submission is accepted in part	No
277.26	Ministry of Education	NH-P3	Retain NH-P3 as notified.	3.6.3	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P3, this submission is accepted in part	No
284.142	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-P3	Retain NH-P3 as notified.	3.6.3	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P3, this submission is accepted in part	No
316.64	Canterbury Regional Council	NH-P3	Retain NH-P3, except for reference to "significant" flood displacement effects.	3.6.3	Accept	The term 'significant' was included as there will likely always be some changes in flood risk to adjacent properties, such as through minor increases in flood water displacement or minor changes in flow paths. It is agreed that risk changes up to but below significant may be unacceptable at the upper end of the spectrum. It is recommended 'significant' is replaced with a reference to 'no more than minor'.	Yes
325.109	Kainga Ora	NH-P3	Retain NH-P3 as notified.	3.6.3	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P3, this submission is accepted in part	No
326.150	Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited	NH-P3	Retain NH-P3 as notified.	3.6.3	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P3, this submission is accepted in part	No
418.67	Keith Godwin	NH-P3	Retain NH-P3 as notified.	3.6.3	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P3, this submission is accepted in part	No
419.53	Department of Conservation	NH-P3	Retain NH-P3 as notified.	3.6.3	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P3, this submission is accepted in part	No

Table B 11: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-P4 Activities outside of high hazard areas for flooding

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.62	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-P4	Retain NH-P4 as notified.	3.6.4	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P4, this submission is accepted in part	No
162.66	John Stevenson	NH-P4	Retain NH-P4 as notified.	3.6.4	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P4, this submission is accepted in part	No
207.43	Summerset Retirement Villages (Rangiora) Ltd	NH-P4	Retain the intent of NH-P4 but amend to ensure that the higher tests are applied to the high hazard areas. Suggest swapping 'mitigate' with 'avoid'.	3.6.4	Accept	This matter was addressed under NH-P2 where it was recommended that the Summerset submission [207.12] is accepted in part by amending NH-P4(2) to refer to 'mitigate'.	Yes
256.62	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-P4	Retain NH-P4 as notified.	3.6.4	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P4, this submission is accepted in part	No
284.143	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-P4	Retain NH-P4 as notified.	3.6.4	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P4, this submission is accepted in part	No
316.65	Canterbury Regional Council	NH-P4	Align consistency between NH-P4 and earthworks rules.	3.6.4	Accept in part	Consistent with recommendations in relation to the general submission from ECan [316.49], it is agreed that the NH-P4(2) should be reworded to replace the reference to 'significant' with a reference to 'no more than minor'. This will help improve consistency across the identified policies.	Yes
325.110	Kainga Ora	NH-P4	Retain NH-P4 as notified.	3.6.4	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P4, this submission is accepted in part	No
326.151	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-P4	Retain NH-P4 as notified.	3.6.4	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P4, this submission is accepted in part	No
418.68	Keith Godwin	NH-P4	Retain NH-P4 as notified.	3.6.4	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P4, this submission is accepted in part	No
419.66	Department of Conservation	NH-P4	Retain NH-P4 as notified.	3.6.4	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P4, this submission is accepted in part	No

Table B 12: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-P5 Activities within the Fault Awareness Overlay and Ashley Fault Avoidance Overlay

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.63	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-P5	Neutral on NH-P5.	3.6.5	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
162.67	John Stevenson	NH-P5	Neutral on NH-P5.	3.6.5	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
256.63	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-P5	Neutral on NH-P5.	3.6.5	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
284.144	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-P5	Retain NH-P5 as notified.	3.6.5	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
316.66	Canterbury Regional Council	NH-P5	Retain NH-P5 as notified.	3.6.5	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
326.152	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-P5	Retain NH-P5 as notified.	3.6.5	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
418.69	Keith Godwin	NH-P5	Neutral on NH-P5.	3.6.5	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
419.54	Department of Conservation	NH-P5	Retain NH-P5 as notified.	3.6.5	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No

Table B 13: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-P6 Subdivision within the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.64	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-P6	Retain NH-P6 as notified.	3.6.6	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
162.68	John Stevenson	NH-P6	Retain NH-P6 as notified.	3.6.6	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
256.64	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-P6	Retain NH-P6 as notified.	3.6.6	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
284.145	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-P6	Retain NH-P6 as notified.	3.6.6	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
316.67	Canterbury Regional Council	NH-P6	Retain NH-P6 as notified.	3.6.6	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
325.111	Kainga Ora	NH-P6	Retain NH-P6 as notified.	3.6.6	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
326.153	Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited	NH-P6	Retain NH-P6 as notified.	3.6.6	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
418.70	Keith Godwin	NH-P6	Retain NH-P6 as notified.	3.6.6	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
419.55	Department of Conservation	NH-P6	Retain NH-P6 as notified.	3.6.6	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No

Table B 14: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-P7 Additions to existing natural hazard sensitive activities

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.65	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-P7	Retain NH-P7 as notified.	3.6.7	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P7, this submission is accepted in part	No
162.69	John Stevenson	NH-P7	Retain NH-P7 as notified.	3.6.7	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P7, this submission is accepted in part	No
256.65	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-P7	Retain NH-P7 as notified.	3.6.7	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P7, this submission is accepted in part	No
277.27	Ministry of Education	NH-P7	Retain NH-P7 as notified.	3.6.7	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P7, this submission is accepted in part	No
284.146	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-P7	Retain NH-P7 as notified.	3.6.7	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P7, this submission is accepted in part	No
316.68	Canterbury Regional Council	NH-P7	NH-P7(3) to consider a change in the language such that where assessing any increase in the risks of a natural hazard to adjacent properties activities and people, the threshold is less than minor rather than not significantly increased.	3.6.7	Accept in part	This submission is consistent with the general submission from ECan [316.49], and the specific submissions in relation to NH-P3 and NH-P4. For the reasons provided in response to those submissions, a reference to 'no more than minor' would be more appropriate and therefore recommend that this submission is accepted in part.	Yes
325.112	Kainga Ora	NH-P7	Retain NH-P7 as notified.	3.6.7	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P7, this submission is accepted in part	No
326.154	Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited	NH-P7	Retain NH-P7 as notified.	3.6.7	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P7, this submission is accepted in part	No
418.71	Keith Godwin	NH-P7	Retain NH-P7 as notified.	3.6.7	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P7, this submission is accepted in part	No
419.56	Department of Conservation	NH-P7	Retain NH-P7 as notified.	3.6.7	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P7, this submission is accepted in part	No

Table B 15: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-P8 Subdivision, use and development other than for any natural hazard sensitive activities

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.66	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-P8	Neutral on NH-P8.	3.6.8	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
162.157	John Stevenson	NH-P8	Neutral on NH-P8.	3.6.8	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
256.66	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-P8	Neutral on NH-P8.	3.6.8	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
284.147	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-P8	Retain NH-P8 as notified.	3.6.8	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
325.113	Kainga Ora	NH-P8	Retain NH-P8 as notified.	3.6.8	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
326.155	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-P8	Retain NH-P8 as notified.	3.6.8	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
418.72	Keith Godwin	NH-P8	Neutral on NH-P8.	3.6.8	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
419.57	Department of Conservation	NH-P8	Retain NH-P8 as notified.	3.6.8	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No

Table B 16: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-P9 Community scale natural hazard mitigation works

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.67	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-P9	Neutral on NH-P9.	3.6.9	Accept	Given recommended changes to NH-P9, this submission is accepted in part.	No
162.70	John Stevenson	NH-P9	Neutral on NH-P9.	3.6.9	Accept	Given recommended changes to NH-P9, this submission is accepted in part.	No
256.67	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-P9	Neutral on NH-P9.	3.6.9	Accept	Given recommended changes to NH-P9, this submission is accepted in part.	No
266.15	199 Johns Road Ltd, Carolina Homes Ltd, Carolina Rental Homes Ltd, Allan Downs Ltd	NH-P9	Amend NH-P9 otherwise development cannot occur in the West Rangiora Development Area until Council finds funding by other means to construct the West Rangiora Lehmans Road flood protection within the corridor provided on the West Rangiora Outline Development Plan.	3.6.9	Accept in part	Given the higher order policy framework, PDP rules and the requirement to still meet the minimum finished floor levels, rather than stopping the construction of private schemes outright, it is recommended that policy NH-P9 is amended so that private schemes are only acceptable where these don't result in significant risk to life or property if they fail.	Yes
277.28	Ministry of Education	NH-P9	Clarify the intent of the policy and if it is directed at all natural hazard mitigation works, then private flood mitigation measures such as stopbanks, or floodwalls to protect new hazard sensitive activities should be restricted and not avoided.	3.6.9	Accept in part	The policy is intended to cover both community scale (clause 1) and non-community scale (clause 2) hazard mitigation works. Given the higher order policy framework, PDP rules and the requirement to still meet the minimum finished floor levels, rather than stopping the construction of private schemes outright, it is recommended that policy NH-P9 is amended so that private schemes are only acceptable	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
						where these don't result in significant risk to life or property if they fail.	
284.148	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-P9	Retain NH-P9 as notified.	3.6.9	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P9, this submission is accepted in part.	No
316.69	Canterbury Regional Council	NH-P9	Retain NH-P9 as notified.	3.6.9	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P9, this submission is accepted in part.	No
326.156	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-P9	Retain NH-P9 as notified.	3.6.9	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P9, this submission is accepted in part.	No
418.73	Keith Godwin	NH-P9	Neutral on NH-P9.	3.6.9	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P9, this submission is accepted in part.	No
419.58	Department of Conservation	NH-P9	Amend NH-P9: "1. undertaken by the Crown, the Regional Council or the District Council are enabled where community scale natural hazard mitigation works are necessary to protect existing communities from natural hazard risk which cannot reasonably be avoided, and any adverse effects on the values of any identified SNA, ONL, ONF, SAL, scheduled natural character areas, the coastal environment, and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori are mitigated; or 2. not undertaken by the Crown, the Regional Council or the District Council, will only be acceptable where: a. the natural hazard risk cannot reasonably be avoided; b. any adverse effects of those works on the values of any areas identified as SNA, ONL, ONF, SAL, scheduled natural character areas and the coastal environment, and on sites and areas of significance to Māori are avoided, remedied or mitigated in accordance with the provisions in those chapters; ..."	3.6.9	Accept	It is agreed that SNAs should be included within the clauses 1 and 2 as a matter to address. There are relatively few SNAs within the District and it is reasonable to require consideration of adverse effects on these matters of national importance when natural hazard mitigation works are proposed. It therefore recommended that NH-P9 is amended as requested.	Yes
FS83	Federated Farmers of NZ – North Canterbury Province		Oppose the submission		Reject		

Table B 17: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-P10 Maintenance and operation of existing infrastructure

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.68	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-P10	Retain NH-P10 as notified.	3.6.10	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P10, this submission is accepted in part	No
162.71	John Stevenson	NH-P10	Retain NH-P10 as notified.	3.6.10	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P10, this submission is accepted in part	No
195.57	Transpower New Zealand Limited	NH-P10	Amend NH-P10: <u>Enable</u> Allow for the operation, maintenance, replacement, minor upgrading, repair and removal of all existing infrastructure in identified natural hazard overlays.	3.6.10	Accept	NPSET Policy 5 does use the term 'enable'. The intention behind the word 'allow' was to both 'enable' and 'recognise and provide for' the specified activities in Policy NH-P10. As such, replacing the word 'allow' with 'enable' to resolve the submitters concerns is acceptable.	Yes
210.4	Waimakariri Irrigation Limited 168	NH-P10	Retain NH-P10 as notified.	3.6.10	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P10, this submission is accepted in part	No
249.168	MainPower	NH-P10	Retain NH-P10 as notified.	3.6.10	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P10, this submission is accepted in part	No
256.68	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-P10	Support NH-P10.	3.6.10	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P10, this submission is accepted in part	No
284.149	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-P10	Retain NH-P10 as notified.	3.6.10	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P10, this submission is accepted in part	No
316.70	Canterbury Regional Council	NH-P10	Retain NH-P10 as notified.	3.6.10	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P10, this submission is accepted in part	No
326.157	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-P10	Retain NH-P10 as notified.	3.6.10	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P10, this submission is accepted in part	No
373.47	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	NH-P10	Retain NH-P10 as notified.	3.6.10	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P10, this submission is accepted in part	No
418.74	Keith Godwin	NH-P10	Retain NH-P10 as notified.	3.6.10	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P10, this submission is accepted in part	No
419.59	Department of Conservation	NH-P10	Retain NH-P10 as notified.	3.6.10	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P10, this submission is accepted in part	No

Table B 18: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-P11 New below ground infrastructure and upgrading of infrastructure outside of high hazard areas

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.69	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-P11	Retain NH-P11 as notified.	3.6.11	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
162.72	John Stevenson	NH-P11	Retain NH-P11 as notified.	3.6.11	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
210.5	Waimakariri Irrigation Limited	NH-P11	Retain NH-P11 as notified.	3.6.11	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
249.169	MainPower	NH-P11	Retain NH-P11 as notified.	3.6.11	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
256.69	Chloe Chai and Mark McKittrick	NH-P11	Retain NH-P11 as notified.	3.6.11	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
284.150	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-P11	Retain NH-P11 as notified.	3.6.11	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
325.114	Kainga Ora	NH-P11	Retain NH-P11 as notified.	3.6.11	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
326.158	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-P11	Retain NH-P11 as notified.	3.6.11	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
418.75	Keith Godwin	NH-P11	Retain NH-P11 as notified.	3.6.11	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
419.60	Department of Conservation	NH-P11	Retain NH-P11 as notified.	3.6.11	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No

