

Topic	Issue	Sub Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
PC74-01: Plan Change and Technical Report	1: General Support / Opposition and Requests for Further Information		1	1	Lovell, Warwick Rodger	Support	Support plan changes 74, and in particular as it relates to Dillon St and in No. 99, subject to the amendments sought in other submission points.	Retain plan changes 74 in its current form, subject to the amendments sought in other submission points.
			1	19	Lovell, Warwick Rodger	Unknown	Please also provide a cost benefit analysis from an economics expert on the plan change, the scenarios considered and the public and private benefits and costs of each approach.	Please also provide a cost benefit analysis from an economics expert on the plan change, the scenarios considered and the public and private benefits and costs of each approach.
			1	20	Lovell, Warwick Rodger	Unknown	Please explain in the Council's hearing report, the Council's strategy for managing erosion over the next 50 to 100 years to provide context to the plan change and Council's commitment or otherwise to continuing to manage erosion at Waihi.	Please explain in the Council's hearing report, the Council's strategy for managing erosion over the next 50 to 100 years to provide context to the plan change and Council's commitment or otherwise to continuing to manage erosion at Waihi.
			2	1	Lovell, Alastair	Support	Support plan changes 74, and in particular as it relates to Dillon St and in No. 99, subject to the amendments sought in other submission points.	Retain plan changes 74 in its current form, subject to the amendments sought in other submission points.
			2	19	Lovell, Alastair	Unknown	Please also provide a cost benefit analysis from an economics expert on the plan change, the scenarios considered and the public and private benefits and costs of each approach.	Please also provide a cost benefit analysis from an economics expert on the plan change, the scenarios considered and the public and private benefits and costs of each approach.
			2	20	Lovell, Alastair	Unknown	Please explain in the Council's hearing report, the Council's strategy for managing erosion over the next 50 to 100 years to provide context to the plan change and Council's commitment or otherwise to continuing to manage erosion at Waihi.	Please explain in the Council's hearing report, the Council's strategy for managing erosion over the next 50 to 100 years to provide context to the plan change and Council's commitment or otherwise to continuing to manage erosion at Waihi.
			5	1	Mahar, Judith May	Oppose	I am fully opposed to Plan Change 74 - Coastal Hazards. In the 33 years we have owned and used the house and property at 2 Broadway Rd, we have noted no perceivable change to the sea level and no change to the water that lies around the reserve on Seaforth Rd, adjacent to our property or on our property during and following heavy rain and storms. There is no evidence to show the rate of increase in sea level will occur at the suggested rate, as it does not take into account the work and commitment to reduce emissions through the Kyoto Treaty. It is therefore premature and irresponsible to assume a nil improvement and force the proposed restrictions and limitations on current property owners based on incomplete and not fully accepted or proven science. Tonkin and Taylor's report, based on their computer-generated models of future sea-level rise around New Zealand has been challenged successfully in Auckland (Omaha) and Kapiti Coast. Their report is to be challenged the Christchurch courts imminently. At the public open days, Tonkin and Taylor admitted that their recommendations were based on the maximum and most exaggerated, possible	Plan Change 74 - Coastal Erosion Areas should not progress as proposed.

Topic	Issue	Sub Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
							increases. This is not only flawed and at odds with common sense: these proposed changes to the plan are significant and life-changing for property owners and yet are based on subjective assumptions; it is arguably unlawful to push these changes through based on erroneous information. To have these changes made to the District Plan and thereby appear on a LIM and force the reduction in the property value is unfair and ill-founded.	
			FS 31 [5]	1 [1]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Oppose	Regional Council opposes the relief sought. Plan Change 74 gives effect to the operative Bay of Plenty Regional Policy Statement (RPS) and in particular Policy NH 1 1 B. Plan Change 74 gives effect to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS), in particular Policy 24 and Policy 25 a) avoid increasing the risk of social, environmental and economic harm from coastal hazards.	Regional Council opposes the relief sought.
			6	1	Longdill, Peter	Support	No objection to reviewing the location of the coastal erosion and inundation zones based on reviewed and accepted scientific evidence	No objection to reviewing the location of the coastal erosion and inundation zones based on reviewed and accepted scientific evidence
			8	1	Vernon, Gordon David	Oppose	Consultation - 1 letter, 1 two hour open day and a letter on eve of notification not good practice. Only using 20 minimum working days is poor practice especially this time of year (early October).	Consultation - 1 letter, 1 two hour open day and a letter on eve of notification not good practice. Only using 20 minimum working days is poor practice especially this time of year (early October).
			11	1	Lloyd, Natalie	Oppose	I am fully opposed to Plan Change 74 - Coastal Hazards. In the 33 years my parents have owned and used the house and property at 2 Broadway Rd, we have noted no perceivable change to the sea level and no change to the water that lies around the reserve on Seaforth Rd, adjacent to our property, or on our property during and following heavy rain and storms. There is no evidence to show the rate of increase in sea level will occur at the suggested rate, as it does not take into account the work and commitment to reduce emissions through the Kyoto Treaty. There will be major pressure on all countries at the climate conference in Paris in December 2015 to make a greater commitment to this. It is therefore premature and irresponsible to assume a nil improvement and force the proposed restrictions and limitations on current property owners based on incomplete and not fully accepted or proven science. Tonkin and Taylor's report, based on their computer-generated models of future sea-level rise around New Zealand has been challenged successfully in Auckland (Omaha) and Kapiti Coast. Their report is to be challenged the Christchurch courts imminently. At the public open days, Tonkin and Taylor admitted that their recommendations were based on the maximum and most exaggerated, possible increases. This is not	Plan Change 74 - Coastal Erosion Areas should not progress as proposed.

Topic	Issue	Sub Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
							only flawed and at odds with common sense: these proposed changes to the plan are significant and life-changing for property owners and yet are based on subjective assumptions; it is arguably unlawful to push these changes through based on erroneous information. To have these changes made to the District Plan and thereby appear on a LIM and force the reduction in the property value is unfair and ill-founded.	
			FS 31 [11]	2 [1]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Oppose	Regional Council opposes the relief sought. Plan Change 74 gives effect to the operative Bay of Plenty Regional Policy Statement (RPS) and in particular Policy NH 1 1 B. Plan Change 74 gives effect to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS), in particular Policy 24 and Policy 25 a) avoid increasing the risk of social, environmental and economic harm from coastal hazards.	Regional Council opposes the relief sought.
			15	1	Treloar, Judy Marie	Oppose	We strongly oppose the proposed Coastal Hazards plan change. The proposed changes will have detrimental and severe effects on landowners – in particular on the property and land values, restrictions on the use of the land in a residential zone, a property owners rights to protect his land and added impacts on insurance. Speculating 100 years ahead and making decisions and rules for the next century that severely affect present day and future landowners, ratepayers and communities is extreme and unreasonable. I consider the predictions used by Council for the proposed plan change are excessively cautious forecasts which take a worst case scenario outlook rather than looking at what is likely to occur overall. I believe the proposed plan changes are not an appropriate way for the Council to manage coastal hazards. The proposed plan changes are based on hazard assessment reports that may be unreliable and/or overly conservative and should not form the sole basis for such critical policy decisions. The Council has not identified or properly investigated other options for achieving its objectives in regard to coastal hazards or considered other mitigation plans and alternatives. In 50 to 100 years there is most likely to be other influences, solutions, remedies and improvements such that we have not presently considered or thought possible.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Keep the Status Quo until sufficient (relevant to projections) historic data has been recorded for the Bay of Plenty and until nationally consistent sea level rise figures are agreed through Central Government and based on reliable international data. 2. Limit any plan changes to the effects of 50 years and reviewed against historical data and projections every decade. 3. Full consideration is given to mitigation and protection options and included in forecast erosion calculations.
			FS 31 [15]	3 [1]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Oppose	The relief sought is inconsistent with the RPS and the NZCPS. The NZCPS requires the avoidance of increasing the risk of social, environmental, and economic harm from coastal hazards (as opposed to mitigation and protection options). Policy 25 (e) is "discourage hard protection structures and promote the use	Regional Council opposes the relief sought.

