RMA Further Submission Form in support of, or in opposition to, submission(s) on publicly notified Plan Change 29

Nelson City Council
Te Kaunihera o Whakatū

Return your submission by 5pm on Friday 8 March 2024 to:

Environmental Planning
PC29 Further Submissions
Nelson City Council
PO Box 645
Nelson 7040

(Hand delivery or courier to: Ground Floor, Civic House, 110 Trafalgar Street, Nelson 7010 or email to: environmental.planning@ncc.govt.nz with plan change no.29 in the subject line)

OFFICE USE
Submission No:
Original Submission No:
Date Received Stamp:
NDOCs No:

*Required

Submitter Details

Full Name*	Sarah-Jayne McCurrach		
Organisation	EQC Toka Tū Ake		
Contact Person	Tabitha Bushell		
Postal address*	88/100 Willis Street, Wellington Central, Wellington 6011		
Telephone*	+64 223110618	Email*	Resilience @eqc.govt.nz ☐

Public information

Please note that your name and address is required to be made publicly available under the Resource Management Act 1991, as any further submission supporting or opposing this submission is required to be forwarded to the original submitter as well as council.

Signature of Submitter*
(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter - a signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means)

08/03/2024
Date*

Council Hearing*

☑ I/we **do not** wish to be heard in support of my/our further submission.

☐ I/we wish to be heard in support of my/our further submission. If yes:

☐ I/we would be prepared to consider presenting my/our submission in a joint case with others making a similar submission at any hearings.

A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter within five working days after it is served on the local authority, their details can be found Online at shape.nelson.govt.nz/plan-change-29.

Not Government Policy

IN CONFIDENCE-LEGAL PRIVILEGE

I/we are *(state whether you are (please tick)******

☐ a person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest. *In this case, also specify the grounds for saying that you come within this category:*

☑ a person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has. *In this case, also specify the grounds for saying that you come within this category:*

Toka Tū Ake EQC is a Crown Entity responsible for providing insurance to residential property owners against the impact of natural hazards. We also invest in and facilitate research and education about natural hazards, and methods of reducing or preventing natural hazard damage. The contingent liability associated with natural hazard risk in New Zealand is high and is carried, in large part, by Toka Tū Ake on behalf of the Crown. Toka Tū Ake therefore has a strong interest in reducing risk from, and building resilience to, natural hazards in New Zealand**.**

I/we ☐ support ☐ support in part ☐ oppose ☐ oppose in part the Submission of*:

Submission Point Number:	**Please see attached table below (pages 3-27)**
Enter the **NAME** of the original submitter	
Enter the **ADDRESS/EMAIL ADDRESS** of the original submitter	

The decision I would like the Council to make on this submission point is *

Please see attached table below (pages 3-27)

☐ accept ☐ accept in part ☐ reject ☐ reject in part

The particular parts of the submission I/we support/oppose are*: *(clearly indicate which parts of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)*

Please see attached table below (pages 3-27)

The reasons for my/our support/opposition are*: *(give reasons)*

Please see attached table below (pages 3-27)

Note:

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- is frivolous or vexatious.
- discloses no reasonable or relevant case.
- would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further.
- contains offensive language.
- is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

Submitter's Name	Submission Point	Provision	Support or Oppose.	Reasons for Support / Opposition.	Decision Sought.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	S198.017 S198.018 S198.019 S198.020	General natural hazards/ Climate change	Oppose	Submitter (Transpower) suggests an amendment is sought to the policy [DO2.2.4 – DO2.2.10] to recognise the functional and/or operational need for some activities to locate within the hazard area. The request concerns 'infrastructure of an operational nature' to be allowed in flood area (DO2.2.4), flood hazard (DO2.2.2.7) and flood inundation overlays (DO2.2.9), floodways and flood paths (DO2.2.10). **We oppose this submission point. We understand the purpose of this submission point but request further clarity be provided on the exact 'activities' proposed to be allowed within the flood hazard area overlays.** **Some infrastructure of an operational nature (e.g. substations) have a need for post-event functionality and inoperability following a natural hazard event, exacerbate consequences of that event, for example the widespread power outages following Cyclone Gabrielle.**	Reject until further clarification of 'activities' is provided and assessed for their appropriateness.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	S198.021 S198.022	Fault	Oppose	Submitter (Transpower) suggests an amendment is sought to the policy [DO2.2.11] to recognise the functional and/or operational need for some activities to locate within the hazard area. The request concerns infrastructure of an operational nature to be allowed in fault deformation overlay, use and development (DO2.2.11 and DO2.2.13). **We oppose this submission point. We understand the purpose of this submission point but request further clarity be provided on the exact 'activities' proposed to be allowed within the Fault Deformation Overlay and Fault Hazard Setback Zone. Some infrastructure of an operational nature (e.g. substations) have a need for post-event functionality and may increase the risk to surrounding people and buildings if damaged by an earthquake event.** **Unlike earthquake shaking and liquefaction, fault rupture and ground deformation cannot be mitigated by engineering or design, and the specific way the ground will deform in an earthquake cannot be predicted. As such, reducing the risk to buildings and infrastructure from this hazard requires avoidance of the fault deformation zone. If the infrastructure of an operational nature (e.g. power lines) is close to or spans the fault zones but is not located directly on the active fault(s), then this should be specified.**	Reject until further clarification of 'activities' is provided and assessed for their appropriateness.

Transpower New Zealand Limited	S198.022	Fault	Oppose	The submitter (Transpower) suggests an Amendment to the policy [DO2.2.13], regarding fault deformation overlay to be appropriately set-back from the fault zones, suggesting the addition "or otherwise appropriately designed". **We oppose this submission as no definition or explanation is given for what constitutes 'appropriate design' to mitigate significant risk from fault rupture and ground deformation. Unlike earthquake shaking and liquefaction, fault rupture and ground deformation cannot be mitigated by engineering or design, and the specific way the ground will deform in an earthquake cannot be predicted. As such reducing the risk to buildings and infrastructure from this hazard requires avoidance of the fault deformation zone.** **If "appropriate design" to mitigate risk from fault rupture and ground deformation is referring to infrastructure (e.g. power lines) which is close to or spans the fault zones but is not located directly on the active fault(s), then this should be specified.**	Reject until further clarification of what constitutes 'appropriate design' to mitigate risk from fault rupture and ground deformation is provided and assessed for appropriateness.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	S198.030	General Residential Zone	Support	The submitter (Transpower) suggests an amendment is sought to recognise that development in all areas it not always appropriate, for example in identified hazard areas. **We strongly support this submission and** s**upport the addition of "where appropriate" for general residential zone housing.**	Accept
BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd, and Z Energy Ltd	S257.001	Coast inundation	Oppose	Submitter (BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd, and Z Energy Ltd) requests that DO2.2.4 be changed from "all building" platform to only "accommodating residential buildings" for controlled subdivision, use and development within Flood Areas. **We oppose this submission point.** **We support restricting use and development within mapped coastal inundation hazard areas. While non-residential buildings involve lower risk to life due to lower occupancy than residential buildings, some non-residential buildings and infrastructure increase the risks from natural hazards in the surrounding areas. For example, petrol stations in a flood area contribute to a higher hazard impact by adding contaminants to floodwaters, negatively impacting on people's health and the environment. We argue the amendment is insufficient to mitigate the inundation hazard risk in these areas, and a more risk based approach to non-residential building development is required.**	Reject