Table B 19: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-P12 New below ground infrastructure and upgrading of infrastructure within high flood hazard areas

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.70	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-P12	Neutral on NH-P12.	3.6.12	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P12, this submission is accepted in part.	No
162.73	John Stevenson	NH-P12	Neutral on NH-P12.	3.6.12	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P12, this submission is accepted in part.	No
210.6	Waimakariri Irrigation Limited	NH-P12	This submission was incorrectly summarised as "Neutral on NH-P12."	3.6.12	Accept	NH-P12 is limited to below ground infrastructure which is less likely to be adversely affected in a flood hazard event.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
			WIL support the intent of NH-P12 to provide for new and upgraded infrastructure in high flood hazard areas where there is a functional or operational need for that location. However, they consider it inappropriate that the policy requires that there are no practical alternatives, particularly in the case of existing below ground infrastructure and consider it would be inappropriate to have to prove that there are no practical alternatives to upgrades whenever undertaking those works. They seek to amend NH-P12(3) to delete the requirement that there be no practical alternatives.			Noting these matters, removal of the requirement to demonstrate that there are no practical alternatives is acceptable for this policy and it is recommended this submission is accepted.	
249.170	MainPower	NH-P12	Retain NH-P12 as notified.	3.6.12	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P12, this submission is accepted in part.	No
256.70	Chloe Chai & Mark McKitterick	NH-P12	Neutral on NH-P12.	3.6.12	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P12, this submission is accepted in part.	No
FS2	Mark McKitterick		<i>Oppose the submission</i>		<i>Reject</i>		
284.151	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-P12	Retain NH-P12 as notified.	3.6.12	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P12, this submission is accepted in part.	No
325.116	Kainga Ora	NH-P12	Retain NH-P12 as notified.	3.6.12	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P12, this submission is accepted in part.	No
326.159	Rolleston Investments Limited	NH-P12	Retain NH-P12 as notified.	3.6.12	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P12, this submission is accepted in part.	No
418.76	Keith Godwin	NH-P12	Neutral on NH-P12.	3.6.12	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P12, this submission is accepted in part.	No
419.61	Department of Conservation	NH-P12	Retain NH-P12 as notified.	3.6.12	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P12, this submission is accepted in part.	No

Table B 20: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-P13 New above ground critical infrastructure and upgrading of critical infrastructure within high flood hazard areas

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.71	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-P13	Neutral on NH-P13.	3.6.13	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P13, this submission is accepted in part.	No
162.74	John Stevenson	NH-P13	Neutral on NH-P13.	3.6.13	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P13, this submission is accepted in part.	No
195.58	Transpower New Zealand Limited	NH-P13	Amend NH-P13: Only allow for the new and upgrading of existing above ground critical infrastructure in high flood hazard or high coastal flood hazard areas where: 1. there is a functional need or operational need for that location and there are no practical alternatives;	3.6.13	Accept in part	CRPS Policy 11.3.4 states that new critical infrastructure will be located outside high hazard areas unless there is no reasonable alternative. For consistency with the CRPS and with NH-P14 it is recommended that 'no practical alternatives' is replaced with the	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
			...			phrase 'no reasonable alternatives' which I consider is a lessor test. It is therefore recommend that this submission is accepted in part.	
FS99	KiwiRail		Allow submission in part		Accept		
249.171	MainPower	NH-P13	Retain NH-P13 as notified.	3.6.13	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P13, this submission is accepted in part.	No
256.71	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-P13	Neutral on NH-P13.	3.6.13	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P13, this submission is accepted in part.	No
275.22	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	NH-P13	Amend NH-P13: Only allow for the new and upgrading of existing above ground critical infrastructure in high flood hazard or high coastal flood hazard areas where: 1. there is a functional need or operational need for that location, <u>including as a result of the linear nature of some infrastructure</u> , and there are no practical alternatives; ...	3.6.13	Accept	The linear nature of some infrastructure is a good example of a functional or operational need to locate in a high hazard area. It is not considered that the additional words are required, however they do add clarity and therefore it is recommended this submission is accepted.	Yes
284.152	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-P13	Retain NH-P13 as notified.	3.6.13	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P13, this submission is accepted in part.	No
303.30	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	NH-P13	Retain NH-P13 as notified.	3.6.13	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P13, this submission is accepted in part.	No
316.71	Canterbury Regional Council	NH-P13	Retain NH-P13 as notified.	3.6.13	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P13, this submission is accepted in part.	No
325.117	Kainga Ora	NH-P13	Retain NH-P13 as notified.	3.6.13	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P13, this submission is accepted in part.	No
326.160	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-P13	Retain NH-P13 as notified.	3.6.13	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P13, this submission is accepted in part.	No
373.48	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	NH-P13	Retain NH-P13 as notified.	3.6.13	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P13, this submission is accepted in part.	No
418.77	Keith Godwin	NH-P13	Neutral on NH-P13.	3.6.13	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P13, this submission is accepted in part.	No
419.62	Department of Conservation	NH-P13	Retain NH-P13 as notified.	3.6.13	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P13, this submission is accepted in part.	No

Table B 21: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-P14 New infrastructure and upgrading of infrastructure within fault overlays

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.166	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-P14	Nil	3.6.14	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P14, this submission is accepted in part	No
162.158	John Stevenson	NH-P14	Nil	3.6.14	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P14, this submission is accepted in part	No
195.59	Transpower New Zealand Limited	NH-P14	Amend NH-P14: Within the fault overlays: ... 2. only allow avoid new and upgrading of existing critical infrastructure below and above ground in the Ashley Fault Avoidance Overlay where unless there is no reasonable alternative, in which case the infrastructure is must be designed to: a. maintain, as far as practicable, its integrity and ongoing operation during and after natural hazard events; or b. be able to be reinstated in a timely manner; ...	3.6.14	Reject	The reference to 'no reasonable alternatives' in Policy NH-P14 gives effect to the CRPS requirement to demonstrate the absence of 'reasonable alternatives'. It is considered that linear infrastructure should be able to demonstrate the lack of reasonable alternatives. Therefore, it is recommended that this submission is rejected.	No
210.7	Waimakariri Irrigation Limited	NH-P14	Considers that the distinctions between types of infrastructure in this policy is confusing and unnecessary. Amend NH-P14(3): "... 3. enable small scale critical infrastructure and other infrastructure in the Fault Awareness Overlay, while ensuring that larger critical infrastructure does not increase the risk to life or property from natural hazard events unless: ..."	3.6.14	Reject	NH-P14 seeks to enable small scale critical infrastructure in fault awareness overlays as these types of infrastructure are less likely to suffer significant damage in the event of a fault rupture and also in recognition of linear infrastructure such as transmission lines that have only small structures. It is considered this distinction is useful.	No
FS99	KiwiRail		Allow submission in part		Reject		
249.172	MainPower	NH-P14	Amend NH-P14: Within the fault overlays: 1. provide for new and upgrading of existing not non critical infrastructure below and above ground in the Ashley Fault Avoidance Overlay where: a. it does not increase the risk to life or property from a natural hazard event; and b. it does not result in a reduction in the ability of people and communities to recover from a natural hazard event; 2. avoid new and upgrading of existing critical infrastructure below and above ground in the Ashley Fault Avoidance Overlay unless there is no reasonable alternative <u>or there is an operational need or functional need</u> , in which case the infrastructure must be designed to: a. maintain, as far as practicable, its integrity and ongoing operation during and after natural hazard events; or	3.6.14	Accept in part	CRPS Policy 11.3.4 states that new critical infrastructure will be located outside high hazard areas unless there is no reasonable alternative and also requires demonstration that the infrastructure can continue to function during a natural hazard event. It is accepted that there are often operational and functional reasons as to why critical infrastructure needs to locate within certain areas and indeed this is recognised within other natural hazards policies such as NH-P13(1). It is considered appropriate to add this consideration to NH-P14.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
			<p>b. be able to be reinstated in a timely manner;</p> <p>3. enable small scale critical infrastructure and other infrastructure in the Fault Awareness Overlay, while ensuring that larger critical infrastructure does not increase the risk to life or property from natural hazard events unless:</p> <p>a. there is no reasonable alternative <u>or there is an operational or functional need</u>, in which case the infrastructure must be designed to maintain, as far as practicable, its integrity and ongoing operation during and after natural hazard events; or</p> <p>b. be able to be reinstated in a timely manner."</p>				
256.159	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-P14	Nil	3.6.14	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P14, this submission is accepted in part	No
284.153	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-P14	Retain NH-P14 as notified.	3.6.14	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P14, this submission is accepted in part	No
303.31	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	NH-P14	Retain NH-P14 as notified.	3.6.14	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P14, this submission is accepted in part	No
316.72	Canterbury Regional Council	NH-P14	<p>Amend NH-P14:</p> <p>1. provide for new and upgrading of existing not <u>non</u>-critical infrastructure.</p> <p>...</p>	3.6.14	Accept	The amended wording is preferable and does not change the meaning. It is recommended that NH-P14 is amended as requested.	Yes
326.161	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-P14	Retain NH-P14 as notified.	3.6.14	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P14, this submission is accepted in part	No
373.49	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	NH-P14	Retain NH-P14 as notified.	3.6.14	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P14, this submission is accepted in part	No
418.78	Keith Godwin	NH-P14	Nil	3.6.14	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P14, this submission is accepted in part	No

Table B 22: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-P15 Natural features providing natural hazard resilience

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.72	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-P15	<p>Amend NH-P15:</p> <p>"Protect natural features which assist in avoiding or reducing the impacts from natural hazards, such as natural ponding areas, wetlands, water body margins and riparian margins, dunes,</p>	3.6.15	Accept	It is considered that this proposed amendment helps to add clarity. The submitter's proposed definition of 'natural features' has already been accepted in part.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
			berms and beaches from inappropriate subdivision, use and development and restore, maintain or enhance the functioning of these features. Where: 'Natural Feature' is defined as: <u>natural ponding areas, wetlands, water body margins and riparian margins, dunes, and beaches. Excludes man-made water races and drainage infrastructure such as swales and Stormwater Management Areas."</u>				
162.75	John Stevenson	NH-P15	Amend NH-P15: "Protect natural features which assist in avoiding or reducing the impacts from natural hazards, such as natural ponding areas, wetlands, water body margins and riparian margins, dunes, berms and beaches from inappropriate subdivision, use and development and restore, maintain or enhance the functioning of these features. Where: 'Natural Feature' is defined as: <u>natural ponding areas, wetlands, water body margins and riparian margins, dunes, and beaches. Excludes man-made water races and drainage infrastructure such as swales and Stormwater Management Areas."</u>	3.6.15	Accept	It is considered that this proposed amendment helps to add clarity. The submitter's proposed definition of 'natural features' has already been accepted in part.	Yes
256.72	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-P15	Amend NH-P15 and Definitions: "Protect natural features which assist in avoiding or reducing the impacts from natural hazards, such as natural ponding areas, wetlands, water body margins and riparian margins, dunes, berms and beaches from inappropriate subdivision, use and development and restore, maintain or enhance the functioning of these features." Where: 'Natural Feature' is defined as: <u>natural ponding areas, wetlands, water body margins and riparian margins, dunes, and beaches. Excludes man-made water races and drainage infrastructure such as swales and Stormwater Management Areas.</u>	3.6.15	Accept	It is considered that this proposed amendment helps to add clarity. The submitter's proposed definition of 'natural features' has already been accepted in part.	Yes
284.154	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-P15	Retain NH-P15 as notified.	3.6.15	Accepted in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P15, this submission is accepted in part	No
316.73	Canterbury Regional Council	NH-P15	Include additional reference in NH-P15 to terraces as an example of natural features providing natural hazard resilience, as follows:	3.6.15	Accept	The addition of 'terraces' is supported as it is considered that this is an example of a natural feature.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
			"Protect natural features which assist in avoiding or reducing the impacts from natural hazards, such as natural ponding areas, wetlands, water body margins and riparian margins, terraces, dunes..."				
326.162	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-P15	Retain NH-P15 as notified.	3.6.15	Accepted in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P15, this submission is accepted in part	No
414.95	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc.	NH-P15	Amend NH-P15 to add: <u>Rural production activities are usually highly resilient to natural hazards.</u>	3.6.15	Reject	It is accepted that rural areas in uses such as pastoral farming can provide resilience. However the value of pastoral land in providing earthquake resilience is not clear. The requested addition is not consistent with Policy NH-P15 as it refers to activities, rather than geographic features. There are no rules that would give effect to this statement and Federated Farmers has not sought any.	No
418.79	Keith Godwin	NH-P15	Amend NH-P15: "Protect natural features which assist in avoiding or reducing the impacts from natural hazards, such as natural ponding areas, wetlands, water body margins and riparian margins, dunes, berms and beaches from inappropriate subdivision, use and development and restore, maintain or enhance the functioning of these features." Where: Natural Feature is defined as: <u>natural ponding areas, wetlands, water body margins and riparian margins, dunes, and beaches. Excludes man-made water races and drainage infrastructure such as swales and Stormwater Management Areas.</u>	3.6.15	Accept	It is considered that this proposed amendment helps to add clarity. The submitter's proposed definition of 'natural features' has already been accepted in part. It is therefore recommended that these submissions are accepted and Policy NH-P15 is amended.	Yes
419.63	Department of Conservation	NH-P15	Retain NH-P15 as notified.	3.6.15	Accepted in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P15, this submission is accepted in part	No