Topic	Issue	Sub Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
							of alternatives to them, including natural defences". The NZCPS also requires hazard risks, over at least 100 years, to be assessed. The RPS Policy NH 118 requires a 100 year timeframe as a minimum when undertaking coastal hazard assessments. Sea-level rise projections are derived from Coastal Hazards and Climate Change: A Guidance Manual for Local Government in New Zealand, Ministry for the Environment, May 2008.	
			19	1	Bay Of Plenty Regional Council	Support	Generally support the Plan Change as it gives effect to the natural hazards provisions in the operative Regional Policy Statement, in particular Policy NH 11 B. It is consistent with the coastal hazard provisions of the Proposed RCEP, in particular Policies CH 11, CH 12 and CH 13. The Regional Council notes the appeal period on the proposed RCEP has closed, and no appeals have been received on the Coastal Hazard policies (Policies CH 1 to CH 16), as such, these provisions are now technically operative.	Generally support the plan change subject to specific amendments discussed in other submission points.
			20	1	Powerco Limited	Support with Amendment	Powerco supports the general intent of the plan change to protect people and buildings within Coastal Protection Areas along the Western Bay of Plenty District Coastline. However, the plan change needs to ensure an appropriate balance is achieved between recognising and providing for the safety of people and buildings and the timely, efficient, effective and affordable provision and operation of infrastructure. Powerco provides electricity to the coastal communities of Waihi Beach and Pukehina and has electricity assets traversing many of the road corridors in close proximity to the coastline. Given the proposed setback for the identified coastal hazard areas, a number of Powerco's assets are caught within the areas affected by the proposed changes to the Section 8 rules. As currently drafted the provisions are of concern to Powerco as they will unduly restrict Powerco's ability to provide and operate its electricity network in coastal hazard areas. Under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), Powerco's electricity infrastructure is a significant physical resource that must be sustainably managed, and any adverse effects on that infrastructure must be avoided, remedied or mitigated.	The plan change needs to ensure an appropriate balance is achieved between recognising and providing for the safety of people and buildings and the timely, efficient, effective and affordable provision and operation of infrastructure.
			21	1	Pukehina Beach Ratepayers Association	Oppose	We oppose these provisions. In particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The approach impacts on properties previously not identified in hazard zones and will likely introduce very onerous restrictions and limit the fair and reasonable development of all in the zone; 	We would like the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Withdrawal of PC 74 until nationally consistent sea level rise figures are agreed through Central Government: (Central Government endorsed figures will provide national consistency and fairness to all affected property owners.

Topic	Issue	Sub Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These provisions will have a huge negative effect, in economic and social terms, on the local community The conservative forecasts result in a potentially enormous adverse impact on the value of property and a negative impact on future investment decisions for Pukehina as a Community; The affected areas are areas of significant existing development, and as such, priority should be given to mitigating coastal hazards; The provisions are based on hazard assessment reports that may be unreliable and/or overly conservative and should not form the sole basis for such critical policy decisions. They take a worst case scenario viewpoint of what maybe is possible; The Council has not identified or properly investigated other options for achieving its objectives in relation to coastal hazards; The 50 and 100 year forecasts fail to identify the potential benefit of erosion mitigation and protecting properties at Pukehina. 	2. Full consideration is given to mitigation and protection options and included in forecast erosion calculations.
			FS 31 [21]	4 [1]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Oppose	The relief sought is inconsistent with the RPS and the NZCPS. The NZCPS requires the avoidance of increasing the risk of social, environmental, and economic harm from coastal hazards (as opposed to mitigation and protection options). Policy 25 (e) is "discourage hard protection structures and promote the use of alternatives to them, including natural defences". The NZCPS also requires hazard risks, over at least 100 years, to be assessed. The RPS Policy NH 118 requires a 100 year timeframe as a minimum when undertaking coastal hazard assessments. Sea-level rise projections are derived from Coastal Hazards and Climate Change: A Guidance Manual for Local Government in New Zealand, Ministry for the Environment, May 2008.	Regional Council opposes the relief sought.
			22	1	Hope, Robert and Susan	Oppose	<p>We are opposed to the findings of the Tonkin and Taylor report being included on LIM reports for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed Improvements to 2 Mile Creek <p>The following measures being proposed by council, after community consultation, need to be taken into account because they have the potential to significantly improve the function of the creek and reduce the impact of coastal inundation and erosion:</p>	For the reasons given we do not think projected coastal inundation should go on LIM reports. Rather, people could be encouraged to access available information and forecasts on the council website.

Summary Report for the 2015 Plan Changes 69-71 and 73-74

Topic	Issue	Sub Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bank stabilisation • Better control of upper catchments • Future restrictions on developments • Straightening the creek where possible to allow the smooth passage of water • Keeping the mouth of the creek cleared to allow water to move quickly to the ocean • Creating a narrower exit from the creek when the banks are built on the east side of the bridge, to decrease the funnel effect of the current creek exit, which will restrict the amount of water potentially flowing into the creek, and concentrate the water for better flow out of the creek. <p>2. Historical Impact of Appropriate Coastal Management</p> <p>It is also worth noting on the Tonkin and Taylor report that the areas of regression over the last 50 years are around the mouths of the creeks while the areas of accretion are where coastal plantings have taken place. Appropriate management clearly impacts on erosion and inundation.</p> <p>3. Uncertainty of forecasts included in the report</p> <p>While we agree that future planning is necessary, it needs to be made clear that there is no certainty regarding coastal inundation in the Tonkin and Taylor report therefore it would be unfair to include such forecasts on a LIM report.</p> <p>4. Effect on Insurance and Property Values Information on a LIM report is likely to be regarded by landowners or prospective landowners as fact. This has the potential to impact on insurance policies and property values.</p>	
			24	1	Hall, Josephine Barrie	Oppose	<p>I am a property owner bordering 2 Mile Creek and I am deeply concerned about the proposed changes.</p> <p>1. Proposed Improvements to 2 Mile Creek The following measures being proposed by council, after community consultation, need to be taken into account because they have the potential to significantly improve the function of the creek and reduce the impact of coastal inundation and erosion:</p>	For the reasons given we do not think projected coastal inundation should go on LIM reports. Rather, people could be encouraged to access available information and forecasts on the council website.

Topic	Issue	Sub Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bank stabilisation • Better control of upper catchments • Future restrictions on developments • Straightening the creek where possible to allow the smooth passage of water • Keeping the mouth of the creek cleared to allow water to move quickly to the ocean • Creating a narrower exit from the creek when the banks are built on the east side of the bridge, to decrease the funnel effect of the current creek exit, which will restrict the amount of water potentially flowing into the creek, and concentrate the water for better flow out of the creek. <p>2. Historical Impact of Appropriate Coastal Management</p> <p>It is also worth noting on the Tonkin and Taylor report that the areas of regression over the last 50 years are around the mouths of the creeks while the areas of accretion are where coastal plantings have taken place. Appropriate management clearly impacts on erosion and inundation.</p> <p>3. Uncertainty of forecasts included in the report</p> <p>While I welcome future planning, it needs to be made clear that there is no certainty, nor absolute truth nor true scientific evidence regarding coastal inundation in the Tonkin and Taylor report. The report contains predictions, not certainty or proof, therefore it would be unfair to include such forecasts on a LIM report. Council's Section 32 report says there is a risk that acting now will lead to unnecessary restrictions on landowners if the coastal hazards do not eventuate. Council's website says a LIM highlights recorded problems but inundation is not a recorded – it is a projection.</p> <p>4. Effect on Insurance and Property Values</p> <p>Information on a LIM report is likely to be regarded by landowners or prospective landowners as fact. This has the potential to impact on insurance policies and property values.</p>	

Summary Report for the 2015 Plan Changes 69-71 and 73-74

Topic	Issue	Sub Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
			25	1	Mander, Kenneth and Sondra	Oppose	<p>We are opposed to the findings of the Tonkin and Taylor report being included on LIM reports for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed Improvements to 2 Mile Creek <p>The following measures being proposed by council, after community consultation, need to be taken into account because they have the potential to significantly improve the function of the creek and reduce the impact of coastal inundation and erosion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bank stabilisation Better control of upper catchments Future restrictions on developments Straightening the creek where possible to allow the smooth passage of water Keeping the mouth of the creek cleared to allow water to move quickly to the ocean Creating a narrower exit from the creek when the banks are built on the east side of the bridge, to decrease the funnel effect of the current creek exit, which will restrict the amount of water potentially flowing into the creek, and concentrate the water for better flow out of the creek. Historical Impact of Appropriate Coastal Management <p>It is also worth noting on the Tonkin and Taylor report that the areas of regression over the last 50 years are around the mouths of the creeks while the areas of accretion are where coastal plantings have taken place. Appropriate management clearly impacts on erosion and inundation.</p> Uncertainty of forecasts included in the report. <p>While we agree that future planning is necessary, it needs to be made clear that there is no certainty regarding coastal inundation in the Tonkin and Taylor report therefore it would be unfair to include such forecasts on a LIM report.</p> Effect on Insurance and Property Values <p>Information on a LIM report is likely to be regarded by landowners or prospective landowners as fact. This has the potential to impact on insurance policies and property values.</p> 	<p>For the reasons given we do not think projected coastal inundation should go on LIM reports. Rather, people could be encouraged to access available information and forecasts on the council website.</p>