Nelson Airport Limited	S478.004 S478.005	General natural Hazards/ Climate change	Support	Submitter (Nelson Airport Limited) suggested change for objectives and policies for Natural Hazards under PC29 (DO2.1) to also incorporate Industrial Zone, Residential Zone: Standard Area, Comprehensive Area and Lower Density Area. **We support this submission point. Expanding the built environment zones covered within the DO2.1 for Natural Hazards is supported.**	Accept
Nelson Airport Limited	S478.007	General natural Hazards/ Climate change	Support in part	The submitter (Nelson Airport Limited) argues that Nelson Airport is identified as nationally and regionally significant infrastructure and is in an area that is subject to natural hazards. They request that DO2.2.7 should be amended to: *Enable activities and development in the Flood Hazard, Flood and Inundation Overlays where… ii: the activity is to support nationally and/or regionally significant infrastructure while mitigating significant risks of adverse effects from flood hazards to people, property, infrastructure and the environment.* **We understand the need for supportive infrastructure and continual maintenance for existing nationally and/or regionally significant infrastructure, such as the Nelson airport, but consider that stricter wording would better restrict unnecessary development within hazard overlays while allowing for the provision that the Nelson Airport requires. We support this submission provided that it is amended to the following:** *Enable activities and development in the Flood Hazard, Flood and Inundation Overlays where… ii: the activity has a functional or operational need to be located within the hazard overlay to support existing nationally and/or regionally significant infrastructure, ~~while~~ and ~~mitigating significant~~ reduces the risks of adverse effects from flood hazards to people, property, infrastructure and the environment to as low as reasonably practicable.*	Accepted with the amended text provided.
Nelson Airport Limited	S478.008	General natural Hazards/ Climate change	Oppose	The submitter (Nelson Airport Limited) argues that Nelson Airport is identified as nationally and regionally significant infrastructure and is in an area that is subject to natural hazards. They request that DO2.2.10i should be amended to: *The areas of high flood flow and/or depth can cause harm to people and significant damage to buildings and infrastructure. Where possible the location of activities in these areas should be avoided (except for nationally and/or regionally significant infrastructure that can demonstrate a functional or operational need*	Reject

				<u>for those activities to occur in these areas)</u>. It is important that prior to development consideration is given to the flood hazard and measures are taken to reduce significant risk. **We understand the need for activities and continual maintenance for existing nationally and/or regionally significant infrastructure such as the Nelson airport. We oppose this submission based on the provision stating that activities should be avoided in areas of high flow and/or flood depth should be avoided "where possible" and requires that "measures are taken to reduce risk". If an activity associated with nationally and/or regionally significant infrastructure has a functional or operational need to occur in these areas, then that would fall under the category of activities for which it is not possible to avoid in the given areas.** **We understand the need for supportive infrastructure and continual maintenance for existing nationally and/or regionally significant infrastructure such as the Nelson airport, but consider that the current wording adequately restricts development within hazard overlays (i.e. 'where possible the location of activities in these areas should be avoided') while allowing for the provision that the Nelson Airport requires**	
Nelson Airport Limited	S478.009	General natural Hazards/ Climate change	Oppose	The submitter (Nelson Airport Limited) argues that Nelson Airport is identified as nationally and regionally significant infrastructure and is in an area that is subject to natural hazards. They request that DO2.2.10i should be amended to: *Control subdivision, use and development within the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay to ensure that: <u>… 5. Nationally and/or regionally significant infrastructure can continue to function efficiently and effectively without unreasonable constraint.</u>* **We oppose this submission, as "unreasonable constraint" on significant infrastructure function is ambiguous and could cause confusion and inconsistent application of the rules.** **As significant infrastructure, Nelson Airport has a need for post-event functionality and needs to ensure its resilience. This may include restrictions or appropriate mitigations based on the risks associated with its location.**	Reject until further clarification of 'unreasonable constraint' is provided and assessed for appropriateness.
Chorus New Zealand Limited	S486.005	Natural Hazards/ Climate change	Support in part	The Submitter (Chorus New Zealand Limited) argues the need for operational and functional infrastructure that is in a flood hazard area. For example (DO2.2.4), "control subdivision, use and development within Flood Areas, unless, for	Accept in part, only if the infrastructure incorporates mitigation

				infrastructure there is a functional or operational need for the infrastructure to be located in the flood hazard area". **For infrastructure that has a functional or operational need to be located in the flood hazard area, this must only be allowed if it incorporates mitigation measures to reduce the flood risk to as low as reasonably practicable.** **We only support this submission point if the functional infrastructure incorporates mitigation measures to reduce the natural hazard risk to as low as reasonably practicable.**	measures to reduce the natural hazard risk to as low as reasonably practicable.
Chorus New Zealand Limited	S486.009 S486.010 S486.011 S486.012 S486.013	Fault; Liquefaction; Slope Instability; River Flooding	Support in part	The Submitter (Chorus New Zealand Limited) suggests adding (under the provisions REr.73.1; Rer.74A.1; Slope Instability Areas 1, 2 and 3; and [Rer.82.1, Rer.83D.1, Rer.83E.1 Icr.58.1, Icr.59D.1 and Icr.59E) that telecommunications network utilities are an exception and can be built, where previously it would not be a permitted activity. **Infrastructure that has a functional or operational need to be located in the natural hazard area must only be allowed if it incorporates mitigation measures to reduce the fault, liquefaction, slope instability and flood risk to as low as reasonably practicable.** **We only support this submission point if the functional infrastructure incorporates mitigation measures to reduce the natural hazard risk to as low as reasonably practicable.**	Accept in part, only if the infrastructure incorporates mitigation measures to reduce the natural hazard risk to as low as reasonably practicable.
Connexa Limited	S487.005	Natural Hazards/ Climate change	Support in part	The Submitter (Connexa Limited) argues the need for operational and functional infrastructure that is in a flood hazard area. For example (DO2.2.4), "control subdivision, use and development within Flood Areas, unless, for infrastructure there is a functional or operational need for the infrastructure to be located in the flood hazard area". **Infrastructure that has a functional or operational need to be located in the flood hazard area must only be allowed if it incorporates mitigation measures to reduce the flood risk to as low as reasonably practicable.** **We only support this submission point if the functional infrastructure incorporates mitigation measures to reduce the natural hazard risk to as low as reasonably practicable.**	Accept in part, only if the infrastructure incorporates mitigation measures to reduce the natural hazard risk to as low as reasonably practicable.