Table B 23: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-P16 Redevelopment and relocation in coastal hazard and natural hazard overlays

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.73	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-P16	Amend NH-P16: "Encourage redevelopment, or changes in land use, where that would reduce <u>or mitigate</u> the risk of adverse effects from natural hazards, including managed retreat and designing for relocation or recoverability from natural hazard events."	3.6.15	Reject	It is considered that the proposed addition of 'or mitigate' is not required as mitigation is a method of reducing the risk of adverse effects from natural hazards. Including these words would create a tautology. As such, it is recommended that this submission is rejected.	No
162.76	John Stevenson	NH-P16	Amend NH-P16: "Encourage redevelopment, or changes in land use, where that would reduce <u>or mitigate</u> the risk of adverse effects from natural hazards, including managed retreat and designing for relocation or recoverability from natural hazard events".	3.6.16	Reject	It is considered that the proposed addition of 'or mitigate' is not required as mitigation is a method of reducing the risk of adverse effects from natural hazards. Including these words would create a tautology. As such, it is recommended that this submission is rejected.	No
256.73	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-P16	Amend NH-P16: "Encourage redevelopment, or changes in land use, where that would reduce <u>or mitigate</u> the risk of adverse effects from natural hazards, including managed retreat and designing for relocation or recoverability from natural hazard events".	3.6.16	Reject	It is considered that the proposed addition of 'or mitigate' is not required as mitigation is a method of reducing the risk of adverse effects from natural hazards. Including these words would create a tautology. As such, it is recommended that this submission is rejected.	No
284.155	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-P16	Retain NH-P16 as notified.	3.6.16	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P16, this submission is accepted in part	No
316.74	Canterbury Regional Council	NH-P16	Retain NH-P16, but clarify limits on 'redevelopment'.	3.6.16	Accept	This policy is drawn from NZCPS Policy 25(c), which also uses the word 'redevelopment'. It is accepted that 'redevelopment' is a broad term, however this term is further qualified by the need to reduce the risk of adverse effects from natural hazards. Given the comments raised by the submitter it is recommended that the word 'redevelopment' is deleted from NH-P16.	Yes
326.163	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-P16	Retain NH-P16 as notified.	3.6.16	Accepted in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P16, this submission is accepted in part	No
418.80	Keith Godwin	NH-P16	Amend NH-P16: "Encourage redevelopment, or changes in land use, where that would reduce <u>or mitigate</u> the risk of adverse effects from natural hazards, including managed retreat and designing for relocation or recoverability from natural hazard events."	3.6.16	Reject	It is considered that the proposed addition of 'or mitigate' is not required as mitigation is a method of reducing the risk of adverse effects from natural hazards. Including these words would create a tautology. As such, it is recommended that this submission is rejected.	No
419.64	Department of Conservation	NH-P16	Retain NH-P16 as notified.	3.6.16	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P16, this submission is accepted in part	No

Table B 24: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-P17 Hard engineering natural hazard mitigation within the coastal environment

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.167	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-P17	Nil	3.6.17	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P17, this submission is accepted in part.	No
162.159	John Stevenson	NH-P17	Nil	3.6.17	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P17, this submission is accepted in part.	No
256.160	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-P17	Nil	3.6.17	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P17, this submission is accepted in part.	No
284.156	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-P17	Retain NH-P17 as notified.	3.6.16	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P17, this submission is accepted in part.	No
316.75	Canterbury Regional Council	NH-P17	<p>Clarify that other considerations, such as on natural character of coastal environments and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and Canterbury Regional Policy Statement policy direction are critically important.</p> <p>Clarify interaction between NH-P17(4) and NH-P17(5).</p> <p>Delete NH-P17(3) where managed retreat has not been adopted and there is an immediate risk to life or property from the natural hazard;</p>	3.6.17	Accept in part	<p>It is agreed that there is a relationship between clauses 4 and 5. It is also accepted that higher-level policy direction (such as the NZCPS and CRPS) consider additional matters such as impacts on natural character and that NH-P17 is therefore too narrowly focussed. In order to resolve the relationship between clauses 4 and 5 and to recognise the higher policy direction under the NZCPS and CRPS, it is recommended that clause 5 is deleted. Regarding the deletion of clause 3, managed retreat and immediate risk are matters that should be addressed holistically through an adaptation planning framework. However, there is currently no adaptation framework applying to the Waimakariri District. In the absence of such a framework, there is value in providing guidance on hard engineering in the coastal environment and therefore it is recommended that clause 3 remains as notified.</p>	Yes
326.164	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-P17	Retain NH-P17 as notified.	3.6.17	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P17, this submission is accepted in part	No
418.81	Keith Godwin	NH-P17	Nil	3.6.17	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P17, this submission is accepted in part	No
419.65	Department of Conservation	NH-P17	Retain NH-P17 as notified.	3.6.17	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P17, this submission is accepted in part	No

Table B 25: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-P18 Fire and ice risks

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.74	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-P18	Neutral on NH-P18.	3.6.18	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
162.77	John Stevenson	NH-P18	Neutral on NH-P18.	3.6.18	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
256.74	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-P18	Neutral on NH-P18.	3.6.18	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
284.157	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-P18	Retain NH-P18 as notified.	3.6.18	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
303.32	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	NH-P18	Retain NH-P18 as notified.	3.6.18	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
326.165	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-P18	Retain NH-P18 as notified.	3.6.18	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
414.96	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc.	NH-P18	Delete NH-P18.	3.6.18	Reject	The submitter's concerns (that it is unfair to blame wildfire and vehicle crash risk from ice hazards solely on woodlots and shelterbelts, while ignoring plantation forestry and carbon forestry; and there are usually inherent setbacks within road corridors and on the sites themselves that guard against this risk) are not reasons to delete the Policy.	No
418.82	Keith Godwin	NH-P18	Neutral on NH-P18.	3.6.18	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
419.67	Department of Conservation	NH-P18	Retain NH-P18 as notified.	3.6.18	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No

Table B 26: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-P19 Other natural hazards

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.75	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-P19	Delete NH-P19, or clarify the word 'other' as follows: "Encourage the consideration of other earthquake, tsunami, erosion, volcanic and geothermal activity, landslip, subsidence, sedimentation, wind, drought, fire natural hazards as part of subdivision, use and development."	3.6.19	Reject	The intent of this policy was to recognise that there are other natural hazards that are not expressly covered in the other chapter policies and to provide guidance on how these are to be addressed. Limiting the application of the policy to the submitters' listed natural hazards is narrower than the RMA natural hazards definition and therefore narrower than the Council's responsibilities under the Act. Given this, it is recommended that the submission is rejected.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
162.78	John Stevenson	NH-P19	Delete NH-P19, or clarify the word 'other' as follows: "Encourage the consideration of other <u>earthquake, tsunami, erosion, volcanic and geothermal activity, landslip, subsidence, sedimentation, wind, drought, fire</u> natural hazards as part of subdivision, use and development."	3.6.19	Reject	The intent of this policy was to recognise that there are other natural hazards that are not expressly covered in the other chapter policies and to provide guidance on how these are to be addressed. Limiting the application of the policy to the submitters' listed natural hazards is narrower than the RMA natural hazards definition and therefore narrower than the Council's responsibilities under the Act. Given this, it is recommended that the submission is rejected.	No
249.173	MainPower	NH-P19	Retain NH-P19 as notified.	3.6.19	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P19, this submission is accepted in part.	No
256.75	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-P19	Delete NH-P19, or clarify the word 'other' as follows: "Encourage the consideration of other <u>earthquake, tsunami, erosion, volcanic and geothermal activity, landslip, subsidence, sedimentation, wind, drought, fire</u> natural hazards as part of subdivision, use and development."	3.6.19	Reject	The intent of this policy was to recognise that there are other natural hazards that are not expressly covered in the other chapter policies and to provide guidance on how these are to be addressed. Limiting the application of the policy to the submitters' listed natural hazards is narrower than the RMA natural hazards definition and therefore narrower than the Council's responsibilities under the Act. Given this, it is recommended that the submission is rejected.	No
284.158	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-P19	Retain NH-P19 as notified.	3.6.19	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P19, this submission is accepted in part	No
316.76	Canterbury Regional Council	NH-P19	Amend NH-P19 to better reflect a risk based approach.	3.6.19	Accept	Unfortunately the submitter did not provide any suggested wording. CRPS Policy 11.3.5 applies a risk-based approach through consideration of likelihood and consequence. It is agreed that NH-P19 would benefit from amendments to be more closely aligned with CRPS Policy 11.3.5 and it is recommended to be amended accordingly.	Yes
325.118	Kainga Ora	NH-P19	Retain NH-P19 as notified.	3.6.19	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P19, this submission is accepted in part	No
326.166	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-P19	Retain NH-P19 as notified.	3.6.19	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-P19, this submission is accepted in part	No
418.83	Keith Godwin	NH-P19	Delete NH-P19, or clarify the word 'other' as follows: "Encourage the consideration of other <u>earthquake, tsunami, erosion, volcanic and geothermal activity, landslip, subsidence, sedimentation, wind, drought, fire</u> natural hazards as part of subdivision, use and development."	3.6.19	Reject	The intent of this policy was to recognise that there are other natural hazards that are not expressly covered in the other chapter policies and to provide guidance on how these are to be addressed. Limiting the application of the policy to the submitters'	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
						listed natural hazards is narrower than the RMA natural hazards definition and therefore narrower than the Council's responsibilities under the Act. Given this, it is recommended that the submission is rejected.	
41.22	Fulton Hogan	Proposed new policies	Insert the following new policy: <u>NH-PX</u> <u>Provide 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.</u>	3.6.20	Reject	Policy NH-P16 already addresses redevelopment and relocation in coastal hazard and natural hazard overlays where these reduce the risk of adverse effects from natural hazards, including managed retreat and designing for relocation or recoverability from natural hazard events. This existing policy is considered to already adequately cover the matters addressed in proposed policy NH-PX. For this reason it is recommended that this submission is rejected.	No

Table B 27: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-R1 Natural hazard sensitive activities

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.76	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-R1	Retain NH-R1 as notified.	3.7.2	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R1, this submission is accepted in part	No
162.79	John Stevenson	NH-R1	Retain NH-R1 as notified.	3.7.2	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R1, this submission is accepted in part	No
167.40	Beach Road Estates Limited	NH-R1	Retain NH-R11 as notified.	3.7.2	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R1, this submission is accepted in part	No
256.76	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-R1	Retain NH-R1 as notified.	3.7.2	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R1, this submission is accepted in part	No
284.159	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-R1	Amend NH-R1 to include the following wording, or words to like effect: An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being <u>limited notified</u> or publicly notified, but may be limited notified.	3.7.1	Reject	Buildings covered by these rules can impede flow paths and cause flood waters displacement, or compromise access, all of which can have an impact on adjacent or 'downstream' properties. It is therefore considered appropriate that these rules are able to be limited notified and that this submission is rejected.	No
284.179	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-R1	Retain NH-R1 as notified.	3.7.2	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R1, this submission is accepted in part	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
316.77	Canterbury Regional Council	NH-R1	Delete NH-R1(1).	3.7.2	Accept in part	Standard 1 permits buildings when these are erected to the level specified in an existing consent notice that is less than five years old. Any resource consent condition imposed over the last five years will not have referenced a flood level less than the 200-year ARI event and in all cases a conservative freeboard of at least 400mm will have been applied. It is noted however that the wording in Standard 1 refers to a 'consent notice'. This was not the intention of the provisions, which was to allow development to a floor height that is up to five years old via referencing a 'consent condition'. It is therefore recommended that this part of the submission is accepted in part.	Yes
325.119	Kainga Ora	NH-R1	Amend NH-R1 to align with the relief sought in the submission point on the Planning Maps and general submission point for the Natural Hazards Chapter, which seek to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Delete Urban Flood Assessment Overlay and Non-Urban Flood Assessment Overlay, and mapped fixed floor level overlays. Include these as non-statutory map layers in the Waimakariri District Natural Hazards Interactive Viewer. - Amend relevant provisions to delete reference to these overlays, instead refer to the specific hazard type that will be identified through a flood assessment. - Recognise that large areas of the urban environment are in High Hazard Areas but as residential and commercial activities are anticipated, sensitive activities should be discretionary rather than non-complying. 	3.7.2	Reject	Having no overlay or map to geographically identify areas susceptible to flooding will likely result in either under or over capture of properties in a flood assessment or consent pathway. Regarding applying a discretionary activity status to hazard sensitive activities, the chapter provides for many hazard sensitive activities in existing urban areas to be permitted, subject to meeting the floor level requirements and that non-compliance defaults to an RDIS activity status, and not non-complying (e.g. see NH-R1 and NH-R3)). A non-complying status generally only applies to non-urban areas, i.e. areas zoned general rural and rural lifestyle (e.g. NH-R2). A permitted activity pathway with an RDIS status where the standards are not met is appropriate for existing urban areas.	No
326.167	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R1	Amend all rules in the Natural Hazards Chapter, to include the following wording, or words to like effect: <p>An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being <u>limited notified or publicly notified</u>, but may be limited notified.</p>	3.7.1	Reject	Buildings covered by these rules can impede flow paths and cause flood waters displacement, or compromise access, all of which can have an impact on adjacent or 'downstream' properties. It is therefore considered it appropriate that these rules are able to be limited notified and that this submission is rejected.	No
326.187	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R1	Retain NH-R1 as notified.	3.7.3	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R1, this submission is accepted in part	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
418.84	Keith Godwin	NH-R1	Retain NH-R1 as notified.	3.7.3	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R1, this submission is accepted in part	No