Summary Report for the 2015 Plan Changes 69-71 and 73-74

Topic	Issue	Sub Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
			26	1	Hall, Geoffrey Stanley Colchester	Oppose	<p>I am a property owner bordering 2 Mile Creek and I am deeply concerned about the proposed changes.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed Improvements to 2 Mile Creek The following measures being proposed by council, after community consultation, need to be taken into account because they have the potential to significantly improve the function of the creek and reduce the impact of coastal inundation and erosion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bank stabilisation Better control of upper catchments Future restrictions on developments Straightening the creek where possible to allow the smooth passage of water Keeping the mouth of the creek cleared to allow water to move quickly to the ocean Creating a narrower exit from the creek when the banks are built on the east side of the bridge, to decrease the funnel effect of the current creek exit, which will restrict the amount of water potentially flowing into the creek, and concentrate the water for better flow out of the creek. Historical Impact of Appropriate Coastal Management It is also worth noting on the Tonkin and Taylor report that the areas of regression over the last 50 years are around the mouths of the creeks while the areas of accretion are where coastal plantings have taken place. Appropriate management clearly impacts on erosion and inundation. Uncertainty of forecasts included in the report While I welcome future planning, it needs to be made clear that there is no certainty, nor absolute truth nor true scientific evidence regarding coastal inundation in the Tonkin and Taylor report. The report contains predictions, not certainty or proof, therefore it would be unfair to include such forecasts on a LIM report. Council's Section 32 report says there is a risk that acting now will lead to unnecessary restrictions on landowners if the coastal hazards do not eventuate. Council's website says a LIM highlights recorded problems but inundation is not a recorded – it is a 	For the reasons given we do not think projected coastal inundation should go on LIM reports. Rather, people could be encouraged to access available information and forecasts on the council website.

Topic	Issue	Sub Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
							<p>projection.</p> <p>4. Effect on Insurance and Property Values Information on a LIM report is likely to be regarded by landowners or prospective landowners as fact. This has the potential to impact on insurance policies and property values.</p>	
			27	1	Wallace, Gavin Roland Graham	Oppose	<p>A similar proposal in Christchurch was dropped by the Environment Minister Nick Smith on Tuesday 29 September 2015. The WBOP proposal for a plan change went after the Minister had announced the Government's intervention and proposal to create a National Policy statement surrounding natural hazards and the management thereof. In the Christchurch case the Minister was satisfied that that "the existing plans provided adequate interim measures to deal with these risks in the immediate future". Residents who fear not being able to insure, mortgage or sell their homes, was the instigation behind the intervention by the Government. There were also concerns surrounding that no mitigation measures had been proposed and the lack of confidence in the science. It is the proposal of the submitter that the existing district plan provisions provide adequate interim measures to deal with these risks.</p> <p>No instructions have been provided from the Council as to what Tonkin and Taylor were actually asked to achieve. The report is not peer reviewed which would normally be common in these instances as in other areas around the country. Some other peer reviews of other Tonkin and Taylor reports highlight errors of fact, substance and conclusion notwithstanding being subjective.</p> <p>Other Councils have been sceptics of the science to predict the outcome in such a long lead in time.</p> <p>The proposal does not meeting the sustainable management provisions of the RMA.</p> <p>The proposal does not meet Objectives 1-4 of the NZCPS. The proposal does not fully meet Objectives 5-7 of the NZCPS.</p> <p>By implementing these changes the Council is actually enhancing the risk as communities may see less investment as a result of the plan change towards the ability to physically counter any threat of erosion. However, the legal liability or indemnity risk of the Council has been reduced. The Council will also be less inclined to prevent such occurrences</p>	It is proposed by the submitter that the plan change should be withdrawn on the basis that the Council knew, or should have known, of the release by the Minister of the impending guidance for Coastal Protection.

Topic	Issue	Sub Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
							through investment in erosion protective measures as their risk of litigation would be reduced.	
			FS 31 [27]	5 [1]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Oppose	Plan Change 74 gives effect to Objective 5 of the NZCPS, as identified in the Section 32 report in section 1.4. The Minister's guidance for coastal protection is an update of Coastal hazards and climate change: A guidance manual for local government in New Zealand. This will include the most up to date sea level rise figures from the IPCC 2015 report which are higher than those figures included in the 2008 guidance material.	Regional Council opposes the relief sought.
PC74-02: Naming of Coastal Hazards	1: Coastal Erosion Area		1	17	Lovell, Warwick Rodger	Oppose	Oppose the use of the wording 'Coastal Erosion Area'. The plan change is not clear on what constitutes the Coastal Erosion Areas and how these are applied to individual properties through the objectives, policies and rules.	Include an explanation of the wording 'Coastal Erosion Area' and their relationship with the objectives, policies and rules and the Planning Maps to ensure a clear and consistent approach.
			2	17	Lovell, Alastair	Oppose	Oppose the use of the wording 'Coastal Erosion Area'. The plan change is not clear on what constitutes the Coastal Erosion Areas and how these are applied to individual properties through the objectives, policies and rules.	Include and explanation of the wording 'Coastal Erosion Area' and their relationship with the objectives, policies and rules and the Planning Maps to ensure a clear and consistent approach.
			27	2	Wallace, Gavin Roland Graham	Oppose	The Term 'Coastal Protection Areas' could give the impression that the Council is providing some sort of protection to the Coast, its inhabitant's and the properties. The proposal to change the name to Coastal Erosion Area could not be further from this. It is likely this would have a very adverse affect on the economic well being of ratepayers in these areas. A 2002 Environment Court hearing confirmed that the areas should be identified as Primary Risk and Secondary Risk based on a 100 year projection. There is no justification since to warrant a name change. The name change will create an alarmist scenario, is contrary to the Objectives of the NZCPS, is completely unnecessary in the short term.	Submitter has requested the Plan Change to be withdrawn.
PC74-03: Maps - Coastal Erosion Area	1: General		4	1	Department Of Conservation	Support	Support the update to the District Plan Maps identifying land that is potentially affected by coastal hazards over the next 100 years as required to give effect to the NZCPS, specifically Policy 24. Showing only those parts of properties that are identified as potentially affected by coastal hazards will support the rules and allow the Plan to give effect to the NZCPS, while ensuring that further restrictions are not placed on land outside of this area that is not likely to be subject to coastal hazards.	Retain maps as notified.

Summary Report for the 2015 Plan Changes 69-71 and 73-74

Topic	Issue	Sub Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
			6	2	Longdill, Peter	Support	Accept revision of planning maps (hazard zones only).	Accept revision of planning maps (hazard zones only).
			8	3	Vernon, Gordon David	Oppose	Oppose Section 32 analysis as poor technical document to support decision. No peer review, no economic or environmental analysis of current rock wall effects or impact on landowners partially captured by the secondary risk area.	Ground truthing should have been completed before notification for properties partially captured by the secondary risk.
			19	2	Bay Of Plenty Regional Council	Support	Generally support the Coastal Erosion Areas (primary and secondary risk) as determined by the Technical Report. Support using Option 3 (from Council Section 32 Report) which identifies only those parts of the properties within the Coastal Erosion Hazard Zone as being shown on the District Plan Maps. This option avoids the adoption of overly conservative boundaries leading to unnecessary restrictions.	Support the methodology set out in the Technical Report to identify coastal erosion areas and the alignment method set out in Issue 3 (Council Section 32 Report).
			27	3	Wallace, Gavin Roland Graham	Oppose	As the '100 year line' does not intercept the road, but is on the coastal side of the road boundary, then the Council has no obligation to protect the public assets from coastal erosion and does not need to consider such legislation as the Public Works Act in its review. On the face of it, it this appears a somewhat contrived approach to avoid responsibility and potential cost but to transfer the risk to the property owners. Also, the 100 year time frame the secondary risk areas will be affected as the majority of them are below the level of the road.	Submitter has requested the Plan Change to be withdrawn.
	2: Property Specific		1	2	Lovell, Warwick Rodger	Oppose	Oppose the location of the Coastal Erosion Area - Secondary Risk on the Planning Maps, and in particular as it relates to Dillon St and No. 99.	Relocate the Coastal Erosion Areas - Secondary Risk seaward of its current location on the Planning Maps, and in particular off Dillon St and No. 99.
			2	2	Lovell, Alastair	Oppose	Oppose the location of the Coastal Erosion Area - Secondary Risk on the Planning Maps, and in particular as it relates to Dillon St and No. 99.	Relocate the Coastal Erosion Areas - Secondary Risk seaward of its current location on the Planning Maps, and in particular off Dillon St and No. 99.
			7	1	Hill, Pamela and David	Oppose	We wish to have an amendment made to the classification of our property for the following reasons: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The primary risk line barely crosses the corner of our property. 2. No building is in the area of primary risk. 3. The distance from our property to the edge of the sand dunes has greatly increased over the past 73 years (submitter has attached photo). 4. This change would realign our property with others in our block who are classified as secondary risk. 5. At present we are subject to primary risk rules which disadvantage us. 	That our property at 15 Seaforth Rd, Waihi Beach, is rezoned from Primary Risk to Secondary Risk.

