

North Otaki Beach Residents Group Inc. (#38)
PO Box 5238 Terrace End Palmerston North 4410

38	North Otaki Beach Residents Group Inc.	General	Support	I generally support NOBRG's analysis (para. 40, pp. 20-22) regarding failures of the PDP to give effect to the NZCPS.	Allow.
38		General	Support	I agree with NOBRG statement (para. 41, p. 22) that the PDP fails to give effect to the proposed Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement.	Allow.
38		Definitions	Support in part	I agree these definitions require revision but notes that different wording may be appropriate.	Allow in part.
38		Objective 2.3	Support in part	I agree that Objective 2.3 requires revision but notes that different wording may be appropriate.	Allow in part.
38		Objective 2.4	Support in part	I agree that "non-exposure to increased risks is an impossible and inappropriate threshold and a more nuanced approach is justified" (p. 37).	Allow in part.
38		Objective 2.5	Support in part	I agree that Objective 2.5 requires revision but alternative wording may be more appropriate.	Allow in part.
38		Policy 4.3 - 4.11	Oppose	I oppose all PDP provisions relating to 'managed retreat' (including concepts such as, but not limited to, 'enable migration inland', 'no build' and 'relocatable build') for the reasons stated in CRU submission.	Disallow.

Great Wellington Regional Council (#441)

PO Box 11646 Wellington 6142 (Attn. Caroline Ammundsen)

441	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Policy 4.4	Oppose	PDP Policy 4.4e implies/enables the removal of all coastal structures irrespective of their merits or value. The proposed RPS Objective 5 & 16, Policy 64 and Method 53 referred to by GWRC (shown helpfully in the operative RPS on page 29 for Objective 5 and pages 53-54 for Objective 16) relate to non-regulatory community restoration initiatives. Citing these RPS provisions as a means to support district plan provisions for the removal of existing coastal defences is inappropriate.	Disallow.
441		Policy 4.5	Oppose	The requested insertion would strengthen the policy in respect of setting the stage for managed retreat in southern areas of the District. Such a policy has not been justified and is not yet the subject of any policy decision by the Council.	Disallow.
441		Policy 4.6	Oppose	It is not appropriate to accommodate natural shoreline movement in all cases. The requested amendment only serves to clarify the intention for 'managed retreat', which I oppose. In addition, as the corresponding adaptation strategies are unknown and the procedures unclear, the related policies and rules are uncertain and invalid.	Disallow.
441		Policy 4.7	Oppose	I oppose GWRC's support for the policy which refers to the enabling of inland migration of dune systems without qualification as to the effects on existing communities and without reference to alternative options.	Disallow

441		Section 4.2 - hazard assessment methodology	Oppose	GWRC states "It is best practice hazards management to consider worst case scenarios for future planning" but fails to qualify this by reference to any such regulatory guidance or relevant provisions of the RMA or NZCPS. There is a material difference between "considering" worst case scenarios and "regulating" for their eventuality, particularly where the probability of such worst case scenarios has not been considered/assigned. Risk analysis should evaluate benefits and costs from all potential outcomes, good and bad.	Disallow.
441		Section 4.2 - distinction between "hazard" and "risk"	Support in part	Essentially the GWRC commentary refers to "hazard" as the assessment of a probability of occurrence of an event and "risk" as an assessment of "costs" associated with such an event occurring. Expected net losses from an adverse event should be evaluated in conjunction with net gains from more benign outcomes. I note that the CSL assessment assigned no probabilities to beneficial or adverse events and the section 32 analysis quantified no costs.	Allow in part.
441		Policy 4.8	Oppose	I oppose GWRC support for the policy as it gives inappropriate emphasis to managed retreat over other potential management options, noting that the 'risks that are posed' have not been quantified for any of the potential management options and nor has the 'degree of certainty' of the hazard been considered.	Disallow.

