

563 **Change 22: Overall Strategy for Mapua/Ruby Bay**■ **SUBMISSIONS DEALT WITH IN THIS REPORT**

Consideration Order : 1

<b>C22.342.3</b>	<b>Adventurer Leisure Properties Ltd</b>	<b>6.15.3.6</b>	Delete reference to "channel entrance" in policy 6.15.3.6.
<b>C22.849.2</b>	<b>NZ Historic Places Trust</b>	<b>6.15.3.2</b>	Retain policy which aims to avoid loss of archaeological sites.
<b>C22.849.5</b>	<b>NZ Historic Places Trust</b>	<b>6.15.30</b>	Retain the reasons and explanation for Mapua policies.
<b>C22.1223.2</b>	<b>Garnett, Colin J &amp; Hulse, Carol</b>	<b>6.15.30</b>	Delete reference to Iwa Street. OR Use a building restriction on all areas subject to seawater inundation.
<b>C22.1223.6</b>	<b>Garnett, Colin J &amp; Hulse, Carol</b>	<b>6.15.30</b>	Remove all limitations to areas claimed to be subject to inundation.
<b>C22.1445.7</b>	<b>Director-General of Conservation</b>	<b>6.15.3.7</b>	Retain issue statement 6.15.3.7.
<i>Support</i>	FC22.3151.11		
<b>C22.1445.9</b>	<b>Director-General of Conservation</b>	<b>6.15.30</b>	Retain reasons including background on past and future erosion and hazards.
<i>Support</i>	FC22.3151.13		
<b>C22.3034.7</b>	<b>Gallagher, Devin &amp; Charmaine</b>	<b>6.15.1.9</b>	Clarify that submitter's land is not "low-lying flood prone land for ponding" and the extent of such land generally.
<i>Oppose</i>	FC22.3151.45		
<b>C22.3034.8</b>	<b>Gallagher, Devin &amp; Charmaine</b>	<b>6.15.3.2</b>	Delete policy 6.15.3.2 about accommodating growth on the hillslopes above the Bay.
<i>Oppose</i>	FC22.3151.46		
<b>C22.3034.9</b>	<b>Gallagher, Devin &amp; Charmaine</b>	<b>6.15.3.3</b>	Retain policy 6.15.3.3 but add new method of implementation such as rezoning submitters' land.
<i>Oppose</i>	FC22.3151.47		
<b>C22.3034.10</b>	<b>Gallagher, Devin &amp; Charmaine</b>	<b>6.15.3.6</b>	Retain policy 6.15.3.6 but apply it only to the extent of former Coastal Hazard Area.
<i>Oppose</i>	FC22.3151.48		
<b>C22.3034.11</b>	<b>Gallagher, Devin &amp; Charmaine</b>	<b>6.15.3.7</b>	Provide a more differentiated coastal hazard area with rules reflecting different hazard levels.
<i>Oppose</i>	FC22.3151.49		
<b>C22.3034.12</b>	<b>Gallagher, Devin &amp; Charmaine</b>	<b>6.15.3.12</b>	Amend to acknowledge that low-impact design is not appropriate in some parts of Ruby Bay.
<i>Oppose</i>	FC22.3151.50		
<b>C22.3034.15</b>	<b>Gallagher, Devin &amp; Charmaine</b>	<b>6.15.30</b>	Delete paragraph about historic erosion and add quote from Tonkin and Taylor report 2002 (wording supplied).
<i>Oppose</i>	FC22.3151.53		
<b>C22.3151.7</b>	<b>BibbySmith, Fiona and Family</b>	<b>6.15.30</b>	Ensure Mapua seawall is only to reduce erosion and is not altered to stop inundation.
<b>C22.3684.4</b>	<b>Tiakina te Taiao Ltd</b>	<b>C22 GEN</b>	Recognition of the concept of tangata whenua rangitiratanga (chieftainship) and kaitiakitanga in Council decision making.