Topic	Issue	Sub Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
			9	1	Allen, John Desmond	Oppose	Would like coastal hazard zone removed from the front edge of property at 285 Seaforth Rd. This is because it only goes onto property by 1 metre so this should not effect any future building works within the 100 year timeframe.	Would like coastal hazard zone removed from the front edge of property at 285 Seaforth Rd.
PC74-04: Maps - Coastal Inundation Area	1: General		3	1	Palmer, Noel and Tineke	Oppose	There is no reference on the Coastal Inundation Areas mapping indicating the predicted global warming sea level rise in the next 20/50/100 years. Global warming sea level predictions must be relevant to risk expectation and therefore should be shown on the maps (currently only predicted sea level rise due to storm/tsunami events is shown which is not based on any scientific evidence).	Add to the Coastal Inundation Areas maps, the line indicating the expected sea level rise due to global warming, for 20/50/100 years; AND Remove the Storm Surge Tsunami lines from the maps, because there is no scientific evidence to predict accurately the type and magnitude of any future event.
			6	3	Longdill, Peter	Oppose	Accept revision of planning maps (hazard zones only).	Accept revision of planning maps (hazard zones only).
			19	3	Bay Of Plenty Regional Council	Support	Generally support the methodology used to determine the Coastal Inundation Area by the Technical Report. Bay of Plenty Regional Council has been working with NIWA to develop the coastal calculator to identify the extent of coastal inundation, The coastal calculator enables a region-wide consistent methodology to be established for coastal inundation identification. It is envisaged any future changes to the District Plan will employ the coastal calculator to establish the extent of coastal hazards.	Support the methodology set out in the Technical Report to determine the Coastal Inundation Area.
PC74-05: Objectives and Policies	1: Objective 1		1	4	Lovell, Warwick Rodger	Unknown	Neutral to the inclusion of the word 'property' in Objective 1, subject to Council providing clarification on whether property is considered to be a natural and physical environment.	Council to provide clarification in the Council's hearing report on the relationship between 'natural and physical environment' and 'property'.
			FS 29 [1]	1 [4]	Powerco Limited	Support with Amendment	Powerco is neutral to the inclusion of the word 'property' in Objective 1 or whether Council distinguish the difference between both 'natural and physical environment' and 'property' However, Powerco does not support the use of the word 'threat' in Objective 1. A more appropriate approach would be to seek to minimise the 'risk' of natural hazards - risk being a function of probability and consequence - as opposed to 'threat' which is the probability of a natural hazard event occurring.	Accept the submission provided that the word 'threat' is substituted by the word 'risk' instead.
			2	4	Lovell, Alastair	Unknown	Neutral to the inclusion of the word 'property' in Objective 1, subject to Council providing clarification on whether property is considered to be a natural and physical environment.	Council to provide clarification in the Council's hearing report on the relationship between 'natural and physical environment' and 'property'.
			8	4	Vernon, Gordon David	Oppose	Objectives are very narrow and contradictory to current practice i.e. natural character of coastline at Waihi Beach destroyed by rock walls!	Objectives are very narrow and contradictory to current practice i.e. natural character of coastline at Waihi Beach destroyed by rock walls!

Topic	Issue	Sub Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
10: Objectives and Policies - Add New			1	5	Lovell, Warwick Rodger	Support	Support the inclusion of a new policy, which seeks to minimise the risk to property from human life, property and the natural and physical environment through appropriate protection mechanisms at the time of subdivision. For example, where an appropriate 'access' and 'build platform' can be identified outside of the Coastal Erosion Areas, use of covenants to prevent development within Coastal Erosion Areas or setting aside land affected by Coastal Erosion Areas.	Include new Policy 9 or similar wording to this effect; "Minimise the threat of natural hazards to human life, and the natural and physical environment, including through the use of appropriate setbacks, buffers and protection mechanisms at the time of subdivision and development."
			FS 29 [1]	2 [5]	Powerco Limited	Support with Amendment	The intent of the Policy can be supported, but not the use of the word 'threat'. As currently worded, the policy seeks to minimise the threat or likelihood of a natural hazard event occurring, which in most cases won't be possible e.g. it is not generally possible to minimise the likelihood of a storm event. However, the effects of that even can be managed. A more appropriate policy approach would be to seek to minimise the 'risk' of natural hazards. Risk is a function of probability and consequence so it allows for consideration of mitigation measures such as setbacks, buffers and protection mechanisms. In the event that the new Policy 9 proposed is included, it could be worded as follows: "Minimise the risk 4-natural hazards pose to human life, and the natural and physical environment, including through the use of appropriate setbacks, buffers, and protection mechanisms at the time of subdivision and development".	Accept the submission point provided that the new policy substitutes the word 'threat' with the word 'risk' instead.
			FS 30 [1]	1 [5]	Department of Conservation	Support with Amendment	A new policy to address the threat of natural hazards through the use of setback and buffers is partially supported, although in relation to coastal hazards, it should avoid an increase in the risk of coastal hazards, giving effect to the NZCPS.	Include a new policy but ensure that it directs the avoidance of increases in the risk of social, environmental and economic harm from coastal hazards as required by the NZCPS.
			2	5	Lovell, Alastair	Support	Support the inclusion of a new policy, which seeks to minimise the risk to property from human life, property and the natural and physical environment through appropriate protection mechanisms at the time of subdivision. For example, where an appropriate 'access' and 'build platform' can be identified outside of the Coastal Erosion Areas, use of covenants to prevent development within Coastal Erosion Areas or setting aside land affected by Coastal Erosion Areas.	Include new Policy 9 or similar wording to this effect; "Minimise the threat of natural hazards to human life, and the natural and physical environment, including through the use of appropriate setbacks, buffers and protection mechanisms at the time of subdivision and development."
			4	5	Department Of Conservation	Support with Amendment	Although the plan change is supported, I am concerned that the objectives and policies do not give effect to the requirement in the NZCPS to avoid increasing the risk of harm, or adverse effects, from coastal hazards and do	Insert new policy direction that requires the avoidance of increases in the risk of adverse effects from coastal hazards.

Summary Report for the 2015 Plan Changes 69-71 and 73-74

Topic	Issue	Sub Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
							not provide a suitable basis for non-complying or prohibited status rules. Objective 1 only requires minimisation of the threat of all natural hazards in the District, and although Policies 1,2 and 3 encourage avoidance of adverse effects from natural hazards, they do not require it. This could potentially result in non-complying activities being granted with only partial mitigation required, which would result in an increase in the risk of harm from coastal hazards. I consider that an additional policy is required that requires the avoidance of increases in the risk of adverse effects from coastal hazards. This will allow the Plan to give effect to the NZCPS direction on coastal hazards.	
			FS 29 [4]	3 [5]	Powerco Limited	Support with Amendment	The intent of the submission to give effect to the NZCPS and to provide a link between avoiding an increase of risk from natural hazards and noncomplying or prohibited activity status rules can be supported, provided that any new policy relates only to those activities that are already identified as non-complying or prohibited and does not extend to all activities in general. It may not be possible or necessary to avoid any increase in risk for all activities. The issue is ensuring the level of risk is acceptable in relation to the nature of the activity.	Accept the submission on the basis that any new policy relates only to activities that are already identified as non-complying or prohibited.
			8	5	Vernon, Gordon David	Oppose	Could have been an objective for secondary risk such as "monitor next 20 years" to gauge any inundation or flooding risks that naturally occur - not spatially mapped!	Could have been an objective for secondary risk such as "monitor next 20 years" to gauge any inundation or flooding risks that naturally occur - not spatially mapped!
			8	6	Vernon, Gordon David	Oppose	Policies could be a little more flexible for 'second 50 years'. There was no need to panic regarding second 50 years of LiDAR predictions.	Monitor first rather than regulate and then 'ground truth'.
	11: Policy 8		1	6	Lovell, Warwick Rodger	Support with Amendment	Support Policy 8, subject to the Council clarifying how the policy is applied to the Coastal Erosion Areas and affected properties. This is explained to some extent on the section 32 report but is currently unclear in the plan change.	Council to provide clarification in the Council's hearing report on how Policy 8 will be applied to the different Coastal Erosion Areas (i.e. wholly within one of the areas or straddling the areas). Also refer to related submission points 17 and 18, which seek new definitions/explanations to provide clarification on the Coastal Erosion Areas and how these will be applied to individual properties in the case of the primary risk and secondary risk etc.
			2	6	Lovell, Alastair	Support with Amendment	Support Policy 8, subject to the Council clarifying how the policy is applied to the Coastal Erosion Areas and affected properties. This is explained to some extent on the section 32 report but is currently unclear in the plan change.	Council to provide clarification in the Council's hearing report on how Policy 8 will be applied to the different Coastal Erosion Areas (i.e. wholly within one of the areas or straddling the areas). Also refer to related submission points 17 and 18, which seek new definitions/explanations to provide clarification on the Coastal Erosion Areas and how these will be applied to individual properties in the