Table B 28: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-R2 Natural hazard sensitive activities

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.77	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-R2	Retain NH-R2 as notified.	3.7.3	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R2, this submission is accepted in part	No
162.80	John Stevenson	NH-R2	Retain NH-R2 as notified.	3.7.3	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R2, this submission is accepted in part	No
256.77	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-R2	Retain NH-R2 as notified.	3.7.3	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R2, this submission is accepted in part	No
284.160	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-R2	Amend NH-R2 to include the following: An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being <u>limited notified</u> or publicly notified, but may be limited notified.	3.7.1	Reject	Buildings covered by these rules can impede flow paths and cause flood waters displacement, or compromise access, all of which can have an impact on adjacent or 'downstream' properties. It is therefore considered appropriate that these rules are able to be limited notified and that this submission is rejected.	No
284.180	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-R2	Retain NH-R2 as notified.	3.7.3	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R2, this submission is accepted in part	No
295.89	Horticulture New Zealand	NH-R2	Retain NH-R2 as notified.	3.7.3	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R2, this submission is accepted in part	No
303.33	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	NH-R2	Retain NH-R2 as notified.	3.7.3	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R2, this submission is accepted in part	No
316.78	Canterbury Regional Council	NH-R2	Amend NH-R2: "Where: 1. the building is erected to the level specified in an existing consent notice that is less than five years old; or 2. ... 3. if the activity is a residential unit or a minor residential unit and is located outside of the Non-Urban Flood Assessment Overlay and located within Rural Zones, it has a finished floor level that is either: i. 400mm above the natural ground level; or	3.7.3	Accept in part	Regarding NH-R2(1), as covered for Rule NH-R1, it is recommended that this part of the submission is accepted in part. The same change is recommended to be made to NH-R3. Regarding the request to delete NH-R2(3) and instead extend the flood assessment overlay to cover all areas that have the potential for flooding, given the acceptance	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
			<p>ii. is equal to or higher than the minimum finished floor level as stated in a Flood Assessment Certificate in accordance with NH-S1."</p> <p>Expand the flood assessment overlay to include all areas that have the potential for flooding.</p>			<p>to extend the flood hazard overlays standard 3 can be deleted.</p> <p>Given this recommendation, it is also recommended that the corresponding clause in NH-R3(2)(e) is also deleted as a consequential amendment.</p>	
325.120	Kainga Ora	NH-R2	Amend to align with the relief sought for the Natural Hazard Chapter outlined in other submission points.	3.7.2	Reject	As for NH-R1.	No
326.168	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R2	<p>Amend all rules in the Natural Hazards Chapter, to include the following wording, or words to like effect:</p> <p>An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being <u>limited notified or publicly notified</u>, but may be limited notified.</p>	3.7.1	Reject	Buildings covered by these rules can impede flow paths and cause flood waters displacement, or compromise access, all of which can have an impact on adjacent or 'downstream' properties. It is therefore considered appropriate that these rules are able to be limited notified and that this submission is rejected.	No
326.188	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R2	Retain NH-R2 as notified.	3.7.3	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R2, this submission is accepted in part	No
408.12	Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd	NH-R2	Ensure flood overlays and relevant provisions are appropriately carried over following certification process for new development areas.	3.7.3	Accept in part	It is not considered appropriate within an urban environment to carry over the non-urban provisions because of the newly built-up nature of the development. Regarding the request to include a default 400mm freeboard height in NH-S1 for sites of very low to low flood hazard, NH-S1 states that the freeboard is up to 500mm. It is considered that added clarity can be provided by amending standard NH-S1 to require 400mm freeboard for low hazard and 500mm freeboard for medium to high hazard.	Yes
418.85	Keith Godwin	NH-R2	Retain NH-R2 as notified.	3.7.3	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R2, this submission is accepted in part	No

Table B 29: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-R3 Natural hazard sensitive addition to existing natural hazard sensitive activities

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.78	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-R3	Retain NH-R3 as notified.	3.7.4	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R3, this submission is accepted in part	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
162.81	John Stevenson	NH-R3	Retain NH-R3 as notified.	3.7.4	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R3, this submission is accepted in part	No
207.13	Summerset Retirement Villages (Rangiora) Ltd	NH-R3	Amend NH-R3 to delete (2)(d)(i). 2(d)(i). located on a site outside of a high flood hazard area as stated in a Flood Assessment Certificate issued in accordance with NH-S1; and	3.7.4	Accept in part	There is a discrepancy between NH-R1 and NH-R3 for buildings and additions in high hazard areas, but only in relation to those proposed to be located within urban environments. In the non-urban flood assessment overlay new buildings (under NH-R2) and additions (under NH-R3) both have provisions relating to high hazard areas. It is therefore recommended that this submission is accepted in part and NH-R3(2)(d) is amended to add a reference to the Non-urban Flood Assessment Overlay.	Yes
256.78	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-R3	Retain NH-R3 as notified.	3.7.4	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R3, this submission is accepted in part	No
284.161	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-R3	Amend NH-R3 to include the following: An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being <u>limited notified or publicly notified.</u> , but may be limited notified.	3.7.1	Reject	Buildings covered by these rules can impede flow paths and cause flood waters displacement, or compromise access, all of which can have an impact on adjacent or 'downstream' properties. It is therefore considered appropriate that these rules are able to be limited notified and that this submission is rejected.	No
284.181	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-R3	Retain NH-R3 as notified.	3.7.4	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R3, this submission is accepted in part	No
325.121	Kainga Ora	NH-R3	Amend to align with the relief sought for the Natural Hazard Chapter outlined in other submission points.	3.7.4	Reject	As for NH-R1. Consistent with previous recommendations, having no flood assessment overlays or map to geographically identify areas susceptible to flooding will likely result in either under or over capture of properties in a flood assessment or consent pathway.	No
325.125	Kainga Ora	NH-R3	Amend rule for readability.	3.7.4	Accept	It is accepted that the rule is complex. Changes have been made to simplify it.	Yes
326.169	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R3	Amend all rules in the Natural Hazards Chapter, to include the following wording, or words to like effect: An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being <u>limited notified or publicly notified.</u> , but may be limited notified.	3.7.1	Reject	Buildings covered by these rules can impede flow paths and cause flood waters displacement, or compromise access, all of which can have an impact on adjacent or 'downstream' properties. It is therefore considered appropriate that these rules are able to be limited notified and that this submission is rejected.	No
326.189	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R3	Retain NH-R3 as notified.	3.7.4	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R3, this submission is accepted in part	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
418.86	Keith Godwin	NH-R3	Retain NH-R3 as notified.	3.7.4	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R3, this submission is accepted in part	No

Table B 30: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-R4 Below ground infrastructure and critical infrastructure

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
62.37	Chorus, Spark, Vodafone	NH-R4	Retain NH-R4 as notified.	3.7.5	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R4, this submission is accepted in part	No
111.79	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-R4	Retain NH-R4 as notified.	3.7.5	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R4, this submission is accepted in part	No
162.82	John Stevenson	NH-R4	Retain NH-R4 as notified.	3.7.5	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R4, this submission is accepted in part	No
195.60	Transpower New Zealand Limited	NH-R4	Retain NH-R4 as notified.	3.7.5	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R4, this submission is accepted in part	No
210.8	Waimakariri Irrigation Limited	NH-R4	Retain NH-R4 as notified.	3.7.5	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R4, this submission is accepted in part	No
249.174	MainPower	NH-R4	Retain NH-R4 as notified.	3.7.5	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R4, this submission is accepted in part	No
256.79	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-R4	Retain NH-R4 as notified.	3.7.5	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R4, this submission is accepted in part	No
284.162	Clampet Investments Limited	NH-R4	Amend NH-R4 to include the following: An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being <u>limited notified</u> or publicly notified, but may be limited notified.	3.7.1	Reject	Buildings covered by these rules can impede flow paths and cause flood waters displacement, or compromise access, all of which can have an impact on adjacent or 'downstream' properties. It is therefore considered appropriate that these rules are able to be limited notified and that this submission is rejected.	No
284.182	Clampet Investments Limited	NH-R4	Retain NH-R4 as notified.	3.7.5	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R4, this submission is accepted in part	No
303.34	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	NH-R4	Retain NH-R4 as notified.	3.7.5	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R4, this submission is accepted in part	No
316.79	Canterbury Regional Council	NH-R4	Insert a provision in NH-R4 that any filling above ground level is not in an overland flow path.	3.7.5	Accept in part	The proposed rules covering 0.25m of fill in the chapter are considered a pragmatic response to this issue and an approach that is able to be measured. However, it is accepted that up to 0.25m of earthworks in an overland flow path could cause adverse effects. It is therefore recommended to	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
						amend this rule to refer to refer to the effects of displacing or diverting floodwaters.	
325.122	Kainga Ora	NH-R4	Amend to align with the relief sought for the Natural Hazard Chapter outlined in other submission points.	3.7.2	Reject	As per recommendation for NH-R1.	No
326.170	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R4	Amend all rules in the Natural Hazards Chapter, to include the following wording, or words to like effect: An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being <u>limited notified</u> or publicly notified., but may be limited notified.	3.7.1	Reject	Buildings covered by these rules can impede flow paths and cause flood waters displacement, or compromise access, all of which can have an impact on adjacent or 'downstream' properties. It is therefore considered appropriate that these rules are able to be limited notified and that this submission is rejected.	No
326.190	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R4	Retain NH-R4 as notified.	3.7.5	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R4, this submission is accepted in part	No
418.87	Keith Godwin	NH-R4	Retain NH-R4 as notified.	3.7.5	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R4, this submission is accepted in part	No

Table B 31: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-R5 Above ground infrastructure that is not critical infrastructure

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
62.38	Chorus, Spark, Vodafone	NH-R5	Retain NH-R5 as notified.	3.7.6	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R5, this submission is accepted in part	No
111.150	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-R5	Retain NH-R5 as notified.	3.7.6	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R5, this submission is accepted in part	No
162.83	John Stevenson	NH-R5	Retain NH-R5 as notified.	3.7.6	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R5, this submission is accepted in part	No
166.31	New Zealand Defence Force	NH-R5	Amend NH-R5: ... 2. new infrastructure or an extension to existing infrastructure: ... c. is limited to a customer connection; or d. <u>is for temporary military training activity.</u>	3.7.6	Accept	Temporary infrastructure associated with TMTA is unlikely to have a significant adverse impact on flooding as these training activities are temporary and the infrastructure examples provided are relatively small. In any case, it is unlikely that the submitter would place temporary infrastructure in an area that is currently in flood, and would remove it in a flooding event.	Yes
210.9	Waimakariri Irrigation Limited	NH-R5	Retain NH-R5 as notified.	3.7.6	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R5, this submission is accepted in part	No
256.150	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-R5	Retain NH-R5 as notified.	3.7.6	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R5, this submission is accepted in part	No
284.163	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-R5	Amend NH-R5 to include the following:	3.7.1	Reject	Buildings covered by these rules can impede flow paths and cause flood waters	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
			"An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being <u>limited notified or publicly notified.</u> , but may be limited notified. "			displacement, or compromise access, all of which can have an impact on adjacent or 'downstream' properties. It is therefore considered appropriate that these rules are able to be limited notified and that this submission is rejected.	
284.183	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-R5	Retain NH-R5 as notified.	3.7.6	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R5, this submission is accepted in part	No
316.80	Canterbury Regional Council	NH-R5	Insert provision in NH-R5 that any filling above ground level is not in an overland flow path.	3.7.6	Accept in part	Clause NH-R5(1) covers earthworks associated with the above ground infrastructure. Clause NH-R5(2) requires that the infrastructure itself is not located within an overland flowpath as stated in a flood assessment certificate. As such, any earthworks associated with above ground infrastructure in a flow path is likely to be caught by clause NH-R5(2), with clause NH-R5(1) being more relevant to flood waters displacement than flow path disruption. However, it is recommended that amending clause 1 in response to submissions [316.79] will likely favourably respond to the submitter's request as filling in a flow path will now be captured.	Yes
325.123	Kainga Ora	NH-R5	Amend to align with the relief sought for the Natural Hazard Chapter outlined in other submission points.	3.7.2	Reject	As per recommendation for NH-R1.	Yes
326.171	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R5	Amend all rules in the Natural Hazards Chapter, to include the following wording, or words to like effect: An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being <u>limited notified or publicly notified.</u> , but may be limited notified.	3.7.1	Reject	Buildings covered by these rules can impede flow paths and cause flood waters displacement, or compromise access, all of which can have an impact on adjacent or 'downstream' properties. It is therefore considered appropriate that these rules are able to be limited notified and that this submission is rejected.	Yes
326.191	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R5	Retain NH-R5 as notified.	3.7.6	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R5, this submission is accepted in part	No
418.88	Keith Godwin	NH-R5	Retain NH-R5 as notified.	3.7.6	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R5, this submission is accepted in part	No