Connexa Limited	S487.009 S487.010 S487.011 S487.012 S487.013	Fault; Liquefaction; Slope Instability; River Flooding	Support in part	The Submitter (Connexa Limited) suggests adding that (under provisions REr.73.1; REr.74A.1; Slope Instability Areas 1, 2 and 3; and [REr.82.1, REr.83D.1, REr.83E.1 ICr.58.1, ICr.59D.1 and ICr.59E) telecommunications network utilities are an exception and can be built, where previously it would not be a permitted activity. **Infrastructure that has a functional or operational need to be located in the natural hazard area must only be allowed if it incorporates mitigation measures to reduce the fault, liquefaction, slope instability and flood risk to as low as reasonably practicable.** **We only support this submission point if the functional infrastructure incorporates mitigation measures to reduce the natural hazard risk to as low as reasonably practicable.**	Accept in part, only if the infrastructure incorporates mitigation measures to reduce the natural hazard risk to as low as reasonably practicable.
Aotearoa Tower Group Limited	S488.005	Natural Hazards/ Climate change	Support in part	The Submitter (Aotearoa Tower Group Limited) argues the need for operational and functional infrastructure that is in a flood hazard area. For example (DO2.2.4), "control subdivision, use and development within Flood Areas, unless, for infrastructure there is a functional or operational need for the infrastructure to be located in the flood hazard area". **Infrastructure that has a functional or operational need to be located in the natural hazard area must only be allowed if it incorporates mitigation measures to reduce the fault, liquefaction, slope instability and flood risk to as low as reasonably practicable.** **We only support this submission point if the functional infrastructure incorporates mitigation measures to reduce the natural hazard risk to as low as reasonably practicable.**	Accept in part, only if the infrastructure incorporates mitigation measures to reduce the natural hazard risk to as low as reasonably practicable.
Aotearoa Tower Group Limited	S488.009 S488.010 S488.011 S488.012 S488.013	Fault; Liquefaction; Slope Instability; River Flooding	Support in part	The Submitter (Aotearoa Tower Group Limited) suggests adding that (under provision REr.73.1; REr.74A.1; Slope Instability Areas 1, 2 and 3; and [REr.82.1, REr.83D.1, REr.83E.1 ICr.58.1, ICr.59D.1 and ICr.59E) telecommunications network utilities are an exception and can be built, where previously it would not be a permitted activity. **Infrastructure that has a functional or operational need to be located in the natural hazard area must only be allowed if it incorporates mitigation measures to reduce the fault, liquefaction, slope instability and flood risk to as low as reasonably practicable.**	Accept in part, only if the infrastructure incorporates mitigation measures to reduce the natural hazard risk to as low as reasonably practicable.

				We only support this submission point if the functional infrastructure incorporates mitigation measures to reduce the natural hazard risk to as low as reasonably practicable.	
One New Zealand Limited	S490.005	Natural Hazards/ Climate change	Support in part	The Submitter (One New Zealand Limited) argues the need for operational and functional infrastructure that is in a flood hazard area. For example (DO2.2.4), "control subdivision, use and development within Flood Areas, unless, for infrastructure there is a functional or operational need for the infrastructure to be located in the flood hazard area". **Infrastructure that has a functional or operational need to be located in the natural hazard area must only be allowed if it incorporates mitigation measures to reduce the fault, liquefaction, slope instability and flood risk to as low as reasonably practicable.** **We only support this submission point if the functional infrastructure incorporates mitigation measures to reduce the natural hazard risk to as low as reasonably practicable.**	Accept in part, only if the infrastructure incorporates mitigation measures to reduce the natural hazard risk to as low as reasonably practicable.
One New Zealand Limited	S490.009 S490.010 S490.011 S490.012 S490.013	Fault; Liquefaction; Slope Instability; River Flooding	Support in part	The Submitter (One New Zealand Limited) suggests adding that (under provision REr.73.1; REr.74A.1; Slope Instability Areas 1, 2 and 3; and [REr.82.1, REr.83D.1, REr.83E.1 ICr.58.1, ICr.59D.1 and ICr.59E) telecommunications network utilities are an exception and can be built, where previously it would not be a permitted activity. **Infrastructure that has a functional or operational need to be located in the natural hazard area must only be allowed if it incorporates mitigation measures to reduce the fault, liquefaction, slope instability and flood risk to as low as reasonably practicable.** **We only support this submission point if the functional infrastructure incorporates mitigation measures to reduce the natural hazard risk to as low as reasonably practicable.**	Accept in part, only if the infrastructure incorporates mitigation measures to reduce the natural hazard risk to as low as reasonably practicable.
Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	S491.005	Natural Hazards/ Climate change	Support in part	The Submitter (Spark New Zealand Trading Limited) argues the need for operational and functional infrastructure that is in a flood hazard area. For example (DO2.2.4), "control subdivision, use and development within Flood Areas, unless, for infrastructure there is a functional or operational need for the infrastructure to be located in the flood hazard area". I**nfrastructure that has a functional or operational need to be located in the natural hazard area must only be allowed if it incorporates mitigation measures**	Accept in part, only if the infrastructure incorporates mitigation measures to reduce the natural hazard risk to as low as reasonably practicable.

				to reduce the fault, liquefaction, slope instability and flood risk to as low as reasonably practicable. **We only support this submission point if the functional infrastructure incorporates mitigation measures to reduce the natural hazard risk to as low as reasonably practicable.**	
Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	S491.009 S491.010 S491.011 S491.012 S491.013	Fault; Liquefaction; Slope Instability; River Flooding	Support in part	The Submitter (Spark New Zealand Trading Limited) suggests adding that (under provision REr.73.1; REr.74A.1; Slope Instability Areas 1, 2 and 3; and [REr.82.1, REr.83D.1, REr.83E.1 ICr.58.1, ICr.59D.1 and ICr.59E) telecommunications network utilities are an exception and can be built, where previously it would not be a permitted activity. **Infrastructure that has a functional or operational need to be located in the natural hazard area must only be allowed if it incorporates mitigation measures to reduce the fault, liquefaction, slope instability and flood risk to as low as reasonably practicable.** **We only support this submission point if the functional infrastructure incorporates mitigation measures to reduce the natural hazard risk to as low as reasonably practicable.**	Accept in part, only if the infrastructure incorporates mitigation measures to reduce the natural hazard risk to as low as reasonably practicable.
New Zealand Institute of Architects	S495.015	High Density Residential Zone	Support in part	Clarification is requested by the submitter (New Zealand Institute of Architects) about whether partial encroachment of a hazard overlay on a property title will trigger the need for a full assessment or if this is only required in situations where the proposed building zone is within the hazard overlay. **We agree that clarification is needed about whether partial encroachment of a hazard overlay into a property will trigger the need for a full hazard and risk assessment.** **We request that while clarifying this it is acknowledged that natural hazard risk that is proximal to a building, even if not directly impacting the building zone, carries a risk to the property area. We consider that this should trigger a full hazard and risk assessment. For example, a landslide on one part of a property may have an outflow path which impacts another part of the property, which needs to be fully investigated.**	Accept in part.
National Public Health Service – Te Whatu Ora	S709.014	General natural hazards/ Climate change	Support	Submitter (National Public Health Service – Te Whatu Ora) wants to strengthen the Plan Change to include wording specific to risks to the public health and wellbeing of people, e.g. information about public health on Liquefaction DO2.2.14; Flooding DO2.2.4; Fault rupture REr.73.4.	Accept.