Topic	Issue	Sub Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
								case of the primary risk and secondary risk etc.
PC74-06: Rules - Coastal Erosion Area	1: 8.3.1 - List of Permitted Activities - Add New		1	7	Lovell, Warwick Rodger	Unknown	Support 8.3.1 Permitted Activities, subject to amendments to provide for subdivision and new buildings/dwellings etc within the Coastal Erosion Areas. The current rules are too prohibitive for these activities and penalise properties largely outside of the Coastal Erosion Areas. For example, controls where an appropriate 'access' and 'build platform' can be identified outside of the Coastal Erosion Areas, use of covenants to prevent development within Coastal Erosion Areas or setting aside land affected by Coastal Erosion Areas.	<p>Include new permitted activities for subdivision and new buildings/dwellings etc within the Coastal Erosion Areas, subject to certain controls. Particularly in relation to properties which only partly straddle the secondary risk etc.</p> <p>For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New buildings/dwellings etc outside the Erosion Protection Areas. • New minor buildings such as fences, sheds, glass houses within the Coastal Erosion Areas. • Subdivision only partly straddling the secondary risk area where 'access' and 'build platform' can be identified outside of the Coastal Erosion Areas.
			2	7	Lovell, Alastair	Support with Amendment	Support 8.3.1 Permitted Activities, subject to amendments to provide for subdivision and new buildings/dwellings etc within the Coastal Erosion Areas. The current rules are too prohibitive for these activities and penalise properties largely outside of the Coastal Erosion Areas. For example, controls where an appropriate 'access' and 'build platform' can be identified outside of the Coastal Erosion Areas, use of covenants to prevent development within Coastal Erosion Areas or setting aside land affected by Coastal Erosion Areas.	<p>Include new permitted activities for subdivision and new buildings/dwellings etc within the Coastal Erosion Areas, subject to certain controls. Particularly in relation to properties which only partly straddle the secondary risk etc.</p> <p>For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New buildings/dwellings etc outside the Erosion Protection Areas. • New minor buildings such as fences, sheds, glass houses within the Coastal Erosion Areas. • Subdivision only partly straddling the secondary risk area where 'access' and 'build platform' can be identified outside of the Coastal Erosion Areas.
	2: 8.3.2 - List of Controlled Activities - Add New		1	8	Lovell, Warwick Rodger	Support with Amendment	Support 8.3.2 Controlled Activities, subject to amendments to provide for subdivision and new buildings/dwellings within the Coastal Erosion Areas. The current rules are too prohibitive for these activities and penalise properties largely outside of the Coastal Erosion Areas. For example, controls where an appropriate 'access' and 'build platform' can be identified outside of the Coastal Erosion Areas, use of covenants to prevent development within Coastal Erosion Areas or setting aside land affected by Coastal Erosion Areas.	<p>Include new controlled activities for subdivision and new buildings/dwellings etc within the Coastal Erosion Areas, subject to certain controls. Particularly in relation to properties which only partly straddle the secondary risk etc.</p> <p>For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New buildings/dwellings etc outside the Erosion Protection Areas. • New minor buildings such as fences, sheds, glass houses within the Coastal Erosion Areas. • Subdivision straddling the secondary risk area where 'access' and 'build platform' can be identified outside of the Coastal Erosion Areas.
			2	8	Lovell, Alastair	Support with Amendment	Support 8.3.2 Controlled Activities, subject to amendments to provide for subdivision and	Include new controlled activities for subdivision and new buildings/dwellings etc within the

Topic	Issue	Sub Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
							new buildings/dwellings within the Coastal Erosion Areas. The current rules are too prohibitive for these activities and penalise properties largely outside of the Coastal Erosion Areas. For example, controls where an appropriate 'access' and 'build platform' can be identified outside of the Coastal Erosion Areas, use of covenants to prevent development within Coastal Erosion Areas or setting aside land affected by Coastal Erosion Areas.	Coastal Erosion Areas, subject to certain controls. Particularly in relation to properties which only partly straddle the secondary risk etc. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New buildings/dwellings etc outside the Erosion Protection Areas. • New minor buildings such as fences, sheds, glass houses within the Coastal Erosion Areas. • Subdivision straddling the secondary risk area where 'access' and 'build platform' can be identified outside of the Coastal Erosion Areas.
	3: 8.3.3 (a) - List of Restricted Discretionary Activities - Secondary Risk		1	9	Lovell, Warwick Rodger	Support with Amendment	Support 8.3.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities, subject to amendments to provide for subdivision within the Coastal Erosion Areas. The current rules are too prohibitive for these activities and penalise properties largely outside of the Coastal Erosion Areas. For example, where an appropriate 'access' and 'build platform' can be identified outside of the Coastal Erosion Areas, use of covenants to prevent development within Coastal Erosion Areas or setting aside land affected by Coastal Erosion Areas.	Include new restricted discretionary activities for subdivision within the Coastal Erosion Areas, subject to certain controls. Particularly in relation to properties which only partly straddle the secondary risk etc. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subdivision straddling the secondary risk area where 'access' is within the Coastal Erosion Area and a 'build platform' can be identified outside of the Coastal Erosion Areas.
			1	10	Lovell, Warwick Rodger	Oppose	Oppose restricted discretionary activity 8.3.3(a) Coastal Erosion Area - Secondary Risk. Without the clarification sought under submission points 6 and 17-18, the current rule appears too prohibitive for these activities and penalise properties largely outside of the Coastal Erosion Areas.	Include an explanation under the rule which clarifies that new buildings/dwellings etc must be inside the Coastal Erosion Areas to be affected by the rule and also exclude minor buildings such as fences: "Outside of the Coastal Erosion Areas new buildings/dwellings etc are a permitted activity. Minor buildings such as fences, sheds, glass houses, etc are also excluded from this rule."
			2	9	Lovell, Alastair	Support with Amendment	Support 8.3.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities, subject to amendments to provide for subdivision within the Coastal Erosion Areas. The current rules are too prohibitive for these activities and penalise properties largely outside of the Coastal Erosion Areas. For example, where an appropriate 'access' and 'build platform' can be identified outside of the Coastal Erosion Areas, use of covenants to prevent development within Coastal Erosion Areas or setting aside land affected by Coastal Erosion Areas.	Include new restricted discretionary activities for subdivision within the Coastal Erosion Areas, subject to certain controls. Particularly in relation to properties which only partly straddle the secondary risk etc. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subdivision straddling the secondary risk area where 'access' is within the Coastal Erosion Area and a 'build platform' can be identified outside of the Coastal Erosion Areas.
			2	10	Lovell, Alastair	Oppose	Oppose restricted discretionary activity 8.3.3(a) Coastal Erosion Area - Secondary Risk. Without the clarification sought under submission points 6 and 17-18, the current rule appears too prohibitive for these activities and penalise properties largely outside of the Coastal Erosion Areas.	Include an explanation under the rule which clarifies that new buildings/dwellings etc must be inside the Coastal Erosion Areas to be affected by the rule and also exclude minor buildings such as fences: "Outside of the Coastal Erosion Areas new buildings/dwellings etc are a permitted activity."