441		Policy 4.9	Oppose	I disagree with GWRC's assertion that "Policy 4.9 [is consistent] with Policy 51 of the PRPS to reduce reliance on hard protection structures". Policy 51 of the operative RPS ".. aims to minimise the <i>risk</i> and <i>consequences of natural hazards</i> events through sound preparation, investigation and planning prior to development .."(emphasis added) and relates to the consenting (or plan changes or reviews) for hazard mitigation measures. I note in passing that this is not a human welfare analysis as it does not consider the net benefits from less malign outcomes. Even so, KCDC Policy 4.9 includes the regulatory treatment of existing hard protection structures and is more appropriately tied to RPS Policy 52 which states "(c) avoiding structural protection works or hard engineering methods unless it is necessary to protect existing development or property from unacceptable risk and the works form part of a long-term hazard management strategy that represents the best practicable option for the future". Note that whether a risk is unacceptable or not depends on the potential upside returns from a risky investment, which rational risk analysis would consider. I conclude that KCDC Policy 4.9 is not consistent with the RPS in respect of existing coastal protection structures. See my submission in relation to risk analysis.	Disallow.
441		Policy 4.10 - 4.14	Oppose	I consider the CHMAs and related policies to be overly conservative and restrictive.	Disallow.
441		Policy 4.15	Oppose	The adaptation strategies referred to do not exist and therefore their content is unknown, the procedures are unclear, and any related policies and rules are uncertain and invalid.	Disallow.

441		Policy 9.2	Oppose	I concur with GWRC's comment that the intent of the risk based approach described by KCDC is unclear and its view this lack of clarity and understanding by the KCDC gives rise to the fundamentally flawed PDP provisions. However, the approach suggested by GWRC is not the methodology adopted or applied in the CSL assessment or section 32 analysis and the resulting district plan provisions.	Disallow.
441		Policy 9.3	Oppose	Although the wording changes suggested in the submission are not appropriate, I note GWRC's appropriate point with respect to KCDCs misunderstanding and incorrect application of a risk-based approach.	Disallow.
441		Policy 9.4	Oppose	The Council has adopted an approach that is well mainstream risk analysis in the economic and finance literature. The precautionary approach is not a recognisable risk analysis, as commonly stated it is a truism. In practice, it has become a mantra. My submission referred to the OECD's analysis of it and recommendation that the mainstream approach of expected utility maximisation should be the centre-piece for risk analysis.	Disallow.

Department of Conservation (#202)
Hamilton Office P O Box 3072 Hamilton 3240

202	Department of Conservation	Objective 2.4	Oppose	For reasons stated in CRU's submission.	Disallow.
202		Objective 2.5	Oppose	For reasons stated in CRU's submission.	Disallow.
202		Policy 4.3	Oppose in part	I oppose the submitter's support for the policy but support the statement that clause e) appears quite restricted and supports that the policy as a whole should be reworded. The policy is too absolute but the specific wording suggested is not supported.	Disallow in part.
202		Policy 4.4	Oppose	For reasons stated in my submission.	Disallow
202		Policy 4.5	Oppose	For reasons stated in my submission. I notes that NZCPS 2010 makes no reference to "high tide dry beach" or similar and in this respect I considers that Policy 4.5 could be seen to be setting the stage for managed retreat in southern areas of the District. Such a policy has not been justified, is not yet the subject of any policy decision by Council and is neither required, nor envisaged, by NZCPS except in "extreme circumstances" (NZCPS Policy 25).	Disallow.
202		Policy 4.6	Oppose	For reasons stated in my submission. I agree agreement in with DOC's comment that the presumption made in Policy 4.6 for a natural shoreline along all parts of the coast is inappropriate.	Disallow.

202		Policy 4.7	Support in part	I generally support the commentary associated with the lack of clarity/understanding as well as the deficiencies in policy identified by DOC. I oppose the specific amendments noting that different wording may be appropriate. I generally supports DOC's call for policy to acknowledge the need for "... different management responses for the different types of coastal erosion problem in the Kapiti District" and corresponding strategic approaches to address these.	Allow in part.
202		Section 4.2 - Coastal hazards identified	Oppose	For reasons stated in my submission. I agree with the submitter's comment that "the recession attributable to climate change effects needs to be superimposed on the erosion or accretion that will happen through coastal processes other than climate change effects" and that "the total/net erosion hazard will be very different along different parts of the Kapiti coastline." I note that the CSL assessment ignores and deals inappropriately with accretion.	Disallow.
202		Section 4.2 - Managing development in response to coastal erosion hazard	Oppose	For reasons stated in CRU's submission .	Disallow.
202		Policy 4.8	Oppose	For reasons stated in my submission.	Disallow.