				We support the suggested amendment of wording related to liquefaction.	
National Public Health Service – Te Whatu Ora	S709.021	General natural hazards/ Climate change	Support	Submitter (National Public Health Service – Te Whatu Ora) requests to define "significant risk" and what "risk to people" means in relation to risks from Natural Hazards; and align the wording with what is proposed in the proposed National Policy Statement for Natural Hazard Decision-Making (NPS-NHD); and make consequential amendments to the natural hazards provisions to reflect the definitions. **We strongly support this suggested amendment. "Significant risk", and the level of risk deemed significant to people may vary between individuals and communities. Lacking an accepted definition of Significant risk" and "risk to people" may allow for different interpretations of the plan and inconsistent application of rules.** **We support alignment with the NPS-NHD as it provides consistent guidelines for decision making about natural hazard risk reduction.**	Accept.
National Public Health Service – Te Whatu Ora	S709.022	General natural hazards/ Climate change	Support	Submitter (National Public Health Service – Te Whatu Ora) suggests that it is important to incorporate an assessment of the social and wellbeing impacts of natural hazard risks when assessing for natural hazards. This includes aligning with the policies proposed in the proposed National Policy Statement for Natural Hazard Decision-Making (NPS-NHD) particularly policies 1-4 using social vulnerability indicators when identifying areas susceptible to natural hazards. **We support this suggested amendment. Assessing vulnerability is an important component of determining risk from natural hazards, as communities will be more or less resilient to the impacts of a natural hazard event depending on their social and wellbeing needs.** **We support alignment with the NPS-NHD as it provides consistent guidelines for decision making about natural hazard risk reduction.**	Accept.
National Public Health Service – Te Whatu Ora	S709.023	General natural hazards/ Climate change	Support	Submitter (National Public Health Service – Te Whatu Ora) suggests the amendment to strengthen provision DO2.2.1. i by removing "if necessary" so that all areas potentially susceptible to a natural hazard are assessed. **We support this suggested amendment.**	Accept.

				Subdivision and development should be restricted to a greater or lesser degree in areas at risk from natural hazards, depending on the type and level of hazard risk. It is therefore always necessary that detailed assessment of natural hazard risk should be completed prior to subdivision and development for any site which is identified as being potentially at risk by regional level natural hazard assessments or modelling (i.e. the natural hazard overlays in the RMP).	
National Public Health Service – Te Whatu Ora	S709.024	General natural hazards/ Climate change	Support	Submitter (National Public Health Service – Te Whatu Ora) suggests the amendment to the flood hazard policies (DO2.2.4) for stricter provisions that avoid new subdivisions, development and activities within flood areas (E.G. adding "In the first instance, it is important that subdivision and development in flood areas is avoided. If the development is to go ahead…"), and to amend the provision to align with the NPS-NHD. **We support this suggested amendment. Flooding is a serious and repeated hazard in the Nelson area, and recent events have caused ongoing harm to the community. The first approach to reducing the risk from flood hazard should be by avoiding new developments within identified flood hazard areas.** **We support alignment with the NPS-NHD as it provides consistent guidelines for decision making about natural hazard risk reduction.**	Accept.
National Public Health Service – Te Whatu Ora	S709.027	General natural hazards/ Climate change	Support	Submitter (National Public Health Service – Te Whatu Ora) suggests amendments to DO2.2.7 flood hazard activities and development to introduce stricter provisions to avoid new activities and development within flood hazard, flood and inundation overlays. **We support this suggested amendment.** **Flooding is a serious and repeated hazard in the Nelson area, and recent events have caused ongoing harm to the community. The first approach to reducing the risk from flood hazard should be by avoiding new developments within identified flood hazard areas.**	Accept.
National Public Health Service – Te Whatu Ora	S709.029	General natural hazards/ Climate change	Support in part	We support in part the submitter's (National Public Health Service – Te Whatu Ora) amendment to DO2.2.10 high flood hazard, floodways and flood paths, "The areas of high flood flow and/or depth can cause harm to people and significant damage to buildings and infrastructure. Where possible the location of activities in these areas should be avoided." **We request that this submission be allowed with the removal of the phrase "where possible", in order to make the provision stronger.**	Accept in part, with amendment.

				Flooding is a serious and repeated hazard in the Nelson area, and recent events have caused ongoing harm to the community. The first approach to reducing the risk from flood hazard should be by avoiding new developments within identified flood hazard areas.	
National Public Health Service – Te Whatu Ora	S709.087 S709.088 S709.092 S709.093 S709.129 S709.130 S709.131 S709.135	General natural hazards/ Climate change	Support	Submitter (National Public Health Service – Te Whatu Ora) suggests amendments to Support adding "people" to the list of risks for natural hazards. **We support this suggested amendment. The primary aim of reducing natural hazard risk is to reduce the impact of natural hazards on people, communities, and property. The natural hazards controlled by this plan change (flooding, liquefaction, slope instability and earthquake) can all have severe impacts on people's life safety, health and wellbeing both in the short- and long-term post-event. This should be reflected in the wording of the noted provisions.**	Accept.
588 Limited	S766.002 S766.003	Fault	Oppose	Submitter (588 Limited) has requested amending the graphical extent / boundaries of the Fault Deformation Overlay to ensure they are accurate. The argument is that the use of inaccurate base information will lead to significant and unreasonable implications for property owners, and that there are areas where the fault position has been identified and therefore the associated overlay should be significantly narrowed. **The Fault Deformation Overlay should continue to be updated when more accurate GIS mapping is available. However, we strongly oppose its current removal, and argue that the best available information must be used. This plan change is updating the Fault Deformation Overlay to reflect peer reviewed geotechnical assessment completed in 2021, and so represents the most current information on the fault hazard in Nelson. The Fault Deformation and Awareness Overlays are intended to restrict development within areas which are at risk from fault deformation hazard. Faults, particularly reverse faults like those in the Nelson region, may rupture over a wide deformation area, and do not always rupture to the surface in the same place, so an existing identified surface fault trace does not indicate that ground deformation from the next earthquake will be confined to the current mapped position of the fault. In the Fault Deformation and Awareness overlays, a degree of uncertainty over both the accuracy of the current position of the fault trace and the area of potential future deformation has been factored into the width of the overlay. Any inaccuracies in the current mapping overlays are an insufficient reason to justify their removal. Improved modelling of natural hazards must be sought, but the use of our current knowledge must be acknowledged and used to reduce risks.**	Reject.

588 Limited	S766.004	Slope Instability	Oppose	Submitter (588 Limited) has requested reassessing the risks associated with all land within the Slope Instability Area 2 overlay and amend the graphical extent / boundaries of the Slope Instability Area 2 Overlay to ensure they are accurate. The argument is that the use of inaccurate base information will lead to significant and unreasonable implications for property owners. **The Slope Instability Overlay should continue to be updated when more accurate GIS mapping is available. However, we strongly oppose its current removal, and argue that the best available information must be used. This plan change is updating the Slope Instability Overlay to reflect geotechnical assessment completed in 2021 and 2023, and so represents the most current information on the slope instability hazard in Nelson. Any inaccuracies in the current mapping overlays are an insufficient reason to justify their removal. Improved modelling of natural hazards must be sought, but the use of our current knowledge must be acknowledged and used to reduce risks.**	Reject.
588 Limited	S766.005 S766.006	Slope Instability; General natural hazards/ Climate change	Oppose	Submitter (588 Limited) has requested either (a) remove the Slope Instability Area 3 Overlay; or (b) Reassess the risks associated with all land within the Area 3 overlay, and (c) Amend the graphical extent / boundaries of the Slope Instability Area 3 Overlay to ensure they are accurate. **The Slope Instability Overlay should continue to be updated when more accurate GIS mapping is available. However, we strongly oppose its current removal, and argue that the best available information must be used. This plan change is updating the Slope Instability Overlay to reflect geotechnical assessment completed in 2021 and 2023, and so represents the most current information on the slope instability hazard in Nelson. Any inaccuracies in the current mapping overlays are an insufficient reason to justify their removal. Improved modelling of natural hazards must be sought, but the use of our current knowledge must be acknowledged and used to reduce risks.**	Reject.
588 Limited	S766.008 S766.009 S766.010	Fault	Oppose	Submitter (588 Limited) has requested amending the rule [REr.73A and REr.73B] to provide an exemption for allotments that have already received engineering certification. The argument is that under the current RMP, building in the Fault Hazard Overlay was permitted with provision of a geotechnical report identifying the position of the fault trace and providing that the building was not within 5 m of the fault. REr.73 (A, B and C) in PC29 makes building within the Fault Deformation Overlay a restricted discretionary activity, and allotments which already have engineering certification should be exempted.	Reject.