Topic	Issue	Sub Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
								Minor buildings such as fences, sheds, glass houses, etc are also excluded from this rule."
	4: 8.3.4 (a) - List of Discretionary Activities - Primary Risk and Rural		4	2	Department Of Conservation	Support	Support the changes to this section, especially Matters of Discretion 8.5.2(b). Relocatability, the imposition of consent conditions requiring relocation of a building/structure when the toe of the foredune retreats to a distance that places it at immediate risk, and registration of an encumbrance instrument on the title are considered necessary matters to address coastal hazard risks.	Retain as notified.
			19	4	Bay Of Plenty Regional Council	Support with Amendment	Seek amendment to the rule framework to include the construction of in-ground swimming pools in the primary coastal erosion areas as an activity that requires resource consent. This is an activity that may increase the risk of harm from coastal erosion.	Add to Rule 8.3.4 (a) a new clause "(v) swimming pools".
	5: 8.3.5 (a) - List of Non-Complying Activities - Coastal Erosion Areas (all)		1	12	Lovell, Warwick Rodger	Oppose	Oppose 8.3.5 Non-complying Activities as they relate to the Coastal Erosion Areas. The current rules are too prohibitive for these activities and penalise properties largely outside of the Coastal Erosion Areas.	Refer to the decisions sought in submission points 7-9 (requesting new permitted, controlled and restricted discretionary activities).
			2	12	Lovell, Alastair	Oppose	Oppose 8.3.5 Non-complying Activities as they relate to the Coastal Erosion Areas. The current rules are too prohibitive for these activities and penalise properties largely outside of the Coastal Erosion Areas.	Refer to the decisions sought in submission points 7-9 (requesting new permitted, controlled and restricted discretionary activities).
			4	3	Department Of Conservation	Support	Support subdivision of titles that are partially identified within a Coastal Erosion Area, with the exclusions, as a non-complying activity. This will ensure that any consent applied for, where the effects are greater than minor, must not be contrary to the objectives and policies of the Plan, and consideration of an increase in risk from coastal hazards, as required by the NZCPS, will be carried out. The Matters of Discretion for these activities (8.5.2(c)) are supported as necessary guidance of activities to achieve no increase in risk.	Retain as notified.
	6: 8.3.6 (a) - List of Prohibited Activities - Coastal Erosion Areas (all)		1	13	Lovell, Warwick Rodger	Oppose	Oppose 8.3.6 Prohibited Activities as they relate to the Coastal Erosion Areas. The current rules are too prohibitive for these activities and penalise properties largely outside of the Coastal Erosion Areas. In most cases new buildings have a design life of 50years which is well inside the 100 years of the Coastal Erosion Areas.	Refer to the decisions sought in submission points 7-9 (requesting new permitted, controlled and restricted discretionary activities).
			2	13	Lovell, Alastair	Oppose	Oppose 8.3.6 Prohibited Activities as they relate to the Coastal Erosion Areas. The current rules are too prohibitive for these activities and penalise properties largely outside of the Coastal Erosion Areas. In most cases new buildings have a design life of 50years which is well inside the 100 years of the Coastal Erosion Areas.	Refer to the decisions sought in submission points 7-9 (requesting new permitted, controlled and restricted discretionary activities).

Topic	Issue	Sub Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
			4	4	Department Of Conservation	Support	The prohibition of the development given in 8.3.6(a)(i) - (iv) within the Coastal Erosion Areas is supported as ensuring that intensification will not occur to increase development potentially affected by coastal hazards in the future. Prohibition of subdivision of any title that is entirely identified within a Coastal Erosion Area is supported as it will prevent the creation of additional development rights and result in the avoidance of increases in coastal hazard risk.	Retain as notified.
			5	2	Mahar, Judith May	Oppose	There is a possibility of making my property at 2 Broadway Rd, Waihi Beach my permanent home. This will require me to make changes to the house to make it more suitable as a permanent dwelling and the proposition that I might be required to apply for resource consent to do this, at significantly increased cost, plus the worry that any alterations I might wish to do could be restricted and limited by the proposed plan change is unacceptable to me. Plan Change 74 should not prohibit additional dwellings, minor dwellings or larger scale accommodation, based on the information made available, which is incomplete and unproven, with insufficient evidence.	Plan Change 74 should not prohibit additional dwellings, minor dwellings or larger scale accommodation.
			FS 31 [5]	6 [2]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Oppose	Regional Council opposes the relief sought. Plan Change 74 gives effect to NZCPS Policy 25 and is consistent with the Proposed Bay of Plenty Regional Coastal Environment Plan Policy CH 13 (f), which states where risk reduction measures are insufficient to avoid exacerbating potential threats to human life, property or the environment, new subdivision or development shall only be provided for at a low intensity or avoid specific hazard locations altogether.	Regional Council opposes the relief sought.
			5	3	Mahar, Judith May	Oppose	Plan Change 74 should not make a change to prohibit subdivision in the secondary risk area based on the information made available, which as described in my introduction, is incomplete and unproven, with insufficient evidence.	Plan Change 74 should not make a change to prohibit subdivision in the secondary risk area.
			FS 31 [5]	7 [3]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Oppose	Regional Council opposes the relief sought. Plan Change 74 gives effect to NZCPS Policy 25 and is consistent with the Proposed Bay of Plenty Regional Coastal Environment Plan Policy CH 13 (f), which states where risk reduction measures are insufficient to avoid exacerbating potential threats to human life, property or the environment, new subdivision or development shall only be provided for at a low intensity or avoid specific hazard locations altogether.	Regional Council opposes the relief sought.
			6	4	Longdill, Peter	Oppose	Support making subdivision prohibited.	Support making subdivision prohibited.

Topic	Issue	Sub Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
			6	5	Longdill, Peter	Oppose	Oppose all other planning rule changes as the Section 32 Report confirms "the existing rules succeed in ensuring new buildings are hazard proofed".	Reject changes to development rules.
			10	1	Western Bay Of Plenty District Council	Support with Amendment	Rules 8.3.6(a)(i) and 8.3.6(a)(ii) are only intended to restrict that part of a title within a 'coastal erosion area' from having more than one dwelling or minor dwelling (combined). However, the rules could also be interpreted as preventing the whole of a title from having more than one dwelling or minor dwelling (combined) even if only one of these was planned to be within the coastal erosion area.	Rules 8.3.6(a)(i) and (ii) need re-wording to reflect their intention which is only to restrict that part of a title within a 'coastal erosion area' from having more than one dwelling or minor dwelling (combined).
			11	2	Lloyd, Natalie	Oppose	My mother has a possibility of making the property at 2 Broadway Rd, Waihi Beach her permanent home. This will require her to make changes to the house to make it more suitable as a permanent dwelling and the proposition that she might be required to apply for resource consent to do this, at significantly increased cost, plus the worry that any alterations she might wish to do could be restricted and limited by the proposed plan change is unacceptable to me. Plan Change 74 should not prohibit additional dwellings, minor dwellings or larger scale accommodation, based on the information made available, which is incomplete and unproven, with insufficient evidence.	Plan Change 74 should not prohibit additional dwellings, minor dwellings or larger scale accommodation.
			FS 31 [11]	8 [2]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Oppose	Regional Council opposes the relief sought. Plan Change 74 gives effect to NZCPS Policy 25 and is consistent with the Proposed Bay of Plenty Regional Coastal Environment Plan Policy CH 13 (f), which states where risk reduction measures are insufficient to avoid exacerbating potential threats to human life, property or the environment, new subdivision or development shall only be provided for at a low intensity or avoid specific hazard locations altogether.	Regional Council opposes the relief sought.
			11	3	Lloyd, Natalie	Oppose	Plan Change 74 should not make a change to prohibit subdivision in the secondary risk area based on the information made available, which as described in my introduction, is incomplete and unproven, with insufficient evidence.	Plan Change 74 should not make a change to prohibit subdivision in the secondary risk area.
			FS 31 [11]	9 [3]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Oppose	Regional Council opposes the relief sought. Plan Change 74 gives effect to NZCPS Policy 25 and is consistent with the Proposed Bay of Plenty Regional Coastal Environment Plan Policy CH 13 (f), which states where risk reduction measures are insufficient to avoid exacerbating potential threats to human life, property or the environment, new subdivision or development shall only be provided for at a low intensity or avoid specific hazard locations altogether.	Regional Council opposes the relief sought.