Table B 32: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-R6 Above ground critical infrastructure

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
62.39	Chorus, Spark, Vodafone	NH-R6	Retain NH-R6 as notified.	3.7.8	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R6, this submission is accepted in part	No
111.152	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-R6	Retain NH-R6 as notified.	3.7.8	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R6, this submission is accepted in part	No
162.84	John Stevenson	NH-R6	Retain NH-R6 as notified.	3.7.8	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R6, this submission is accepted in part	No
184.52	Martin Pinkham	NH-R6	Retain NH-R6 as notified.	3.7.8	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R6, this submission is accepted in part	No
193.52	Martin Pinkham	NH-R6	Implement NH-R6(2) for the proposed Rangiora to Woodend Medium Residential Zone.	3.7.8	Reject	The fixed floor level approach is only appropriate for those areas subject to coastal inundation or ponding with no significant overland flowpaths. For the Waimakariri District this includes the urban areas of Kaiapoi, Pines Kairaki, Woodend Beach and Waikuku Beach. In other areas of the district the sloping nature of the land and the presence of overland flowpaths means it is not possible to define an area wide maximum flood level and instead site specific considerations are needed. The Kaiapoi fixed floor level is proposed to be replaced by the flood assessment overlays in response to ECan's submission [316.52] (see the General assessment section).	No
195.61	Transpower New Zealand Limited	NH-R6	Amend NH-R6: "Where: 1. if located with the Fault Awareness Overlay, new critical infrastructure or an extension to existing infrastructure has a footprint of less than 100m ² <u>per structure</u> ; and 2. if located within a Flood Assessment Overlay or the Kaiapoi Fixed Minimum Finished Floor Level Overlay: ... c. new infrastructure or an extension to existing infrastructure: i. has a footprint of less than 10m ² <u>per structure</u> ; or ..."	3.7.8	Accept	The submitter seeks to amend the rules to better enable electricity transmission. It is considered that a fully permitted status is inconsistent with CRPS Policy 11.3.4 which states that new critical infrastructure will be located outside high hazard areas unless there is no reasonable alternative. However, the consenting burden could be reduced by excluding overhead electricity transmission lines from being required to get a flood assessment certificate as these are clearly not subject to flood damage. The area thresholds can apply on a 'per structure' basis as it would be impractical to apply this as a total area across an entire flood assessment overlay. It is also considered that small buildings or extensions up to 25m ² are acceptable, consistent with the exclusion of small buildings in the definition of natural hazard sensitive activities. It is therefore	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
						recommended that the submission is accepted and NH-R6 is amended.	
<i>FS99</i>	<i>KiwiRail</i>		<i>Allow the submission</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
249.175	MainPower	NH-R6	Amend NH-R6: "Above ground critical infrastructure (<u>not covered by new rule Rule NH-RX</u>) Activity status: PER Where: 1. if located <u>with</u> in the Fault Awareness Overlay, new critical infrastructure or an extension to existing infrastructure has a footprint of less than 100m ² ; and 2. if located within a Flood Assessment Overlay or the Kaiapoi Fixed Minimum Finished Floor Level Overlay: a. the profile, contour or height of the land is not permanently raised by more than 0.25m when compared to natural ground level; and b. the infrastructure is located on a site outside of high flood hazard area as stated in a Flood Assessment Certificate issued in accordance with NH-S1; or c. new infrastructure or an extension to existing infrastructure: i. has a footprint of less than 10 13m ² ; or ..."	3.7.8	Accept in part	The submitter seeks to amend the rules to better enable electricity distribution. It is considered that a fully permitted status is inconsistent with CRPS Policy 11.3.4 which states that new critical infrastructure will be located outside high hazard areas unless there is no reasonable alternative. However, the consenting burden could be reduced by excluding overhead electricity distribution lines from being required to get a flood assessment certificate as these are clearly not subject to flood damage. The area thresholds can apply on a 'per structure' basis as it would be impractical to apply this as a total area across an entire flood assessment overlay. It is also considered that small buildings or extensions up to 25m ² are acceptable, consistent with the exclusion of small buildings in the definition of natural hazard sensitive activities. It is therefore recommended that the submission is accepted and NH-R6 is amended.	Yes
256.151	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-R6	Retain NH-R6 as notified.	3.7.8	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R6, this submission is accepted in part	No
268.2	Paul Lupi	NH-R6	The Kaiapoi Fixed Minimum Finished Floor Level Overlay as detailed in NH-R6, to be retained in its present form.	3.7.8	Reject	Based on technical advice it is recommended that the Kaiapoi FMFFL is replaced by the urban flood assessment overlay.	No
<i>FS80</i>	<i>Paul Lupi</i>		<i>Oppose the submission</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
275.23	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	NH-R6	Amend, or clarify the basis for the 0.25m threshold. Reconsider the requirement for a Flood Assessment Certificate to be obtained for any type of critical infrastructure.	3.7.8	Accept in part	This rule seeks to both manage risk to critical infrastructure from natural hazards and manage displacing the risk to other properties. The basis for the 0.25m threshold is not set out in the s32. With this rule applying to critical infrastructure (and indeed all activities) and therefore covering flow path obstruction, it is considered appropriate to exclude roads from NH-R6 as these will not suffer damage in flooding events to the same extent as other critical infrastructure, or are often unable to be designed to withstand it (e.g. fault rupture). It is therefore recommended to accept the submission in part.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
284.164	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-R6	Amend NH-R6 to include the following: An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being <u>limited notified or publicly notified.</u> but may be limited notified.	3.7.1	Reject	Buildings covered by these rules can impede flow paths and cause flood waters displacement, or compromise access, all of which can have an impact on adjacent or 'downstream' properties. It is therefore considered appropriate that these rules are able to be limited notified and that this submission is rejected.	No
284.184	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-R6	Retain NH-R6 as notified.	3.7.8	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R6, this submission is accepted in part	No
303.35	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	NH-R6	Retain NH-R6 as notified.	3.7.8	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R6, this submission is accepted in part	No
325.124	Kainga Ora	NH-R6	Amend to align with the relief sought for the Natural Hazard Chapter outlined in other submission points.	3.7.2	Reject	As per recommendation for NH-R1.	No
326.172	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R6	Amend all rules in the Natural Hazards Chapter, to include the following wording, or words to like effect: An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being <u>limited notified or publicly notified.</u> but may be limited notified.	3.7.1	Reject	Buildings covered by these rules can impede flow paths and cause flood waters displacement, or compromise access, all of which can have an impact on adjacent or 'downstream' properties. It is therefore considered appropriate that these rules are able to be limited notified and that this submission is rejected.	No
326.192	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R6	Retain NH-R6 as notified.	3.7.8	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R6, this submission is accepted in part	No
373.50	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	NH-R6	Retain NH-R6 as notified.	3.7.8	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R6, this submission is accepted in part	No
418.89	Keith Godwin	NH-R6	Retain NH-R6 as notified.	3.7.8	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R6, this submission is accepted in part	No

Table B 33: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-R7 Woodlots and shelterbelts

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.80	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-R7	Neutral on NH-R7.	3.7.9	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R7, this submission is accepted in part	No
162.85	John Stevenson	NH-R7	Neutral on NH-R7.	3.7.9	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R7, this submission is accepted in part	No
256.80	Chloe Chai & Mark McKitterick	NH-R7	Neutral on NH-R7.	3.7.9	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R7, this submission is accepted in part	No
FS2	Mark McKitterick		Oppose the submission		Reject		

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
284.165	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-R7	Amend NH-R7 to include the following: An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being <u>limited notified or publicly notified.</u> but may be limited notified.	3.7.9	Reject	Buildings covered by these rules can impede flow paths and cause flood waters displacement, or compromise access, all of which can have an impact on adjacent or 'downstream' properties. It is therefore considered appropriate that these rules are able to be limited notified and that this submission is rejected.	No
284.185	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-R7	Retain NH-R7 as notified.	3.7.9	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R7, this submission is accepted in part	No
295.90	Horticulture New Zealand	NH-R7	Delete NH-R7.	3.7.9	Accept in part	Shelterbelts are an important component of rural production and their location can have an impact on productive potential. However, shelterbelts and woodlots can also increase wildfire risk and ice on roads. It appears that there is some overlap between GRUZ-R2 and NH-R7. To reduce this overlap it is recommended that 'woodlots' is removed from NH-R7 in clause 1.	Yes
303.36	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	NH-R7	Retain NH-R7 as notified.	3.7.9	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R7, this submission is accepted in part	No
326.173	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R7	Amend all rules in the Natural Hazards Chapter, to include the following wording, or words to like effect: An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being <u>limited notified or publicly notified.</u> but may be limited notified.	3.7.1	Reject	Buildings covered by these rules can impede flow paths and cause flood waters displacement, or compromise access, all of which can have an impact on adjacent or 'downstream' properties. It is therefore considered appropriate that these rules are able to be limited notified and that this submission is rejected.	No
326.193	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R7	Retain NH-R7 as notified.	3.7.9	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R7, this submission is accepted in part	No
414.97	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc.	NH-R7	Delete NH-P18 and NH-R7, or replace with an activity status of Permitted in NH-R7, with no limitations.	3.7.9	Accept in part	Shelterbelts are an important component of rural production and their location can have an impact on productive potential. However, shelterbelts and woodlots can also increase wildfire risk and ice on roads. It appears that there is some overlap between GRUZ-R2 and NH-R7. To reduce this overlap it is recommended that 'woodlots' is removed from NH-R7 in clause 1.	Yes
418.90	Keith Godwin	NH-R7	Retain NH-R7 as notified.	3.7.9	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R7, this submission is accepted in part	No

Table B 34: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-R8 Maintenance of existing community scale natural hazard mitigation works

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.81	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-R8	Retain NH-R8 as notified.	3.7.10	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R8, this submission is accepted in part	No
162.86	John Stevenson	NH-R8	Retain NH-R8 as notified.	3.7.10	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R8, this submission is accepted in part	No
256.81	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-R8	Retain NH-R8 as notified.	3.7.10	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R8, this submission is accepted in part	No
284.186	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-R8	Retain NH-R8 as notified.	3.7.10	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R8, this submission is accepted in part	No
316.81	Canterbury Regional Council	NH-R8	Insert provision in NH-R8 for all works to maintain the effective operation of established river and drainage schemes that are administered by local authorities within all zones. Include an exclusion from the earthworks requirements for the maintenance of existing community scale natural hazard mitigation works in any other chapter.	3.7.10	Accept in part	The activity status of river and drainage schemes has been assessed under other chapters of the PDP and amendments are recommended to the CE and EW chapters to facilitate the maintenance of ECan's flood protection schemes.	Yes
326.174	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R8	Amend all rules in the Natural Hazards Chapter, to include the following wording, or words to like effect: An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being <u>limited notified or publicly notified.</u> , but may be limited notified.	3.7.1	Reject	Buildings covered by these rules can impede flow paths and cause flood waters displacement, or compromise access, all of which can have an impact on adjacent or 'downstream' properties. It is therefore considered appropriate that these rules are able to be limited notified and that this submission is rejected.	No
326.194	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R8	Retain NH-R8 as notified.	3.7.10	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R8, this submission is accepted in part	No
418.91	Keith Godwin	NH-R8	Retain NH-R8 as notified.	3.7.10	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R8, this submission is accepted in part	No

Table B 35: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-R9 Upgrading existing community scale natural hazard mitigation works

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.82	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-R9	Retain NH-R9 as notified.	3.7.12	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R9, this submission is accepted in part	No
162.87	John Stevenson	NH-R9	Retain NH-R9 as notified.	3.7.12	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R9, this submission is accepted in part	No
256.82	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-R9	Retain NH-R9 as notified.	3.7.12	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R9, this submission is accepted in part	No
284.187	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-R9	Retain NH-R9 as notified.	3.7.12	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R9, this submission is accepted in part	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
316.82	Canterbury Regional Council	NH-R9	<p>Insert provision within NH-R9 for all works to maintain the effective operation of established river and drainage schemes that are administered by local authorities within all zones.</p> <p>Provide an exclusion from the earthworks requirements in any other chapter.</p>	3.7.12	Accept in part	<p>The NH-R9 covers upgrading rather than maintenance. The maintenance component of the submission is already generally provided for as set out under NH-P8. Upgrading would also be permitted under NFL-R5, NATC-R8 and NATC-R9 and potentially under ECO-R2 and SASM-R4, but would likely be required under CE-R3, ECO-R1.</p> <p>It is noted that the submitter runs schemes, as opposed to individual hazard mitigation structures. This was identified by the submitter in its submission on 'community scale natural hazard mitigation works' covered in the definitions section of this report. There is value in recognising this scheme approach within the definition of 'upgrading'. It is therefore recommended to amend the definition of 'upgrading' to include a footprint increase of up to 10% of the original scheme across any continuous 5-year period for ECan's flood infrastructure. This definition change will further support the submitter to maintain the effective operation of existing river and drainage schemes consistent with their submission on NH-R9.</p>	Yes
326.175	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R9	<p>Amend all rules in the Natural Hazards Chapter, to include the following wording, or words to like effect:</p> <p>An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being <u>limited notified or publicly notified.</u>, but may be limited notified.</p>	3.7.12	Reject	<p>Buildings covered by these rules can impede flow paths and cause flood waters displacement, or compromise access, all of which can have an impact on adjacent or 'downstream' properties. It is therefore considered appropriate that these rules are able to be limited notified and that this submission is rejected.</p>	No
326.195	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R9	Retain NH-R9 as notified.	3.7.12	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R9, this submission is accepted in part	No
418.92	Keith Godwin	NH-R9	Retain NH-R9 as notified.	3.7.12	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R9, this submission is accepted in part	No