				We oppose this submission. An engineering certification regarding fault location should not exempt allotments from restricted discretionary activity status within the Fault Deformation Overlay. The operative RMP only requires structures to be 5m away from an identified fault trace. MfE's planning guidelines for development around active faults requires that buildings be located at least 20 m from identified active fault traces to account for the fact that faults, particularly reverse faults like those in the Nelson region, may rupture over a wide deformation area, and do not always rupture to the surface in the same place, so an existing identified surface fault trace does not indicate that ground deformation from the next earthquake will be confined to the current mapped position of the fault. Fault deformation is also not something that can be mitigated by geotechnical or engineering remediation. The importance of the fault deformation zone is not to provide for earthquake shaking hazard (which can be mediated), but for the chance that the fault will rupture or cause other ground deformation (e.g. uplift, subsidence, fault splay, ground rifting) under the building, which can't be predicted or mitigated for.	
588 Limited	S766.012	Slope Instability	Oppose	Submitter (588 Limited) has requested deleting the rule [REr.75G.1] or significantly reduce the scope of the requirement for resource consent approval and provide for practical exemptions. The argument is that REr.75G.1 will generate a very high number of additional consents, adding significant cost of individual property owners, and add considerably to the workload of the compliance team at NCC. We oppose this submission point. **We support restricting subdivision, building and development within the Slope Instability Overlay. We oppose reducing the restrictions and requirements for resource consent approval for areas that are at-risk to natural hazards and within the Slope Instability Overlay. The workload of NCC staff is beyond the scope of this plan change process.**	Reject.
588 Limited	S766.014 S766.015 S766.016 S766.017 S766.018 S766.019 S766.020 S766.021 S766.022 S766.023 S766.024	Slope Instability	Oppose	Submitter (588 Limited) has requested deleting the provision rules [REr.75H.1; REr.75I.1; REr.75J.1; REr.75K.1; REr.75L.1; REr.75M.1; REr.75N.1; REr.75O.1; REr.75P.1; REr.75Q.1; REr.75R.1] or amending to an appropriate standard that is relevant in terms of risk. The argument is that the multiple rules listed above will generate a very high number of additional consents, adding significant cost of individual property owners, and add considerably to the workload of the compliance team at NCC. **We support restricting subdivision, building and development within the Slope Instability Overlay. We oppose reducing the restrictions and requirements for resource consent approval for areas that are at-risk to natural hazards and**	Reject.

				within the Slope Instability Overlay. The workload of NCC staff is beyond the scope of this plan change process.	
Bayview Nelson Limited	S767.002 S767.003	Fault	Oppose	Submitter (Bayview Nelson Limited) has requested amending the graphical extent / boundaries of the Fault Deformation Overlay to ensure they are accurate. The argument is that the use of inaccurate base information will lead to significant and unreasonable implications for property owners. **The Fault Deformation Overlay should continue to be updated when more accurate GIS mapping is available. However, we strongly oppose its current removal, and argue that the best available information must be used. This plan change is updating the Fault Deformation Overlay to reflect peer reviewed geotechnical assessment completed in 2021, and so represents the most current information on the fault hazard in Nelson. Any inaccuracies in the current mapping overlays are an insufficient reason to justify their removal. Improved modelling of natural hazards must be sought, but the use of our current knowledge must be acknowledged and used to reduce risks.**	Reject.
Bayview Nelson Limited	S767.004	Slope Instability	Oppose	Submitter (Bayview Nelson Limited) has requested reassessing the risks associated with all land within the Slope Instability Area 2 overlay and amend the graphical extent / boundaries of the Slope Instability Area 2 Overlay to ensure they are accurate. The argument is that the use of inaccurate base information will lead to significant and unreasonable implications for property owners. **The Slope Instability Overlay should continue to be updated when more accurate GIS mapping is available. However, we strongly oppose its current removal, and argue that the best available information must be used. This plan change is updating the Slope instability Overlay to reflect geotechnical assessment completed in 2021 and 2023, and so represents the most current information on the slope instability hazard in Nelson. Any inaccuracies in the current mapping overlays are an insufficient reason to justify their removal. Improved modelling of natural hazards must be sought, but the use of our current knowledge must be acknowledged and used to reduce risks.**	Reject.

Bayview Nelson Limited	S767.005 S767.006	Slope Instability; General natural hazards/ Climate change	Oppose	Submitter (Bayview Nelson Limited) has requested either (a) remove the Slope Instability Area 3 Overlay; or (b) Reassess the risks associated with all land within the Area 3 overlay, and (c) Amend the graphical extent / boundaries of the Slope Instability Area 3 Overlay to ensure they are accurate. **The Slope Instability Overlay should continue to be updated when more accurate GIS mapping is available. However, we strongly oppose its current removal, and argue that the best available information must be used. This plan change is updating the Slope instability Overlay to reflect geotechnical assessment completed in 2021 and 2023, and so represents the most current information on the slope instability hazard in Nelson. Any inaccuracies in the current mapping overlays are an insufficient reason to justify their removal. Improved modelling of natural hazards must be sought, but the use of our current knowledge must be acknowledged and used to reduce risks.**	Reject.
Bayview Nelson Limited	S767.009 S767.010 S767.011 S767.012	Fault	Oppose	Submitter (Bayview Nelson Limited) has requested amending the rule [REr.73A and REr.73B] to provide an exemption for allotments that have already received engineering certification. The argument is that under the current RMP, building in the Fault Hazard Overlay was permitted with provision of a geotechnical report identifying the position of the fault trace and providing that the building was not within 5 m of the fault. REr.73 (A, B and C) in PC29 makes building within the Fault Deformation Overlay a restricted discretionary activity, and allotments which already have engineering certification should be exempted. **We oppose this submission. Without seeking legal advice on the status of existing engineering certifications, we are of the opinion that a 20m setback from an active fault is required, rather than the proposed 5m setback. This is consistent with the MFE Active Fault Guidelines. MfE's planning guidelines for development around active faults[1] requires that buildings be located at least 20 m from identified active fault traces to account for the fact that faults, particularly reverse faults like those in the Nelson region, may rupture over a wide deformation area, and do not always rupture to the surface in the same place, so an existing identified surface fault trace does not indicate that ground deformation from the next earthquake will be confined to the current mapped position of the fault. Fault deformation is also not something that can be mitigated by geotechnical or engineering remediation. The importance of the fault deformation zone is not to provide for earthquake shaking hazard (which**	Reject.