202		Policy 4.9	Oppose	For reasons stated in my submission. I note the relief sought with respect to reference to "adaptation strategies" and point out that the process for, and the content of, adaptation strategies is unknown and accordingly associated policies and rules are uncertain and invalid. I also note DOC reasons for opposing the use of the term "affordable" as failing to apply a net benefit approach to cost/benefit analysis, and DOC's support for reference to "cost effective" in the Explanation for the policy. I further note the relevance of RMA s5(2) and s7(b) in respect of this policy consideration.	Disallow.
202		Policy 4.10	Oppose	For reasons stated in my submission. The CSL assessment does not correctly apply the NZCPS, and in particular fails to give effect to Policy 24 of the NZCPS 2010.	Disallow.
202		Policy 4.11	Oppose	For reasons stated in my submission. I do however note the submitter's amendment which seeks to acknowledge that there are a range of options to mitigate hazard risk.	Disallow.
202		Policy 4.12 - 4.14	Oppose	For reasons stated in my submission. The CSL assessment does not correctly apply the NZCPS, and in particular fails to give effect to Policy 24 of the NZCPS 2010.	Disallow.
202		Policy 4.15	Oppose	For reasons stated in my submission. I do however note the submitter's point that prejudgement is contrary to best practice and the corresponding amendment which seeks to acknowledge that there are a range of options to mitigate hazard risk.	Disallow.
202		All Rules relating to CHMAs	Oppose	For reasons stated in my submission, the CRU submission and in the second submission of Rob Crozier and Joan Allin.	Disallow.
202		Chapter 9.1.1 - Introduction	Oppose	For reasons stated in the CRU submission. The Council has adopted an approach that is well beyond any reasonable precautionary approach and it is not risk-based.	Disallow

202		Policy 9.1	Oppose	For reasons stated in the CRU submission. The identification of coastal hazards is not in accordance with NZCPS 2010 and does not use the best available information.	Disallow.
202		Policy 9.2	Oppose	For reasons stated in the CRU submission. A risk-based approach has not been adopted.	Disallow.
202		Policy 9.3	Oppose	For reasons stated in my submission and the CRU submission. The CSL assessment is not in accordance with the Ministry for the Environment Guidelines (MfE 2008).	Disallow.
202		Policy 9.4	Oppose	For reasons stated in my submission and the CRU submission. The Council has adopted an approach that is well beyond any reasonable precautionary approach thereby bringing the precautionary approach into disrepute given the science supporting it has not been carried out appropriately, as with the CSL assessment.	Disallow.
202		Policy 9.5	Oppose	For reasons stated in my submission and the CRU submission. The policy can be seen as setting the stage for managed retreat in southern areas of the District.	Disallow.
202		Policy 9.6	Oppose	For reasons stated in the CRU submission. The policy can be seen as setting the stage for managed retreat in southern areas of the District.	Disallow.

Kāpiti Coast District Council (#440)
Private Bag 60601, Paraparaumu 5254

440	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Policy 4.6	Oppose	The Te Horo setback for amenity reasons has been in place for many decades, has been relied upon, is supported by people in Te Horo and should be retained.	Disallow.
440		Section 4.2 – under the heading Coastal hazards identified, page 4-9	Oppose	For the reasons stated in the CRU submission. The proposed amendment is an admission by the Council that the CSL hazard assessment does not assess probability or likelihood of occurrence of the hazard. I submit that this deficiency in the assessment is one of a number of aspects that contribute to the fundamentally flawed assessment and inappropriate PDP provisions.	Disallow.
440		Policy 4.11	Oppose	For the reasons stated in my submission and the CRU submission. The proposed amendment is an admission by the Council that the CSL hazard assessment does not assess probability or likelihood of occurrence of the hazard. I submit that this deficiency in the assessment is one of a number of aspects that contribute to the fundamentally flawed assessment.	Disallow.
440		Policy 4.12	Oppose in part	For the reasons stated in my submission and the CRU submission. The proposed amendment is an admission of the Council's lack of understanding of how the extent of the CHMAs should be determined. Errors such as this draw into question the entire basis on which the assessment was carried out, the matters that should have been considered by the Council under the RMA when preparing the PDP, the adequacy of the section 32 evaluation and the judgements made about the imposition of lines on hazard maps. However, I support the removal of the reference to the buffers.	Disallow in part.
440		Rule 4A.5.3	Oppose	For the reasons stated in the CRU submission.	Disallow.