Table B 36: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-R10 Construction of new community scale natural hazard mitigation works

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.83	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-R10	Retain NH-R10 as notified.	3.7.13	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R10, this submission is accepted in part	No
162.88	John Stevenson	NH-R10	Retain NH-R10 as notified.	3.7.13	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R10, this submission is accepted in part	No
256.83	Chloe Chai and Mark McKittrick	NH-R10	Retain NH-R10 as notified.	3.7.13	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R10, this submission is accepted in part	No
266.16	199 Johns Road Ltd, Carolina Homes Ltd, Carolina Rental Homes Ltd, Allan Downs Ltd	NH-R10	If West Rangiora Development Area is relying on Council undertaking natural hazard mitigation works under NH-P9(1), then NH-R10 applies. It is unclear that an earth engineered 'bund' would meet the definition of 'soft engineering natural hazard mitigation' thus reconsideration of this rule and definition are required.	3.7.13	Accept	It is agreed that it is not fully clear whether an earth engineered bund would meet the definition of 'soft engineering natural hazard mitigation'. An artificially constructed earthen bund would most likely be classified as hard engineering natural hazard mitigation. To add clarity to NH-R10 it is recommended that permitted activity standard NH-R10(1) is amended to specify soft engineering excludes earth engineered bunds.	Yes
284.188	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-R10	Retain NH-R10 as notified.	3.7.13	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R10, this submission is accepted in part	No
316.83	Canterbury Regional Council	NH-R10	Insert provision into NH-R10 for all works to maintain the effective operation of established river and drainage schemes that are administered by local authorities within all zones. Provide an exclusion from the earthworks requirements in any other chapter.	3.7.13	Accept in part	NH-R10 is about the construction of new mitigation schemes, whereas the submitter's submission refers to the effective operation of established river and drainage schemes. As such, it is not clear if this submission applies to NH-R10. Given the adverse effects that can occur from the construction of new hazard mitigation schemes, it is considered appropriate that a resource consent is required for these. Regarding excluding earthworks, it is considered acceptable for EW-R4 to be deleted, relying on NH-R10 instead.	Yes
326.176	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R10	Amend all rules in the Natural Hazards Chapter, to include the following wording, or words to like effect: An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being <u>limited notified or publicly notified.</u> but may be limited notified.	3.7.1	Reject	Buildings covered by these rules can impede flow paths and cause flood waters displacement, or compromise access, all of which can have an impact on adjacent or 'downstream' properties. It is therefore considered appropriate that these rules are able to be limited notified and that this submission is rejected.	No
326.196	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R10	Retain NH-R10 as notified.	3.7.13	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R10, this submission is accepted in part	No
418.93	Keith Godwin	NH-R10	Retain NH-R10 as notified.	3.7.13	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R10, this submission is accepted in part	No

Table B 37: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-R11 New and upgrading of above and below ground existing infrastructure that is not critical infrastructure

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.84	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-R11	Retain NH-R11 as notified.	3.7.14	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
162.89	John Stevenson	NH-R11	Retain NH-R11 as notified.	3.7.14	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
256.84	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-R11	Retain NH-R11 as notified.	3.7.14	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
284.189	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-R11	Retain NH-R11 as notified.	3.7.14	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
326.177	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R11	Amend all rules in the Natural Hazards Chapter, to include the following wording, or words to like effect: An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being <u>limited notified or publicly notified.</u> , but may be limited notified.	3.7.1	Reject	Buildings covered by these rules can impede flow paths and cause flood waters displacement, or compromise access, all of which can have an impact on adjacent or 'downstream' properties. It is therefore considered appropriate that these rules are able to be limited notified and that this submission is rejected.	No
326.197	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R11	Retain NH-R11 as notified.	3.7.14	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
418.94	Keith Godwin	NH-R11	Retain NH-R11 as notified.	3.7.14	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No

Table B 38: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-R12 Natural hazard sensitive activities

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.85	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-R12	Retain NH-R12 as notified.	3.7.15	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
162.9	John Stevenson	NH-R12	Retain NH-R12 as notified.	3.7.15	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
256.85	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-R12	Retain NH-R12 as notified.	3.7.15	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
284.190	Clampett Investments Ltd	NH-R12	Retain NH-R12 as notified.	3.7.15	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
326.178	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R12	Amend all rules in the Natural Hazards Chapter, to include the following wording, or words to like effect: "An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being <u>limited notified</u> or publicly notified., but may be limited notified."	3.7.1	Reject	Buildings covered by these rules can impede flow paths and cause flood waters displacement, or compromise access, all of which can have an impact on adjacent or 'downstream' properties. It is therefore considered appropriate that these rules are able to be limited notified and that this submission is rejected.	No
326.198	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R12	Retain NH-R12 as notified.	3.7.15	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
418.95	Keith Godwin	NH-R12	Retain NH-R12 as notified.	3.7.15	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No

Table B 39: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-R13 Upgrading of existing or construction of new non-community scale natural hazard mitigation works for flood mitigation

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.86	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-R13	Retain NH-R13 as notified.	3.7.16	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
162.91	John Stevenson	NH-R13	Retain NH-R13 as notified.	3.7.16	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
256.86	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-R13	Retain NH-R13 as notified.	3.7.16	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
277.29	Ministry of Education	NH-R13	Clarify the intent of the policy and how it interacts with NH-P9	3.7.16	Accept in part	NH-R13 does not apply to community scale natural hazard mitigation works. Rather NH-R10 would apply to works undertaken by or on behalf of the Ministry of Education. Earlier recommendations in relation to NH-P9 help clarify the relationship between NH-R13 and NH-P9. As such, it is recommended that this submission is accepted in part.	No
284.191	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-R13	Retain NH-R13 as notified.	3.7.16	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
326.179	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R13	Amend all rules in the Natural Hazards Chapter, to include the following wording, or words to like effect:	3.7.1	Reject	Buildings covered by these rules can impede flow paths and cause flood waters displacement, or compromise access, all of which can have an impact on adjacent or 'downstream' properties. It is therefore	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
			An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being <u>limited notified or publicly notified</u> , but may be limited notified.			considered appropriate that these rules are able to be limited notified and that this submission is rejected.	
326.199	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R13	Retain NH-R13 as notified.	3.7.16	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
418.96	Keith Godwin	NH-R13	Retain NH-R13 as notified.	3.7.16	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No

Table B 40: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-R14 New and upgrading of above and below ground critical infrastructure

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.87	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-R14	Retain NH-R14 as notified.	3.7.17	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R14, this submission is accepted in part	No
162.92	John Stevenson	NH-R14	Retain NH-R14 as notified.	3.7.17	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R14, this submission is accepted in part	No
195.62	Transpower New Zealand Limited	NH-R14	Amend NH-R14: Activity status: DIS <u>RDIS</u> ... Activity status where compliance is not achieved: <u>DISNC</u>	3.7.17	Accept	A Restricted Discretionary activity status for new critical infrastructure in the Ashley Fault Avoidance Overlay is considered acceptable as the matters of discretion are able to be identified.	Yes
249.177	MainPower	NH-R14	Amend NH-R14 (1)(a): ... Where: 1. the critical infrastructure involves any of the following: a. electricity substations, networks , and transmission and distribution installations, including the National Grid and the electricity distribution network ;	3.7.17	Reject	It is considered that the submitter's assets should be treated consistently with other critical infrastructure providers as they are all critical infrastructure being proposed in an area subject to natural hazards, and that electricity is a lifeline utility. It is proposed that the activity status for NH-R14 to be Restricted Discretionary, rather than Discretionary, which reduces the consenting burden for the submitter. It is therefore recommend that the submitter's (249.177) submission is rejected.	No
256.87	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-R14	Retain NH-R14 as notified.	3.7.17	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R14, this submission is accepted in part	No
284.192	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-R14	Retain NH-R14 as notified.	3.7.17	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R14, this submission is accepted in part	No
326.180	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R14	Amend all rules in the Natural Hazards Chapter, to include the following wording, or words to like effect:	3.7.1	Reject	Buildings covered by these rules can impede flow paths and cause flood waters displacement, or compromise access, all of which can have an impact on adjacent or	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
			An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being <u>limited notified or publicly notified</u> , but may be limited notified.			'downstream' properties. It is therefore considered appropriate that these rules are able to be limited notified and that this submission is rejected.	
326.200	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R14	Retain NH-R14 as notified.	3.7.17	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R14, this submission is accepted in part	No
FS78	Forest & Bird		Oppose the submission		Reject		
FS119	Andrea Marsden		Oppose the submission		Reject		
FS120	Christopher Marsden		Oppose the submission		Reject		
418.97	Keith Godwin	NH-R14	Retain NH-R14 as notified.	3.7.17	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R14, this submission is accepted in part	No

Table B 41: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-R15 Natural hazard sensitive activities within the urban environment

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.159	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-R15	Nil	3.7.18	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
162.160	John Stevenson	NH-R15	Nil	3.7.18	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
167.50	Beach Road Estates Limited	NH-R15	Retain NH-R15(1) as notified.	3.7.18	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
186.14	Tim Stephenson	NH-R15	Not specified	3.7.18	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
256.161	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-R15	Nil	3.7.18	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
284.173	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-R15	Amend NH-R15 to include the following: An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being <u>limited notified or publicly notified</u> , but may be limited notified.	3.7.1	Reject	Buildings covered by these rules can impede flow paths and cause flood waters displacement, or compromise access, all of which can have an impact on adjacent or 'downstream' properties. It is therefore considered appropriate that these rules are able to be limited notified and that this submission is rejected.	No
284.193	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-R15	Retain NH-R15 as notified.	3.7.18	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
316.84	Canterbury Regional Council	NH-R15	Delete NH-R15(1): Where: 1. the building is erected to the level specified in an existing subdivision consent notice or on an approved subdivision consent	3.7.18	Accept in part	It is appropriate to enable buildings to be built to the level specified in a consent notice. It is noted that the January 21 date was included as this date is when the coastal	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
			plan that was approved after 1 January 2021, and is less than five years old; or 2. ...			flood modelling was provided by Jacobs and therefore is the latest data available. As such, the floor levels identified in consent notices approved after January 1 2021 are based on the most up to date flood modelling and consider acceptable magnitude flood events. The 5-year time limit is appropriate given the semi frequent rate at which the flood modelling data is updated. Based on recommendations for NH-R1, NH-R2 and NH-R3 it is recommended that this clause is retained but amended to only refer to a 'consent decision'.	
325.126	Kainga Ora	NH-R15	Retain NH-R15 as notified.	3.7.18	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
326.181	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R15	Amend all rules in the Natural Hazards Chapter, to include the following wording, or words to like effect: An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being <u>limited notified or publicly notified</u> , but may be limited notified.	3.7.1	Reject	Buildings covered by these rules can impede flow paths and cause flood waters displacement, or compromise access, all of which can have an impact on adjacent or 'downstream' properties. It is therefore considered appropriate that these rules are able to be limited notified and that this submission is rejected.	No
326.201	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R15	Retain NH-R15 as notified.	3.7.18	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
418.98	Keith Godwin	NH-R15	Nil	3.7.18	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No

Table B 42: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-R16 Natural hazard sensitive activities outside the urban environment

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.160	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-R16	Nil	3.7.19	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
162.161	John Stevenson	NH-R16	Nil	3.7.19	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
256.162	Chloe and Mark McKitterick	NH-R16	Nil	3.7.19	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
284.194	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-R16	Retain NH-R16 as notified.	3.7.19	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
295.91	Horticulture New Zealand	NH-R16	Retain NH-R16 as notified.	3.7.19	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
316.85	Canterbury Regional Council	NH-R16	Delete permitted pathway in NH-R16 for new natural hazard sensitive activities in the coastal flood assessment overlay.	3.7.19	Accept in part	Based on technical advice and the earlier recommendation to amend the definition of 'high coastal flood hazard' the permitted pathway under NH-R16 is considered to be consistent with CRPS Policy 11.3.1. Consistent with recommendations for NH-R1, NH-R2, NH-R3 and NH-R15, it is recommended that clause NH-R16(1) is retained but amended to only refer to a 'consent decision'.	Yes
326.182	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R16	Amend all rules in the Natural Hazards Chapter, to include the following wording, or words to like effect: An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being <u>limited notified</u> or publicly notified, but may be limited notified.	3.7.1	Reject	Buildings covered by these rules can impede flow paths and cause flood waters displacement, or compromise access, all of which can have an impact on adjacent or 'downstream' properties. It is therefore considered appropriate that these rules are able to be limited notified and that this submission is rejected.	No
326.202	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R16	Retain NH-R16 as notified.	3.7.19	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
418.99	Keith Godwin	NH-R16	Not specified	3.7.19	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No