Summary Report for the 2015 Plan Changes 69-71 and 73-74

Topic	Issue	Sub Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
			19	5	Bay Of Plenty Regional Council	Support	Support the use of prohibited activity status for the activities listed. Not allowing these activities in the coastal erosion area is consistent with Policy CH 2 of the Proposed RCEP and Policy 25 of the NZCPS.	Retain Rule 8.3.6(a) as notified.
	7: 8.5.1.1 - Matters of Discretion - Restricted Discretionary Activities - Secondary Risk		1	15	Lovell, Warwick Rodger	Support	Support matters of discretion 8.5.1.1 Coastal Erosion Area - Secondary Risk Matters of Discretion, subject to any consequential amendments to address the other submissions points, and in particular submission points 7-13.	Refer to the decisions sought in submission point 7-13 (requests for new permitted, controlled and restricted discretionary activities).
			2	15	Lovell, Alastair	Support	Support matters of discretion 8.5.1.1 Coastal Erosion Area - Secondary Risk Matters of Discretion, subject to any consequential amendments to address the other submissions points, and in particular submission points 7-13.	Refer to the decisions sought in submission point 7-13 (requests for new permitted, controlled and restricted discretionary activities).
			6	7	Longdill, Peter	Oppose	8.5.11. (b). The use of concrete block walls for garage areas should be allowed. Most houses within the secondary risk area have Concrete Block lower floors, addition works MUST allow for this, and not prohibit use of that material.	8.5.1.1 (b) to be revised as "Avoid as possible the use of concrete and block wall foundations, walls, and flooring, except that for sheds and garages all of these are allowed. Consideration to be given to existing materials during additions"
			19	6	Bay Of Plenty Regional Council	Support with Amendment	Support the intent of these provisions but seek amendment to provide greater certainty regarding the matters that should be considered when assessing whether a relocation proposal is appropriate.	Amend clause 8.5.1.1(a) to read: "Extent to which the building/structure is relocatable, taking into account the design, location of the building/structure, and access to remove the building/structure, ability to rehabilitate the site (including the removal of services), achievable timeframes for relocation and whether a site for relocation is available. "
			FS 30 [19]	2 [6]	Department of Conservation	Support	The requested amendment will provide greater certainty that the relocation of buildings or structures will be achievable and appropriate.	Accept submission points
			27	4	Wallace, Gavin Roland Graham	Oppose	Concrete foundations and walls will have the highest reduction in impact from a tsunami. Additions to an existing block walls should be allowed under the existing use right provisions. Many of the property along Pukehina Parade a solid construction and cannot be moved. If a building application is made for a building consent then the existing property should not be forced to move back.	Additions to an existing block walls should be allowed under the existing use right provisions. If a building application is made for a building consent then the existing property should not be forced to move back.
	8: 8.5.2 (b) - Matters of Discretion - Discretionary / Non-Complying Activities - Primary Risk and Rural		1	18	Lovell, Warwick Rodger	Unknown	Please explain in the Council's hearing report, the cost of the scientific information required from a suitably qualified coastal expert under the discretionary and non-complying matter of discretion 8.5.2(b)(x), to demonstrates that the land within the Coastal Erosion Area is not under any actual or potential risk from coastal erosion hazard.	Please explain in the Council's hearing report, the cost of the scientific information required from a suitably qualified coastal expert under the discretionary and non-complying matter of discretion 8.5.2(b)(x), to demonstrates that the land within the Coastal Erosion Area is not under any actual or potential risk from coastal erosion hazard.
			2	18	Lovell, Alastair	Unknown	Please explain in the Council's hearing report, the cost of the scientific information required from a suitably qualified coastal expert under the discretionary and non-complying matter of discretion 8.5.2(b)(x), to demonstrates that the	Please explain in the Council's hearing report, the cost of the scientific information required from a suitably qualified coastal expert under the discretionary and non-complying matter of discretion 8.5.2(b)(x), to demonstrates that the

Topic	Issue	Sub Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
							land within the Coastal Erosion Area is not under any actual or potential risk from coastal erosion hazard.	land within the Coastal Erosion Area is not under any actual or potential risk from coastal erosion hazard.
			19	7	Bay Of Plenty Regional Council	Support with Amendment	Support the intent of these provisions but seek amendment to provide greater certainty regarding the matters that should be considered when assessing whether a relocation proposal is appropriate.	Amend clause 8.5.2 (b) (i) to read: "Extent to which the building/structure is relocatable, taking into account the design, location of the building/structure, and access to remove the building/structure, ability to rehabilitate the site (including the removal of services), achievable timeframes for relocation and whether a site for relocation is available. "
			FS 30 [19]	3 [7]	Department of Conservation	Support	The requested amendment will provide greater certainty that the relocation of buildings or structures will be achievable and appropriate.	Accept submission points
			19	8	Bay Of Plenty Regional Council	Support	Support the inclusion of clause (b)(vii) as a matter for consideration during assessment of activities in the primary risk and rural coastal erosion areas. The direction to consider and impose consent conditions relating to a relocation trigger is consistent with Policy CH 13(d) of the proposed RCEP.	Retain section 8.5.2(b)(vii) as notified.
			27	5	Wallace, Gavin Roland Graham	Oppose	Concrete foundations and walls will have the highest reduction in impact from a tsunami. Additions to an existing block walls should be allowed under the existing use right provisions. Many of the property along Pukehina Parade a solid construction and cannot be moved. If a building application is made for a building consent then the existing property should not be forced to move back.	Additions to an existing block walls should be allowed under the existing use right provisions. If a building application is made for a building consent then the existing property should not be forced to move back.
	9: 8.5.2 (c) - Matters of Discretion - Discretionary / Non-Complying Activities - Coastal Erosion Areas (all)		1	16	Lovell, Warwick Rodger	Oppose	Oppose the discretionary and non-complying matters of discretion 8.5.2(c) Coastal Erosion Areas. The current matters are too prohibitive for these activities and penalise properties largely outside of the Coastal Erosion Areas. If the related rule and matters are to be retained they need to include consideration of more innovative design solutions and protection measures, which can achieve similar ends. For example, where appropriate access and build areas can be identified outside of the Coastal Erosion Areas, the use of restrictive covenants to prevent development within Coastal Erosion Areas or vesting of land affected by Coastal Erosion Areas.	If the related rule and matters are retained they need to include consideration of more innovative design solutions that can achieve the outcomes sought by the Council and the property owner. For example, recognising alternative development patterns which achieve similar ends or the use of other protection mechanisms.
			2	16	Lovell, Alastair	Oppose	Oppose the discretionary and non-complying matters of discretion 8.5.2(c) Coastal Erosion Areas. The current matters are too prohibitive for these activities and penalise properties largely outside of the Coastal Erosion Areas. If the related rule and matters are to be retained they need to include consideration of more innovative design solutions and protection measures, which can achieve similar ends. For example, where appropriate access and build areas can be identified outside of the Coastal Erosion Areas, the use of restrictive covenants	If the related rule and matters are retained they need to include consideration of more innovative design solutions that can achieve the outcomes sought by the Council and the property owner. For example, recognising alternative development patterns which achieve similar ends or the use of other protection mechanisms.

Topic	Issue	Sub Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
							to prevent development within Coastal Erosion Areas or vesting of land affected by Coastal Erosion Areas.	
			8	7	Vernon, Gordon David	Oppose	Oppose non-complying activity status for subdivision, vegetable gardens and fences in properties partially affected by secondary risk.	This could have been discretionary given no ground truthing has been undertaken.
	10: Other		8	2	Vernon, Gordon David	Oppose	Oppose Section 32 analysis as poor technical document to support decision. No peer review, no economic or environmental analysis of current rock wall effects or impact on landowners partially captured by the secondary risk area.	Provide some genuine alternative options for properties partially affected by secondary risk area.
PC74-07: Coastal Erosion Area - Access Yard	1: Access Yard		1	11	Lovell, Warwick Rodger	Support with Amendment	Support discretionary activity 8.3.4(b) Coastal Erosion Access Yard, subject to Council providing clarification on the intent of the rule and the Council's strategy that supports the location of this road, and when it is likely to be delivered.	Council to include clarification on the intent of the rule and the Council's strategy that supports the location of this road, and when it is likely to be delivered. Retain the right to amend this position to support or oppose 8.3.4(b) depending on the response from Council.
			1	3	Lovell, Warwick Rodger	Support with Amendment	Support the location of the Coastal Erosion Access Yard on the Planning Maps, subject to Council providing clarification on Council's strategy behind its location and when it is likely to be delivered.	Support the location of the Coastal Erosion Access Yard on the Planning Maps, subject to Council providing clarification on Council's strategy behind its location and when it is likely to be delivered.
			2	11	Lovell, Alastair	Support with Amendment	Support discretionary activity 8.3.4(b) Coastal Erosion Access Yard, subject to Council providing clarification on the intent of the rule and the Council's strategy that supports the location of this road, and when it is likely to be delivered.	Council to include clarification on the intent of the rule and the Council's strategy that supports the location of this road, and when it is likely to be delivered. Retain the right to amend this position to support or oppose 8.3.4(b) depending on the response from Council.
			2	3	Lovell, Alastair	Support with Amendment	Support the location of the Coastal Erosion Access Yard on the Planning Maps, subject to Council providing clarification on Council's strategy behind its location and when it is likely to be delivered.	Support the location of the Coastal Erosion Access Yard on the Planning Maps, subject to Council providing clarification on Council's strategy behind its location and when it is likely to be delivered.
			6	6	Longdill, Peter	Oppose	Object to changing the alignment of the access way, just to please one landowner (and at the expense of two others). Changing the alignment for this reason would set a DANGEROUS precedent as there a multiple dwellings in the same accessway on BROADWAY RD (e.g.76,78,82).	No change to access way at 10 Edinburgh St.
			12	1	Tait-Jamieson, Marguerite Anne	Support	Support the change to the Coastal Erosion Area Access Yard for the following reasons; a) the current access yard passes through the dwelling at 10 Edinburgh St and because of the gradient required could not be constructed without a significant retaining wall which would need to fall within the 6m width making access impractical even with the removal of the dwelling. b) the existing dwelling effectively blocks	Approve amended access way on DP Map UO4 as shown in attachment A of section 32 report