[1] https://environment.govt.nz/publications/planning-for-development-of-land-on-or-close-to-active-faults-a-guideline-to-assist-resource-management-planners-in-new-zealand/

				can be mediated), but for the chance that the fault will rupture or cause other ground deformation (e.g. uplift, subsidence, fault splay, ground rifting) under the building, which can't be predicted or mitigated for.	
Bayview Nelson Limited	S767.013	Slope Instability	Oppose	Submitter (Bayview Nelson Limited) has requested deleting the rule [REr.75G.1] or significantly reduce the scope of the requirement for resource consent approval and provide for practical exemptions. The argument is that REr.75G.1 will generate a very high number of additional consents, adding significant cost of individual property owners, and add considerably to the workload of the compliance team at NCC. **We support restricting subdivision, building and development within the Slope Instability Overlay. We oppose reducing the restrictions and requirements for resource consent approval for areas that are at-risk to slope instability hazards and within the Slope Instability Overlay.**	Reject.
Bayview Nelson Limited	S767.014 S767.015 S767.016 S767.017 S767.018 S767.019 S767.020 S767.021 S767.022 S767.023 S767.024	Slope Instability	Oppose	Submitter (Bayview Nelson Limited) has requested deleting the rules [REr.75H.1; REr.75I.1; REr.75J.1; REr.75K.1; REr.75L.1; REr.75M.1; REr.75N.1; REr.75O.1; REr.75P.1; REr.75Q.1; REr.75R.1] or amending to an appropriate standard that is relevant in terms of risk. The argument is that the multiple rules listed above will generate a very high number of additional consents, adding significant cost of individual property owners, and add considerably to the workload of the compliance team at NCC. **We support restricting subdivision, building and development within the Slope Instability Overlay. We oppose reducing the restrictions and requirements for resource consent approval for areas that are at-risk to slope instability hazards and within the Slope Instability Overlay.**	Reject.
Bayview Nelson Limited	S767.030 S767.031	Slope Instability	Oppose	Submitter (Bayview Nelson Limited) has requested deleting the rule REr.112B and rule REr.112C. The argument is that the discretionary activity for subdivision is unnecessary and inefficient. There is already a high level of care given in subdivision applications with the involvement of geotechnical engineering experts and the relevant and appropriate consideration of geotechnical stability and slope risk is already a part of application triggered under REr.107. **We support restricting subdivision, building and development within the Slope Instability Overlay. We oppose reducing the restrictions and requirements for**	Reject.

				resource consent approval for areas that are at-risk to slope instability hazards and within the Slope Instability Overlay.	
GP Investments Limited	S845.002 S845.003	Fault	Oppose	Submitter (GP Investments limited) has requested amending the graphical extent / boundaries of the Fault Deformation Overlay to ensure they are accurate. The argument is that the use of inaccurate base information will lead to significant and unreasonable implications for property owners. **The Fault Deformation Overlay should continue to be updated when more accurate GIS mapping is available. However, we strongly oppose its current removal, and argue that that the best available information must be used. This plan change is updating the Fault Deformation Overlay to reflect peer reviewed geotechnical assessment completed in 2021, and so represents the most current information on the fault hazard in Nelson. Any inaccuracies in the current mapping overlays are an insufficient reason to justify their removal. Improved modelling of natural hazards must be sought, but the use of our current knowledge must be acknowledged and used to reduce risks.**	Reject.
GP Investments Limited	S845.004	Slope Instability	Oppose	Submitter (GP Investments limited) has requested reassessing the risks associated with all land within the Slope Instability Area 2 overlay and amend the graphical extent / boundaries of the Slope Instability Area 2 Overlay to ensure they are accurate. The argument is that the use of inaccurate base information will lead to significant and unreasonable implications for property owners. **The Slope Instability Overlay should continue to be updated when more accurate GIS mapping is available. However, we strongly oppose its current removal, and argue that that the best available information must be used. This plan change is updating the Slope instability Overlay to reflect geotechnical assessment completed in 2021 and 2023, and so represents the most current information on the slope hazard in Nelson. Any inaccuracies in the current mapping overlays are an insufficient reason to justify their removal. Improved modelling of natural hazard risk must be sought, but the use of current knowledge must be acknowledged and used to reduce risks.**	Reject.

GP Investments Limited	S845.005	River Flooding	Oppose	The submitter (GP Investments limited) has requested deleting the Flood Hazard Overlay and High Flood Hazard Overlay entirely. The argument is that based on past and recent experience, the flood modelling has not provided an accurate assessment of actual risks. **We oppose this submission point and support the use of the Flood Hazard Overlay and High Hazard Overlay mapping to restrict subdivision, building and development. We argue that the best available information must be used. With Nelson City Council updating the Flood Hazard Overlays to remove inaccurate polygons the overlay the flood overlays will be based on modelling updated in 2021. This represents the most current information on the flood hazard in Nelson. Any inaccuracies in the current mapping overlays are an insufficient reason to justify their removal. Improved modelling of natural hazards must be sought, but the use of current knowledge must be acknowledged and used to reduce risks.**	Reject.
GP Investments Limited	S845.006 S845.007	Slope Instability; General natural hazards / climate change	Oppose	The submitter (GP Investments limited) has requested either (a) remove the Slope Instability Area 3 Overlay; or (b) Reassess the risks associated with all land within the Area 3 overlay, and (c) Amend the graphical extent / boundaries of the Slope Instability Area 3 Overlay to ensure they are accurate. **The Slope Instability Overlay should continue to be updated when more accurate GIS mapping is available. However, we strongly oppose its current removal, and argue that that the best available information must be used. This plan change is updating the Slope instability Overlay to reflect geotechnical assessment completed in 2021 and 2023, and so represents the most current information on the slope hazard. Any inaccuracies in the current mapping overlays are an insufficient reason to justify their removal. Improved modelling of natural hazards must be sought, but the use of current knowledge must be acknowledged and used to reduce risks.**	Reject.
GP Investments Limited	S845.041 S845.042 S845.043	Natural hazards in the industrial zone	Oppose	The submitter (GP Investments limited) has requested the deletion of provision rules INr.60B; INr.60C; INr.60E for the reasoning that the rules open the door for highly complex and expensive flooding assessment for all development proposals. This is considered to add significant unnecessary cost and delay to all development projects. **We oppose this submission point and support the importance of flood risk assessments within Flood Areas, Flood Paths and Floodways to restrict subdivision, building and development.**	Reject.