Table B 43: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-R17 Above ground critical infrastructure

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
62.40	Chorus, Spark, Vodafone	NH-R17	Retain NH-R17 as notified.	3.7.20	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R17, this submission is accepted in part	No
111.161	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-R17	Nil	3.7.20	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R17, this submission is accepted in part	No
162.163	John Stevenson	NH-R17	Nil	3.7.20	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R17, this submission is accepted in part	No
195.63	Transpower New Zealand Limited	NH-R17	Amend NH-R17: "Activity status: PER Where:	3.7.20	Accept in part	Consistent with the recommendation for NH-R6, it is accepted that the area thresholds can apply on a 'per structure' basis as it would be impractical to apply this as a total	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
			<p>1. the profile, contour or height of the land is not permanently raised by more than 0.25m when compared to natural ground level; and</p> <p>a. new infrastructure or an extension to existing infrastructure has a footprint of less than 10m² per structure; or</p> <p>b. any new building that is identified as being subject to 0.29m or less of coastal flooding as stated in a Coastal Flood Assessment Certificate and has finished floor level equal to or higher than the minimum finished floor level as stated in a Coastal Flood Assessment Certificate issued in accordance with NH-S2; or</p> <p>c. if not a building, new infrastructure, excluding any support base, towers or poles, is located above ground level at an elevation higher than the minimum floor level as stated in a Coastal Flood Assessment Certificate issued in accordance with NH-S2.</p> <p>Activity status where compliance is not achieved: for NH-R17 (1), NH-R17 (1)(a) and NH-R17 (1)(c): RDIS Matters of discretion are restricted to: NH-MD3 - Natural hazards and infrastructure NH-MD4 - Natural hazards coastal matters</p> <p>Activity status where compliance is not achieved for NH-R17 (1)(b): RDIS (see NH-R17 (2)) Activity status: RDIS Where: 2. any building that is identified as being subject to between 0.3m and 0.99m of coastal flooding, as stated in a Coastal Flood Assessment Certificate, is erected on raised land or utilises a combination of raised land and a raised floor level equal to or higher than the minimum requirements stated in a Coastal Flood Assessment Certificate issued in accordance with NH-S2. Matters of discretion are restricted to: NH-MD4 - Natural hazards coastal matters Activity status where compliance is not achieved: NC:"</p>			<p>area across an entire flood assessment overlay.</p> <p>Regarding the submitter's request to delete standard 2, standard 2 is connected to standard 1 in a cascade. Standard 2 only applies to buildings that are proposed in areas subject to between 0.3 and 0.99m of flooding. It does not apply to structures. As set out earlier in the definitions section flooding of more than 1m is likely to be high hazard under the CRPS. As set out in the assessment under NH-R6, CRPS Policy 11.3.4 states that new critical infrastructure will be located outside of high hazard areas unless there is no reasonable alternative. It is therefore considered that it is appropriate that buildings associated with critical infrastructure proposed to be located in areas subject to more than 1m of flooding in the prescribed hazard event are non-complying if they are not built higher than the minimum requirements stated in a Coastal Flood Assessment Certificate. It is therefore recommended that this submission component is rejected. Overall, the submitter's submission is accepted in part.</p>	
249.178	MainPower	NH-R17	<p>Amend NH-R17 (1)(a):</p> <p>...</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>1. the profile, contour or height of the land is not permanently raised by more than 0.25m when compared to natural ground level; and</p> <p>a. new infrastructure or an extension to existing infrastructure has a footprint of less than 1013m²; or</p> <p>...</p>	3.7.20	Accepted in part	Consistent with my recommendation for NH-R6, it is accepted that the area thresholds can apply on a 'per structure' basis as it would be impractical to apply this as a total area across an entire flood assessment overlay. It is also agreed that the area threshold can be increased so as to provide for a typical cabinet and kiosk. It is therefore recommended this submission point is accepted.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
						Regarding the submitter's request to add a reference to EI-MD3, it is noted this matter of discretion refers to operational requirements. NH-MD3 already refers to functional and operational need and therefore it is considered this additional matter of discretion is not required.	
256.163	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-R17	Nil	3.7.20	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R17, this submission is accepted in part	No
284.195	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-R17	Retain NH-R17 as notified.	3.7.20	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R17, this submission is accepted in part	No
303.37	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	NH-R17	Retain NH-R17 as notified.	3.7.20	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R17, this submission is accepted in part	No
316.86	Canterbury Regional Council	NH-R17	Delete permitted pathway in NH-R17 for new infrastructure in the coastal flood assessment overlay.	3.7.20	Reject	Consistent with conclusions on NH-R16, it is considered that development subject to coastal flooding of 0.29m and 0.29m-0.99m aligns with the CRPS approach to flooding that is not high hazard. In addition, the non-complying status for activities on land subject to 1m or more depth of coastal flooding does align with the CRPS approach for high hazard areas for fresh water flood hazard, thereby giving effect to CRPS Policy 11.3.4.	No
326.183	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R17	Amend all rules in the Natural Hazards Chapter, to include the following wording, or words to like effect: An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being <u>limited notified</u> or publicly notified., but may be limited notified.	3.7.1	Reject	Buildings covered by these rules can impede flow paths and cause flood waters displacement, or compromise access, all of which can have an impact on adjacent or 'downstream' properties. It is therefore considered appropriate that these rules are able to be limited notified and that this submission is rejected.	No
326.203	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R17	Retain NH-R17 as notified.	3.7.20	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R17, this submission is accepted in part	No
418.100	Keith Godwin	NH-R17	Nil	3.7.20	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R17, this submission is accepted in part	No
FS82	Rolleston Industrial Developments; Carters Group Property Limited and CSI Property Ltd		Allow the submission		Accept		

Table B 44: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-R18 Below ground infrastructure and critical infrastructure

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
62.41	Chorus, Spark, Vodafone	NH-R18	Retain NH-R18 as notified.	3.7.21	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R18, this submission is accepted in part	No
111.162	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-R18	Nil	3.7.21	Accept in part	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
162.164	John Stevenson	NH-R18	Nil	3.7.21	Accept in part	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
195.64	Transpower New Zealand Limited	NH-R18	Retain NH-R18 as notified.	3.7.21	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R18, this submission is accepted in part	No
249.179	MainPower	NH-R18	Retain NH-R18 as notified.	3.7.21	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R18, this submission is accepted in part	No
256.164	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-R18	Nil	3.7.21	Accept in part	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
284.196	Clampett Investments	NH-R18	Retain NH-R18 as notified.	3.7.21	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R18, this submission is accepted in part	No
316.87	Canterbury Regional Council	NH-R18	Change the applicability of this rule from the overland flow paths to the flood assessment overlays, amend the rule to capture all activities that have the potential to cause offsite effects and only permit activities where there will be no effects and only require resource consent in situations where there will be effects.	3.7.21	Accept in part	It is accepted that 0.25m of earthworks in an overland flow path could cause adverse effects, and also that consent might be required for earthworks that do not cause adverse effects due to the blunt and arbitrary nature of the rule. It is recommended recommend that [316.87] is accepted in part	Yes
326.184	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R18	Amend all rules in the Natural Hazards Chapter, to include the following wording, or words to like effect: An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being <u>limited notified</u> or publicly notified., but may be limited notified.	3.7.1	Reject	Buildings covered by these rules can impede flow paths and cause flood waters displacement, or compromise access, all of which can have an impact on adjacent or 'downstream' properties. It is therefore considered appropriate that these rules are able to be limited notified and that this submission is rejected.	No
326.204	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R18	Retain NH-R18 as notified.	3.7.21	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R18, this submission is accepted in part	No
418.101	Keith Godwin	NH-R18	Nil	3.7.21	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-R18, this submission is accepted in part	No

Table B 45: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-R19 Construction of new community scale natural hazard mitigation works involving hard engineering natural hazard mitigation

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.163	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-R19	Nil	3.7.22	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
162.165	John Stevenson	NH-R19	Nil	3.7.22	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
256.165	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-R19	Nil	3.7.22	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
284.197	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-R19	Retain NH-R19 as notified	3.7.22	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
326.185	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R19	Amend all rules in the Natural Hazards Chapter, to include the following wording, or words to like effect: An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being <u>limited notified</u> or publicly notified., but may be limited notified.	3.7.1	Reject	Buildings covered by these rules can impede flow paths and cause flood waters displacement, or compromise access, all of which can have an impact on adjacent or 'downstream' properties. It is therefore considered appropriate that these rules are able to be limited notified and that this submission is rejected.	No
326.205	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R19	Retain NH-R19 as notified.	3.7.22	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
418.102	Keith Godwin	NH-R19	Nil	3.7.22	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
419.68	Department of Conservation	NH-R19	Retain NH-R19 as notified.	3.7.22	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No

Table B 46: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-R20 Upgrading of existing or construction of new non-community scale natural hazard mitigation works for coastal flood hazard mitigation

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.164	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-R20	Nil	3.7.23	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
162.166	John Stevenson	NH-R20	Nil	3.7.23	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
256.166	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-R20	Nil	3.7.23	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
284.198	Clampett Investments Limited	NH-R20	Retain NH-R20 as notified.	3.7.23	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
326.186	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R20	Amend all rules in the Natural Hazards Chapter, to include the following wording, or words to like effect: An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being <u>limited notified</u> or publicly notified., but may be limited notified.	3.7.1	Reject	Buildings covered by these rules can impede flow paths and cause flood waters displacement, or compromise access, all of which can have an impact on adjacent or 'downstream' properties. It is therefore considered appropriate that these rules are able to be limited notified and that this submission is rejected.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
326.206	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	NH-R20	Retain NH-R20 as notified.	3.7.23	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
418.103	Keith Godwin	NH-R20	Nil	3.7.23	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
419.69	Department of Conservation	NH-R20	Retain NH-R20 as notified.	3.7.23	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No

Table B 47: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-S1 Flood Assessment Certificate

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.88	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-S1	Retain NH-S1 as notified.	3.8.1	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-S1, this submission is accepted in part	No
162.93	John Stevenson	NH-S1	Retain NH-S1 as notified.	3.8.1	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-S1, this submission is accepted in part	No
226.9	McAlpines Ltd	NH-S1	Delete the method of calculating minimum floor levels within the Urban Flood Assessment Overlay in NH-S1(1)(e) and within the Kaiapoi Fixed Minimum Finished Floor Level Overlay; and Insert a new method of calculating minimum floor levels within the Urban Flood Assessment Overlay and within the Kaiapoi Fixed Minimum Finished Floor Level Overlay that relies on a 1% AEP (1 in 100-year) method of calculating minimum floor levels.	3.8.1	Accept in part	The fixed floor level approach for Kaiapoi would not be appropriate for Southbrook or Rangiora given the sloping nature of the land and the presence of natural overland flowpaths, which means the predicted flood levels are not uniform and will vary across each site. Site-specific assessments are therefore required. The CRPS requires a 0.5% AEP (1 in 200 year) level to be applied rather than a 1% AEP. The District Plan must give effect to the CRPS and as such it is not possible to apply a 1% AEP through the District Plan. However, there is value in more clearly considering the nature of the activity occurring and the extent to which a building might suffer material damage in an inundation event. It is therefore, recommended that NH-MD1(2) is amended and this submission is accordingly accepted in part.	Yes
249.180	MainPower	NH-S1	Retain NH-S1 as notified.	3.8.1	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-S1, this submission is accepted in part	No
FS102	McAlpines Ltd		<i>Disallow the submission in part</i>		<i>Reject</i>		
256.88	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-S1	Retain NH-S1 as notified.	3.8.1	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-S1, this submission is accepted in part	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
FS102	McAlpines Ltd		Disallow the submission in part		Reject		
306.4	Robert Kimber	NH-S1	Ensure the Flood Assessment Certificate is as accurate as practically possible.	3.8.1	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-S1, this submission is accepted in part	No
316.88	Canterbury Regional Council	NH-S1	Clarify how the freeboard height will be determined. Amend NH-S1 (1)(e)(iii): ... iii. flooding predicted to occur in a 40.5% 5% AEP (1 in 200--year) Storm Surge Event concurrent with a 5% AEP (1 in 20-year) River Flow Event with sea level rise based on an RCP8.5 climate change scenario, plus up to 500mm freeboard.	3.8.1	Accept	Technical evidence for the Council supports applying a 0.5% AEP for storm surge events. Freeboard application is proposed to be clarified as per earlier submissions and [408.99] below.	Yes
FS102	McAlpines Ltd		Disallow the submission in part		Reject		
325.127	Kainga Ora	NH-S1	Amend to align with the relief sought in the submission point on the Planning Maps and general submission point for the Natural Hazards Chapter, which seek: - Delete Urban Flood Assessment Overlay and Non-Urban Flood Assessment Overlay, and mapped fixed floor level overlays. Include these as non-statutory map layers in the Waimakariri District Natural Hazards Interactive Viewer. - Amend relevant provisions to delete reference to these overlays, instead refer to the specific hazard type that will be identified through a flood assessment. - Recognise that large areas of the urban environment are in High Hazard Areas but as residential and commercial activities are anticipated, sensitive activities should be discretionary rather than noncomplying.	3.7.2	Reject	As per recommendation for NH-R1.	No
408.99	Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd	NH-S1	Amend NH-S1: ... <u>f. For the purposes of determining the required freeboard in (e), any site considered to be medium risk (adjacent to a stormwater treatment facility (i.e. basin or similar) or overland flow channel) shall require a freeboard of 500mm. All other sites are considered low risk and can have a reduced freeboard of 400mm.</u>	3.8.1	Accept in part	400mm freeboard is appropriate in areas of very low to low flood hazard and that this approach is also generally consistent with the Council's current approach. 500mm freeboard is considered appropriate in areas of medium to high hazard which reflects the overall higher level of risk associated with these areas. Amendments are recommended to NH-S1 to specify this, but these are not consistent with the wording requested by the submitter, hence the 'accept in part' classification.	Yes
418.104	Keith Godwin	NH-S1	Retain NH-S1 as notified.	3.8.1	Accepted in part	Given recommended changes to NH-S1, this submission is accepted in part	No