Topic	Issue	Sub Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
							<p>the access way.</p> <p>c) the new access way is beneficial to the adjacent properties in Shaw road as it avoids an existing house and provides access to what would be a landlocked property.</p> <p>d) although it requires the removal of a deck at 10 Edinburgh Street, that is less significant than demolition of the existing dwelling and it allows future redevelopment of the site to take advantage of the more elevated area.</p> <p>e) although decreasing the section size, the access way is at a lower and more practical level.</p> <p>f) while overall it is still detrimental to the property, it is a practical solution providing benefits to all affected parties.</p>	
PC74-08: Rules - Coastal Inundation Area	1: 8.3.3 (b) - List of Restricted Discretionary Activities		5	4	Mahar, Judith May	Oppose	<p>Plan Change 74 - Coastal Inundation (Flooding) Areas should not make a change to require resource consent and require minimum floor levels to be imposed because the science is incomplete and unproven, so the District Council should not be able to impose these requirements. There is a possibility of making my property at 2 Broadway Rd, Waihi Beach my permanent home. This will require me to make changes to the house to make it more suitable as a permanent dwelling and the proposition that I might be required to apply for resource consent to do this, at significantly increased cost, plus the worry that any alterations I might wish to do could be restricted and limited by the proposed plan change is unacceptable to me. Plan Change 74 should not prohibit additional dwellings, minor dwellings or larger scale accommodation, based on the information made available, which is incomplete and unproven, with insufficient evidence. Recommendations can be made by architects and , by the District Council when advice is sought, but these should not be mandatory requirements as they may prove completely unnecessary.</p>	Plan Change 74 - Coastal Inundation (Flooding) Areas should not make a change to require resource consent and require minimum floor levels to be imposed.
			FS 31 [5]	10 [4]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Oppose	<p>Regional Council opposes the relief sought. Plan Change 74 gives effect to the RPS, and gives effect to NZCPS Policy 25.</p>	Regional Council opposes the relief sought.
			11	4	Lloyd, Natalie	Oppose	<p>Plan Change 74 - Coastal Inundation (Flooding) Areas should not make a change to require resource consent and require minimum floor levels to be imposed because the science is incomplete and unproven, so the District Council should not be able to impose these requirements. My mother has a possibility of making the property at 2 Broadway Rd, Waihi</p>	Plan Change 74 - Coastal Inundation (Flooding) Areas should not make a change to require resource consent and require minimum floor levels to be imposed.

Summary Report for the 2015 Plan Changes 69-71 and 73-74

Topic	Issue	Sub Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
							Beach her permanent home. This will require her to make changes to the house to make it more suitable as a permanent dwelling and the proposition that she might be required to apply for resource consent to do this, at significantly increased cost, plus the worry that any alterations she might wish to do could be restricted and limited by the proposed plan change is unacceptable to me. Plan Change 74 should not prohibit additional dwellings, minor dwellings or larger scale accommodation, based on the information made available, which is incomplete and unproven, with insufficient evidence. Recommendations can be made by architects and, by the District Council when advice is sought, but these should not be mandatory requirements as they may prove completely unnecessary.	
			FS 31 [11]	11 [4]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Oppose	Regional Council opposes the relief sought. Plan Change 74 gives effect to the RPS, and gives effect to NZCPS Policy 25.	Regional Council opposes the relief sought.
			20	3	Powerco Limited	Oppose	Rule 8.3.3(b) requires a restricted discretionary activity consent for over 5m ³ of earthworks within both the floodable areas and coastal inundation areas. A portion of Powerco's electricity infrastructure within the district is underground. In order to effectively maintain, upgrade or reliably operate its underground electricity network, Powerco requires earthwork provisions that permit access to existing infrastructure (i.e. reasonable provisions that allow the excavation of earth to uncover underground assets). Currently, the proposed provisions are too restrictive to enable earthworks associated with the upgrade and maintenance of existing underground utilities and are not justified for the development of new utilities. During maintenance and upgrading of existing utilities and the development of new utilities, the ground will be reinstated to its current condition – works generally do not involve re-contouring or the movement of earth offsite. It is considered that Powerco's best practice approach to earthworks associated with the maintenance, upgrade or development of existing and new utilities will ensure there are no ongoing effects on coastal inundation areas. The section 32 report does not indicate the process used to determine the 5m ³ earthwork quantity therefore it is considered unjustified.	Amend Rule 8.3.3 (b) (ii) to provide for permitted earthworks for the maintenance, operation, upgrade and development of network utilities, as follows. (ii) Earthworks over 5m ³ (except for the maintenance, operation, upgrade and development of network utilities).
	2: 8.3.4 (c) - List of Discretionary Activities		24	2	Hall, Josephine Barrie	Support	I wish to acknowledge council for allowing property owners to subdivide, with due consideration being given to flood risk. In my situation I have two existing dwellings. I trust council will be reasonable about the fact that	I wish to acknowledge council for allowing property owners to subdivide, with due consideration being given to flood risk

Topic	Issue	Sub Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
							there will be little difference to the site with two existing dwellings whether sub-divided or not.	
			26	2	Hall, Geoffrey Stanley Colchester	Support	I wish to thank council for still allowing property owners to subdivide, with due consideration being given to flood risk. In my situation I have two existing dwellings. I trust council will be reasonable about the fact that there will be little difference to the site with two existing dwellings whether sub-divided or not.	I wish to thank council for still allowing property owners to subdivide, with due consideration being given to flood risk
	3: 8.5.1.2 - Matters of Discretion - Restricted Discretionary Activities		14	1	Harray, Kenneth Graeme	Support with Amendment	I seek a change to 8.5.1.2 (b) the appropriate minimum finished floor level rules namely where an existing building/structure is sited on a section subject to predicted coastal flooding over 100 years but the building/structure is sited above the predicted coastal flood level - then any future alterations to the building/structure will not have to raise existing floor levels.	An amendment to 8.5.1.2 (b) to allow alterations to existing buildings/structures sited above the predicted coastal flooding level without the restriction of needing to raise existing floor levels.
			20	4	Powerco Limited	Support with Amendment	It is noted that the matters to which the Council has restricted its discretion, outlined in section 8.5.1.2 (Floodable areas and coastal inundation areas), do not include any specific reference to earthworks, such that it is uncertain what effects the Council is seeking to control.	No decision is requested but it is assumed the submitter wants clarification.
	4: Rules - Add New		13	1	Steward, Caroline Mary Anne	Support with Amendment	We do not want to see further development in the coastal inundation zones. However our second choice is to have these rules: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not allow buildings to exceed daylight boundaries No filling of sections 	Add new rules: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not allow buildings to exceed daylight boundaries No filling of sections
PC74-10: Rules - All Identified Natural Hazards	1: 8.3.1 - List of Permitted Activities		20	2	Powerco Limited	Oppose	Rule 8.3.1 sets out the permitted activities within the identified natural hazard areas. As currently drafted these rules only permit the development of support poles associated with electricity lines within floodable areas. However, in the operative plan the development of support poles associated with electricity lines is a permitted activity in all natural hazards areas. PC 74 therefore places a new restriction on the development of support poles associated with electricity in coastal hazard and other natural hazard areas. The erection of electricity line support poles has limited effect on coastal hazard areas (such as coastal inundation areas). The development of electricity support poles requires minimal earthworks and the assets are designed to withstand inundation without compromising structural integrity. The identified coastal hazard areas capture many roads in close proximity to the coastline. While the majority of Powerco's electricity assets within the coastal hazard areas are located underground, there are some above ground	Amend 8.3.1 (a) by adding the following new permitted activities under 'All Identified Natural Hazards'; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (ii) support poles associated with electricity lines, (iii) earthworks associated with the maintenance, operation, upgrade and development or network utilities. Amend 8.3.1 (c) to delete "(ii) support poles associated with electricity lines" from 'Floodable Areas' only.

Summary Report for the 2015 Plan Changes 69-71 and 73-74

Topic	Issue	Sub Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
							structures. There may be situations in which poles need to be replaced or additional poles added within the area served by the existing overhead electricity infrastructure. This change of activity status introduces a new consent requirement that has not been sufficiently justified and which may lead to unnecessary delays and costs for obtaining consent.	
	3: 8.4.2 - Matters of Control - Controlled Activities		1	14	Lovell, Warwick Rodger	Support	Support 8.4 Matters of Control, subject to any consequential amendments to address the other submissions points.	Refer to the decisions sought in submission point 8 (request for new controlled activities).
			2	14	Lovell, Alastair	Support	Support 8.4 Matters of Control, subject to any consequential amendments to address the other submissions points.	Refer to the decisions sought in submission point 8 (request for new controlled activities).