				The rules referred to by GP Investment's submission are risk-based in that they are more restrictive of development which will increase the intensity or exposure to flooding hazards. We consider this an appropriate method of managing the risk from flood hazard.	
GP Investments Limited	S845.044 S845.045 S845.046 S845.047	Fault	Oppose	The submitter (GP Investments limited) has requested amending the rule [REr.73A and REr.73B] to provide an exemption for allotments that have already received engineering certification. The argument is that under the current RMP, building in the Fault Hazard Overlay was permitted with provision of a geotechnical report identifying the position of the fault trace and providing that the building was not within 5 m of the fault. REr.73 (A, B and C) in PC29 makes building within the Fault Deformation Overlay a restricted discretionary activity, and allotments which already have engineering certification should be exempted. **We oppose this submission. Without seeking legal advice on the status of existing engineering certifications, we are of the opinion that a 20m setback from an active fault is required, rather than the proposed 5m setback. This is consistent with the MFE Active Fault Guidelines. MfE's planning guidelines for development around active faults requires that buildings be located at least 20 m from identified active fault traces to account for the fact that faults, particularly reverse faults like those in the Nelson region, may rupture over a wide deformation area, and do not always rupture to the surface in the same place, so an existing identified surface fault trace does not indicate that ground deformation from the next earthquake will be confined to the current mapped position of the fault. Fault deformation is also not something that can be mitigated by geotechnical or engineering remediation. The importance of the fault deformation zone is not to provide for earthquake shaking hazard (which can be mediated), but for the chance that the fault will rupture or cause other ground deformation (e.g. uplift, subsidence, fault splay, ground rifting) under the building, which can't be predicted or mitigated for.**	Reject.
GP Investments Limited	S845.048	Slope Instability	Oppose	Submitter (GP Investments limited) has requested deleting the rule [REr.75G.1] or significantly reduce the scope of the requirement for resource consent approval and provide for practical exemptions. The argument is that REr.75G.1 will generate a very high number of additional consents, adding significant cost of individual property owners, and add considerably to the workload of the compliance team at NCC. **We support restricting subdivision, building and development within the Slope Instability Overlay. We oppose reducing the restrictions and requirements for**	Reject.

				resource consent approval for areas that are at-risk to natural hazards and within the Slope Instability Overlay. The workload of NCC staff is beyond the scope of this plan change process.	
GP Investments Limited	S845.049 S845.050 S845.051 S845.052 S845.053 S845.054 S845.055 S845.056 S845.057 S845.058 S845.059	Slope Instability	Oppose	Submitter (GP Investments limited) has requested deleting the provision rules [REr.75H.1; REr.75I.1; REr.75J.1; REr.75K.1; REr.75L.1; REr.75M.1; REr.75N.1; REr.75O.1; REr.75P.1; REr.75Q.1; REr.75R.1] or amending to an appropriate standard that is relevant in terms of risk. The argument is that the multiple rules listed above will generate a very high number of additional consents, adding significant cost of individual property owners, and add considerably to the workload of the compliance team at NCC. **We support restricting subdivision, building and development within the Slope Instability Overlay. We oppose reducing the restrictions and requirements for resource consent approval for areas that are at-risk to natural hazards and within the Slope Instability Overlay. The workload of NCC staff is beyond the scope of this plan change process.**	Reject.
GP Investments Limited	S845.064 S845.065	Slope Instability	Oppose	Submitter (GP Investments limited) has requested deleting the provision rule REr.112B and rule REr.112C. The argument is that the discretionary activity for subdivision is unnecessary and inefficient. There is already a high level of care given in subdivision applications with the involvement of geotechnical engineering experts and the relevant and appropriate consideration of geotechnical stability and slope risk is already a part of application triggered under REr.107. **We support restricting subdivision, building and development within the Slope Instability Overlay. We oppose reducing the restrictions and requirements for resource consent approval for areas that are at-risk to natural hazards and within the Slope Instability Overlay. The workload of NCC staff is beyond the scope of this plan change process.**	Reject.
Manuka Street Hospital Limited	S881.026	River Flooding	Oppose	Submitter (Manuka Street Hospital Limited) requests amending rule REr.83B Flood Areas except Flood Paths or Floodways - Building and by providing specifically for non-notification and without the need to obtain affected person approvals. The argument is that the rule also opens the door for highly complex and expensive flooding assessment for most development proposals. **We oppose this submission and support the importance of flood risk assessments within Flood Areas, Flood Paths and Floodways to restrict subdivision, building and development.**	Reject.

				The rules referred to by GP Investment's submission are risk-based in that they are more restrictive of development which will increase the intensity or exposure to flooding hazards. We consider this an appropriate method of managing the risk from flood hazard.	
Manuka Street Hospital Limited	S881.027	River Flooding	Oppose	Submitter (Manuka Street Hospital Limited) requests deleting provision rules REr.83C Flood Areas except Flood Paths or Floodways - Fence, wall, retaining wall, outside storage and REr.83E Flood Areas except Flood Paths or Floodways – Earthworks **We oppose this submission and support the importance of flood risk assessments within Flood Areas, Flood Paths and Floodways to restrict subdivision, building and development.** **The rules referred to by GP Investment's submission are risk-based in that they are more restrictive of development which will increase the intensity or exposure to flooding hazards. We consider this an appropriate method of managing the risk from flood hazard.**	Reject.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	S898.023 S898.030	Inner City and City Fringe Zones & Suburban Commercial Zone	Oppose in part	The submitter (Ryman Healthcare Limited) has requested separate rules for "ICr.37E Retirement Village" for the section, "Matters of Discretion are limited to: … Mitigation measures to address risk from any flood or inundation hazards…". **"Mitigation measures to address risk from any flood or inundation hazards" does not encompass natural hazard risk which cannot be mitigated and must be avoided, nor does it include risk from other natural hazards. This is of particular concern because retirement villages are an activity of high vulnerability and therefore require high levels of protection and management from natural hazards.** **As such we request that the submission only be allowed if "Mitigation measures to address risk from any flood or inundation hazards" is replaced as a matter of discretion by "Risk to residents, staff, and property from natural hazards".**	Accept in part, with amendment.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	S901.022 S901.029	Inner City and City Fringe Zones & Suburban Commercial Zone	Oppose in part	The submitter (Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand) has requested separate rules for "ICr.37E Retirement Village" for the section, "Matters of Discretion are limited to: … Mitigation measures to address risk from any flood or inundation hazards…". **"Mitigation measures to address risk from any flood or inundation hazards" does not encompass natural hazard risk which cannot be mitigated and must be**	Accept in part, with amendment.

				avoided, nor does it include risk from other natural hazards. This is of particular concern because retirement villages are an activity of high vulnerability and therefore require high levels of protection from protection and management from natural hazards. **As such we request that the submission only be allowed if "Mitigation measures to address risk from any flood or inundation hazards" is replaces as a matter of discretion by "Risk to residents, staff, and property from natural hazards ".**	
Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	S933.003	Natural Hazard Mapping	Oppose	The submitter (Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities) opposes the inclusion of flood hazard overlays within the map as part of the District Plan hazards. **We strongly oppose the removal of natural hazard flooding overlay(s) from the Planning Maps to be replaced with non-statutory GIS maps. We argue that hazard overlays are required to ensure low-risk development, and to assess development in higher risk areas. To do this, the inclusion of flooding, faults, liquefaction and slope instability as overlays in the planning maps is needed. We argue that the best available information must be used. Any inaccuracies in the current mapping overlays are an insufficient reason to justify their removal. Improved modelling of natural hazards must be sought, but the use of current knowledge must be acknowledged and used to reduce risks.**	Reject.
Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	S933.004	Natural Hazard Mapping	Oppose	The submitter (Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities) requests removal of Flood Overlays (Flood Overlay; Flood Path Overlay, and Inundation Overlay), Flood Hazard Overlay, High Flood Hazard Overlay and Floodway from the NRMP. **We strongly oppose this. Hazard overlays are required to ensure low-risk development, and to control development in at-risk areas. To do this, the inclusion of flooding, faults, liquefaction and slope instability as overlays in the Planning Maps is needed. We argue that the best available information must be used. Any inaccuracies in the current mapping overlays are an insufficient reason to justify their removal. Improved modelling of natural hazards must be sought, but the use of our current knowledge must be acknowledged and used to reduce risks.**	Reject.
Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	S933.005	Natural Hazard Mapping	Oppose	The submitter (Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities) requests the amendment to removal of Flood Overlays (Flood Overlay; Flood Path Overlay, and Inundation Overlay), Flood Hazard Overlay, High Flood Hazard Overlay and Floodway from the NRMP. **We strongly oppose this and argue that hazard overlays are required to ensure low-risk development, and to control development in at-risk areas. To do this,**	Reject.