Table B 48: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-S2 Coastal Flood Assessment Certificate

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
111.165	CA and GJ McKeever	NH-S2	Nil	3.8.2	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
162.167	John Stevenson	NH-S2	Nil	3.8.2	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
186.15	Tim Stephenson	NH-S2	<p>Review the 500mm freeboard in the calculation for the coastal flood assessment certificate.</p> <p>Delete the land height requirement for anything but a new subdivision.</p> <p>Continued review of the accuracy of the map data.</p>	3.8.2	Reject	<p>500mm of freeboard is supported by technical evidence. The required floor levels shown on the current Kaiapoi Flood Building Level map include between 300 mm and 500 mm of freeboard. Areas of very deep water (such as the '2 m' referred to by the submitter) would be considered 'high hazard areas' and development in these locations is non-complying and NH-S2 will not necessarily apply in such areas.</p> <p>The land height requirement under NH-S2 only applies to activities within the non-urban flood are and as such, it will apply to greenfield subdivisions, rather than subdivisions in existing urban areas, consistent with the submitters request.</p> <p>The map data referred to (the Waimakariri District Natural Hazards Interactive Viewer) does not form part of the PDP and the PDP already states, as an advisory to NH-S1 and NH-S2, that the AEP flood event risk level, minimum floor levels and overland flow path locations are to be determined by reference to the most up to date models, maps and data held by the District Council and the Regional Council.</p>	No
249.181	MainPower	NH-S2	Retain NH-S1 as notified subject to seeking further clarification	3.8.2	Accept	<p>NH-S2 is triggered by NH-R16 and NH-R17. NH-R17 covers above ground critical infrastructure, which would include the submitter's assets associated with the electricity distribution network (clause (d) of the critical infrastructure definition). The submitter supports NH-R17, but in clause 1(a) seeks the footprint be increased to 13m² so that the typical cabinets and kiosks used can be accommodated without the burden of requiring a resource consent (similar to their submission on NH-R6). It is recommended to accept this submission so these assets would be excluded from the application of NH-S2.</p>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
						It is noted that a building would be captured under clause (b) while remaining infrastructure is covered under clause (c). Clause (c) expressly excludes any support base, towers or poles needing to meet the minimum floor level stated in a coastal flood assessment certificate. As such, it is considered that a coastal flood assessment certificate will not be required for infrastructure such as poles and towers, consistent with this submission.	
256.167	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	NH-S2	Nil	3.8.2	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No
316.89	Canterbury Regional Council	NH-S2	Amend NH-S2 to delete permitted pathway for new natural hazard sensitive activities in the coastal flood assessment overlay.	3.8.2	Reject	Technical advice supports the permitted pathway enabled by NH-S2. Flood depths of less than 0.3m are considered to be low hazard and, with the proposed floor level mitigation, a permitted pathway in these circumstances is appropriate.	No
418.105	Keith Godwin	NH-S2	Nil	3.8.2	Accept	This submission does not seek changes that require assessment	No

Table B 49: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-MD1 Matters of Discretion – Natural Hazards General Matters

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
207.14	Summerset	NH-MD1	<p>Amend NH-MD1:</p> <p>Natural hazards general matters</p> <p>1. <u>The extent to which the setting of minimum floor levels are not achieved by the proposal and the effect of the lower levels, and the effects of minimum land levels and the predicted sea water and other inundation that will occur on the site.</u></p> <p>The frequency at which any proposed building or addition is predicted to be damaged and the extent of damage likely to occur in such an event, including taking into account the building material and design proposed; the anticipated life of the building, whether the building is relocatable, and for redevelopments, the extent to which overall risk will change as a result of the proposal.</p>	3.9.1	Accept in part	The submitted amended wording is an improvement and therefore, it is recommended that the changes are made. Regarding the proposed deletion of NH-1(7), please see the assessment under submission 316.90 (Canterbury Regional Council). For the reasons provided under that submission it is recommend clause 7 is not deleted.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
			... 7. The extent to which there are any positive effects from a reduction in floor levels in relation to neighbouring buildings or the streetscape. ...				
316.90	Environment Canterbury	HN-MD1	Delete NH-MD1(7): Natural hazards general matters 7. The extent to which there are any positive effects from a reduction in floor levels in relation to neighbouring buildings or the streetscape.	3.9.1	Accept in part	NH-MD1(7) enables decision makers to consider the extent to which there are any positive effects from a reduction in floor levels in relation to neighbouring buildings or the streetscape where a resource consent is required for not meeting a minimum floor level. While it is accepted that natural hazard risk reduction is more important than positive effects, there are valid reasons for being able to consider positive effects. For example, a building or part of a building may be proposed to be only 100mm below the required minimum floor level (thereby triggering a resource consent) for reasons such as to reduce obtrusive impacts on neighbouring properties. Without NH-MD1(7) the positive benefits of the proposal are unlikely to be considered, although it is proposed to reframe it.	Yes
325.128	Kainga Ora	HN-MD1	Retain NH-MD1 as notified	3.9.1	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-MD1, this submission is accepted in part	No
414.37	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	HN-MD1	Amend NH-MD1 to include: <u>New buildings and structures, additions to buildings and additions to access tracks (excluding maintenance)</u>	3.9.1	Reject	It is unclear how the relief sought responds to the issue raised. In any case, maintenance to existing natural hazard sensitive buildings would not be captured by the provisions as they apply to new activities and it is noted even additions to natural hazard sensitive activities up to 25m ² would not be captured by virtue of the definition of 'natural hazard sensitive activities'.	No

Table B 50: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-MD2 Natural Hazards mitigation works

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
325.129	Kainga Ora	NH-MD2	Retain NH-MD2 as notified	3.9.2	Accept	There are no submissions to assess for NH-MD2.	No

Table B 51: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-MD3 Natural Hazards and Infrastructure

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
195.65	Transpower New Zealand Limited	NH-MD3	<p>Amend NH-MD3:</p> <p>1. Any increase in the risk to life or property from natural hazard events.</p> <p>2. Any negative eEffects on the ability of people and communities to recover from a natural hazard event.</p> <p>3. The extent to which the infrastructure will suffer damage in a hazard event and whether the infrastructure is designed to maintain reasonable and safe operation during and after a natural hazard event.</p> <p>4. The time taken to reinstate critical infrastructure following a natural hazard event.</p> <p>45. The extent to which the infrastructure exacerbates the natural hazard risk or transfers the risk to another site.</p> <p>56. The ability for flood water conveyance to be maintained.</p> <p>67. The extent to which there is a functional need and operational need for that location and there are no practical alternatives.</p> <p>78. The extent to which any mitigation measures are proposed, their effectiveness and environmental effects, and any benefits to the wider area associated with hazard management.</p> <p>89. The positive benefits derived from the installation of the infrastructure.</p> <p>10. Any effects on cultural values.</p>	3.10.1	Accept in part	<p>The proposed changes to NH-MD3(2) and NH-MD-3(9) simplify the matters of discretion. Regarding the proposed deletion of NH-MD(4), in considering whether a proposal maintains its integrity and function, a relevant matter to consider in a consent application is the time taken to reinstate the critical infrastructure. It is noted that the time taken to reinstate critical infrastructure following a natural hazard event is identified in the CRPS Principal explanation and reasons to Policy 11.3.4.</p> <p>Regarding the proposed deletion in NH-MD(7) of the reference to practical alternatives, CRPS 11.3.4 expressly refers to whether there is a practical alternative. As such, there is higher order policy support for referring to practical alternatives.</p> <p>Regarding the submitter's proposed amendments to NH-MD3(8) to remove the reference to mitigation effectiveness and environmental effects, it is considered appropriate to enable a decision maker to consider the environmental effects of proposed mitigation which could be very minor or could include significant works. The rules for infrastructure do not distinguish between infrastructure occurring in within or outside sensitive.</p> <p>Regarding the submitter's request to delete NH-MD3(10) which enabled a decision maker to consider effects on cultural values, there is a separate sites and areas of significance to</p>	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
						Māori chapter that covers these matters. As such, this clause should be deleted.	
325.130	Kainga Ora	NH-MD3	Retain NH-MD3 as notified	3.10.1	Accept in part	Given recommended changes to NH-MD3, this submission is accepted in part	No
<i>FS110</i>	<i>Waka Katahi</i>		<i>Support the submission</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
414.38	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NH-MD3	Reword NH-MD3 to apply to critical infrastructure only.	3.10.1	Reject	NH-MD3 is intended to apply to all infrastructure as some rules (e.g. NH-R4 and NH-R18) cover all infrastructure. The rules are intended to target infrastructure that could cause flood water displacement or flow path disruption and include standards to permit minor structures. As such, farm infrastructure is not automatically assumed to be a hazard.	No

Table B 52: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions NH-MD4 Natural Hazards coastal matters

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
316.91	Environment Canterbury	NH-MD4	Delete NH-MD4(6) and (7): 6. Whether there are any positive effects from a reduction in floor or land levels in relation to accessibility, the height of the existing building, neighbouring buildings or the streetscape or the financial viability of the development. 7. Whether the site is located within an existing urban area and raised land or floor levels would create an unreasonable burden on the ability to continue to use an existing building and support the local community.	3.11.1	Accept in part	As for NH-MD1, these clauses enable decision makers to consider the extent to which there are any positive effects from a reduction in floor levels in relation to neighbouring buildings or the streetscape or for existing urban areas where a resource consent is required for not meeting a minimum floor level. While it is accepted that natural hazard risk reduction is more important than these other effects, there are valid reasons for being able to consider these additional matters. It is however accepted that a reference to financial viability is less relevant to considerations of risk and the other matters identified in NH-MD4 and it is therefore recommended that this reference is deleted and the submission accepted in part.	Yes
414.39	Federated Farmers	NH-MD4	Reword NH-MD4 to apply only to new buildings or sites	3.11.1	Reject	Maintenance to existing natural hazard sensitive buildings would not be captured by the provisions as they apply to new activities and upgrades involving additions to natural	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
						hazard sensitive activities up to 25m2 would not be captured by virtue of the definition of 'natural hazard sensitive activities'. As such, it is considered that the request by Federated Farmers is already achieved.	

Table B 53: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions - Other matters – Planning Maps – Natural Hazard Overlays

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
226.7	McAlpines	Planning Maps	Adopt the Kaiapoi Fixed Minimum Finished Floor Level Overlay for the Southbrook industrial and commercial area.	3.12.1	Reject	This matter was addressed under general submissions (McAlpines (226.8)). Technical advice is that the minimum fixed finished floor level approach is only appropriate for those areas subject coastal inundation or ponding with no significant overland flowpaths. In other areas of the district such as Southbrook, the sloping nature of the land and the presence of overland flowpaths means it is not possible to define an area wide maximum flood level and instead site-specific considerations are needed.	No
325.100	Kainga Ora	Planning Maps	Delete the Urban Flood Assessment Overlay and Non-Urban Flood Assessment Overlay, and mapped fixed floor level overlays but include them as non-statutory map overlays in the Waimakariri District Natural Hazards Interactive Viewer.	3.7.2	Reject	As per recommendation for NH-R1.	No
367.42	Waimakariri District Council	Planning Maps	Replace the Urban Flood Hazard Assessment Overlay in the planning maps with an updated overlay that matches the 200-year flood hazard layer (all) as shown on the public hazards portal.	3.12.1	Accept	The Urban Flood Assessment Overlay was intended to be based on the 200-year return period (0.5% AEP) in accordance with Policy 11.3.2 of the CRPS and consistent with Christchurch and Selwyn District plans.	Yes
408.10	Bellgrove Rangiora Limited	Planning Maps	Modify the Liquefaction Overlays to be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Liquefaction Overlay 1: Liquefaction damage unlikely</i> • <i>Liquefaction Overlay 2: Liquefaction damage is possible</i> 	3.12.1	Reject	ECan also submitted on the liquefaction overlay as a general submission (submission number 316.53). That submission sought to reduce the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay so that it only captures the gold coloured 'liquefaction damage is possible' area and excludes the green coloured 'liquefaction damage is unlikely' area. As set out the assessment of that submission (earlier in the general section), the liquefaction overlays	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
						are not referenced in the Natural Hazards Chapter, but they are in the Subdivision Chapter (SUB-R3). SUB-R3 is intended to only apply to the 'liquefaction damage possible' area as this is where liquefaction damage is more likely to occur. It was recommended that the overlay is amended so it only includes the 'liquefaction damage is possible' area, noting that the Building Act covers geotechnical matters for individual buildings.	
FS37	Richard and Geoff		no position		Accept		