440		Rule 4A.6.1	Oppose	For the reasons stated in the CRU submission.	Disallow.
-----	--	-------------	--------	---	-----------

Simon Arnold (#740)
PO Box 16135 Te Horo 5544

740	Simon Arnold	General - PDP provisions and the CSL assessment	Support	I supports the submitter's opposition to the CSL assessment being used as the basis for PDP provisions for the reasons stated in the submission.	Allow.
-----	--------------	---	---------	--	--------

Christopher Ruthe (#356)
199 Manly Street Paraparaumu 5032

356	Christopher Ruthe	Policy 4.10 - relocatables	Support	I support the submitter's opposition to the relocatable build CHMA provisions for the reasons stated in the submission and suggests the issues raised by the submitter should be considered in a section 32 analysis.	Allow.
-----	-------------------	----------------------------	---------	---	--------

Rob Crozier & Joan Allin (#451)
47 Rodney Avenue Te Horo Beach RD 1 Otaki 5581

451	Rob Crozier & Joan Allin	Policy 9.1 - 9.5	Support	I support opposition to Policies 9.1, 9.2, 9.3, 9.4 and 9.5 for the reasons stated in the submission and in the CRU submission.	Allow.
451		Objective 2.4	Support	For reasons stated in the submission and in the CRU submission.	Allow.
451		Objective 2.5	Support	For reasons stated in the submission and in the CRU submission.	Allow.

451		General - New policy to enable appropriate activities in the coastal environment	Support	I supports the submitter's opposition to the lack of a policy that deals with enabling appropriate subdivision, development and land use activities in the coastal environment and supports the remedy sought for a "New policy to enable appropriate activities in the coastal environment" (see explanation under same heading in the original submission).	Allow.
451		General - coastal hazard lines, PDP provisions and the CSL assessment	Support	I supports the submitter's request for a revised hazard assessment and PDP provisions that identify 'areas at high risk of being affected', taking into account the 'likely' effects of climate change, 'areas at high risk from natural hazards', 'highly hazard prone areas' as well as the 'likely' impact of future sea level rise for the reasons stated in the submission and in the CRU submission.	Allow.
451		Section 4.2	Support	I generally support the comments made by the submitter in relation to amendments necessary in a re-write of this section of the PDP.	Allow.
451		Section 4.2.1	Support	I generally support the comments made by the submitter in relation to amendments necessary in relation to policies in this section of the PDP and the remedy sought with respect to a legal and a planning audit of all of the provisions by experienced resource management practitioners, taking into account the submissions lodged; and the revised section 32 evaluation.	Allow.

Support for opposition to the CSL assessment

CRU notes the many submissions which sought more specific and appropriate local, neighbourhood or other assessment in relation to the identification of coastal hazards. CRU supports the general thrust of all of these submissions. CRU submits directly on a small selection below as being representative of this aspect of widespread opposition to the CSL assessment.

Don Frampton (#685)

10 Nuhaka Place Paraparaumu 5032

685	Don Frampton	General - coastal hazard lines, PDP provisions and the CSL assessment	Support	I support the submitter's opposition to the CSL assessment and associated coastal hazard lines [CHMA] shown on planning maps, and the PDP provisions, for the reasons stated. And more particularly, I support the submitter's request for more careful assessment of the issues at Paraparaumu Beach North (Map 08C) to take into account the KCDC actions with respect to the removal of sand from the active beach system in the area and supports the remedy sought with respect to a credit-allowance for the erosion effects of these unnatural (KCDC/man-made) sand excavations.	Allow.
-----	--------------	---	---------	---	--------

John Harding (#474)

15 Hungerford Road Lyall Bay Wellington 6022

474	John Harding	General - coastal hazard lines, PDP provisions and the CSL assessment	Support	I support the submitter's opposition to the CSL assessment and associated coastal hazard lines [CHMA] shown on planning maps, and the PDP provisions, for the reasons stated in the submission, my submission and in the CRU submission. And more particularly, I support the submitter's request for errors in the CSL assessment, including in relation to the assessment of the Waimeha Inlet, Waikanae Beach (Map 05C), to be corrected.	Allow.
-----	--------------	---	---------	--	--------