				the inclusion of flooding, faults, liquefaction and slope instability as overlays in the Planning Maps is needed. We argue that the best available information must be used. This represents the most current information on the flood hazard in Nelson. Any inaccuracies in the current mapping overlays are an insufficient reason to justify their removal. Improved modelling of natural hazards must be sought, but the use of our current knowledge must be acknowledged and used to reduce risks.	
Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	S933.009	Natural Hazard Mapping	Oppose	The submitter (Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities) requests the amendment to removal of Flood Overlays (Flood Overlay; Flood Path Overlay, and Inundation Overlay), Flood Hazard Overlay, High Flood Hazard Overlay and Floodway from the NRMP. **We strongly oppose this and argue that hazard overlays are required to ensure low-risk development, and to control development in at-risk areas. To do this, the inclusion of flood overlays in the planning maps is needed. Any inaccuracies in the current mapping overlays are an insufficient reason to justify their removal. We support the decision to improve the hazard overlays overtime to reflect latest the accurate and scientific modelling, but strongly disagree with the decision to remove the current modelling until then.**	Reject.
Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	S933.0018	River Flooding	Oppose	The submitter (Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities) requests the removal of the Flood Overlays, and to entirely delete policy DO2.2.3. **We strongly oppose the argument that the current flooding overlay maps should be removed before the updated modelling flood layers are ready. We argue that the best available information must be used. Any inaccuracies in the current mapping overlays are an insufficient reason to justify their removal. Improved modelling of natural hazards must be sought, but the use of current knowledge must be acknowledged and used to reduce risks.**	Reject.
Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	S933.0019	River Flooding	Oppose	The submitter (Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities) considers that building platforms could be located within flood paths if mitigated through higher floor levels to allow for continued flow of water where the risk is not high. **We oppose this submission point because flood paths are some of the highest risk areas of floods, as the water will be flowing quickly. It is also important to keep flood paths clear of building because impeding the flow of the flood will make it harder for the flood water to disperse, making the flood longer and possibly deeper. As such allowing this submission would increase risk to residents from flood risk.**	Reject.

Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	S933.030	Natural Hazard Mapping	Oppose	The submitter (Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities) requests amendments to rules REr.82 Flood Path, Floodway and REr.83A-F Flood Areas except Flood Paths or Floodways. **The amendments are related to the previous submission point to remove all flooding overlays, which we strongly oppose (refer to submission point above (S933.003) and submission point S933.018).**	Reject.
Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	S933.035	Other	Oppose	The submitter (Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities) considers that subdivision within the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay can be adequately managed through site specific foundation design as opposed to restrictions on subdivision [as in REr.110B] and suggests amending rule [REr.110B] to a controlled activity from restricted discretionary. **We disagree that subdivision within the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay can be adequately managed through site specific foundation design as opposed to restrictions on subdivision. MBIE planning and engineering guidance for potentially liquefaction-prone land[2] recommends that district plans establish provisions to address liquefaction-related risk associated with land use, subdivision and development. Therefore, we oppose amending rule [REr.110B] to a controlled activity from restricted discretionary.** **Zoning through liquefaction as well as site specific foundation design is important because liquefaction has many non-structure, non-foundation design specific consequences which are best considered in addition to and separately from site specific foundation design through the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay. Liquefaction and lateral spreading can result in major damage to buildings and infrastructure, such as differential settlement of buildings, distortion of roads, or breakage of buried infrastructure (Lin et al. 2020[3]). Liquefaction can damage infrastructure (pipes, roading, cables), land and buildings (through subsidence and lateral spreading). Liquefaction can have significant economic, health and well-being consequences for people. Liquefaction can also restrict accessibility, which is critical for emergency services and natural hazard event recovery. An example of liquefaction damage is from the Canterbury earthquake sequence 2010-2011, causing substantial damage to 60,000 residential houses and major parts of the urban infrastructure systems (Lin et al. 2020).**	Reject.

[2] https://www.building.govt.nz/building-code-compliance/b-stability/b1-structure/planning-engineering-liquefaction-land

[3] Lin, A., Wotherspoon, L., Blake, D., Bradley, B., & Motha, J. (2020). Liquefaction exposure and impacts across New Zealand State Highways. In *NZGS Symposium 2021, Dunedin, New Zealand* (pp. 1-9).

Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	S933.055 S933.039 S933.073	Medium Density Residential Zone; High Density Residential Zone	Oppose	The submitter (Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities) requests removing the Rule Table which provides context for what development complies with the permitted, controlled, discretionary and restricted conditions. **We disagree with the removal of reference to the Rule Table in the suggested amendments to REr17B.1 because it helps provides a clear approach to which rules apply.**	Reject.
Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	S933.102 S933.110 S933.111 S933.112	Natural hazards in the Industrial Zone	Oppose	With regard to [ICr.88; SCr.74; INr.72A; INr.76] subdivision rules relating to overlays, the submitter (Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities), considers that subdivision within the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay can be adequately managed through site specific foundation design as opposed to restrictions on subdivision. **We disagree that subdivision within the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay can be adequately managed through site specific foundation design as opposed to restrictions on subdivision. MBIE planning and engineering guidance for potentially liquefaction-prone land[4] recommends that district plans establish provisions to address liquefaction-related risk associated with land use, subdivision and development. Therefore, we oppose amending the rules [ICr.88; SCr.74; INr.72A; INr.76] to a controlled activity from restricted discretionary.** **Liquefaction has many non-structural, non-foundation design specific consequences that are best considered in addition to and separately from site specific foundation design through the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay. Liquefaction and lateral spreading can result in major damage to buildings and infrastructure, such as differential settlement of buildings, distortion of roads, or breakage of buried infrastructure (Lin et al. 2020). Liquefaction can damage infrastructure (pipes, roading, cables), land and buildings (through subsidence and lateral spreading). Liquefaction can have significant economic, health and well-being consequences for people. Liquefaction can also restrict accessibility, which is critical for emergency services and natural hazard event recovery. An example of liquefaction damage is from the Canterbury earthquake sequence 2010-2011, causing substantial damage to 60,000 residential houses and major parts of the urban infrastructure systems (Lin et al. 2020).**	Reject.

[4] https://www.building.govt.nz/building-code-compliance/b-stability/b1-structure/planning-engineering-liquefaction-land