**Staff Assessment Report : 563 - Change 22: Overall Strategy for Mapua/Ruby Bay**

<b>C22.3684.6</b>	<b>Tiakina te Taiao Ltd</b>	<b>C22 GEN</b>	Restore habitat so tangata whenua customs and practices can occur.
<b>C22.3684.7</b>	<b>Tiakina te Taiao Ltd</b>	<b>C22 GEN</b>	Develop working relationships with the submitter and allow monitoring of significant sites.
<b>C22.3692.5</b>	<b>Bannister, Frederick &amp; Annamarie</b>	<b>AM 87</b>	Rename Coastal Hazard Area.
<b>C22.3694.4</b>	<b>Blair, Malcolm &amp; Natalie</b>	<b>6.15.30</b>	Provide figures for sea level rise at Ruby Bay.
<b>C22.3701.1</b>	<b>Drewery, Graeme</b>	<b>C22 GEN</b>	Retain Plan Change 22.
<b>C22.3710.2</b>	<b>Jarvis, Martin D</b>	<b>6.15.3.7</b>	Delete policy 6.15.3.7 about identifying coastal hazard area.
<b>C22.3710.3</b>	<b>Jarvis, Martin D</b>	<b>6.15.30</b>	Remove reference to enlarged Coastal Hazard Area in 6.15.30.
<b>C22.3715.2</b>	<b>Le Petit, Gary and 95 others</b>	<b>6.15.3.7</b>	Change coastal hazard area reference in Policy 6.15.3.7 to "Coastal Protected Area".
<i>Oppose</i>	FC22.3151.79		
<b>C22.3715.3</b>	<b>Le Petit, Gary and 95 others</b>	<b>6.15.30</b>	Focus on achieving a more consistently engineered approach to protect the coastline and property.
<i>Oppose</i>	FC22.3151.80		
<b>C22.3718.12</b>	<b>Mapua and District Cycle-Walkways Group</b>	<b>6.15.3.7</b>	Change policy 6.15.3.7 so subdivision is prohibited and delete the reference to "development".
<i>Support</i>	FC22.3151.96		
<b>C22.3722.1</b>	<b>Ngaruroro Farm Ltd</b>	<b>6.15.3.2</b>	Strictly control future development so there is no excess runoff onto lower lying land.
<b>C22.3726.2</b>	<b>Rhodes, Charles R</b>	<b>6.15.30</b>	Delete reference to Tahi St as susceptible to sea level rise effects.
<b>C22.3736.2</b>	<b>Talley, P; Ryder, J; Fitchett, J</b>	<b>6.15.3.6</b>	Delete policy 6.15.3.6 on new buildings in areas of risk.
<i>Oppose</i>	FC22.3151.127		
<b>C22.3736.3</b>	<b>Talley, P; Ryder, J; Fitchett, J</b>	<b>6.15.3.7</b>	Delete policy 6.15.3.7 on identifying a coastal hazard area where subdivision and development is limited.
<i>Oppose</i>	FC22.3151.128		
<b>C22.3739.1</b>	<b>Waugh, J and Armstrong, A</b>	<b>6.15.3.6</b>	Delete policy 6.15.3.6 on avoiding buildings on parts of the coast most at risk from erosion, slips and inundation.

**■ ASSESSMENT**

1.0 SAR 563: OVERALL STRATEGY FOR MAPUA/RUBY BAY

The overall strategy for Mapua and Ruby Bay is stated in the set of policies given in 6.15.3 of the Tasman Resource Management Plan (TRMP). The policies have been updated in Plan Change 22 to address issues which are affecting, and are likely in the future to affect, Mapua and Ruby Bay. Coastal management at Mapua/Ruby Bay is being reviewed in the light of the NZ Coastal Policy Statement 2010, guidance provided by the Ministry of the Environment on climate change and sea level rise, and the Waimea Inlet Management Strategy 2010. Urban growth management for Mapua/Ruby Bay has also been reviewed for the Council's Long Term Plan. The LTP makes provision for a population of 2427 by 2031 (2006 population 1911) at Mapua/Ruby Bay.

2.0 POLICY 6.15.3.2

This key policy is to accommodate residential growth at Ruby Bay on the hillslopes above the Bay to retain a transition between urban and rural landscapes and to avoid exacerbating the risks from coastal erosion, inundation and the loss of archaeological sites on the coastal plain. There are a small number of submissions for and against this policy.

C22.3034.8 is concerned that the policy for growth on the hillslopes of Ruby Bay could direct stormwater flow to the coastal plain and artificially elevate groundwater levels. As the submitters have included a plan for 12 rural residential lots on their low-lying Rural 1 Coastal Zone site on the coastal plain with their submission, their concerns are understandable. Background engineering studies have been undertaken to plan for the future safe disposal of stormwater from the deferred Rural Residential Zone on the hillslopes behind Ruby Bay. It is possible that sea level rise will also have an effect in gradually elevating groundwater in low-lying coastal properties such as the submitters. The policy remains appropriate.

C22.3722.1 has similar concerns to the previous submitter and also refers to wastewater. She wants development to be self-sufficient in dealing with stormwater. It is recommended to clarify in the policy that the development allowed for is rural residential rather than residential.

C22.849.2 is supportive of the policy because it aims to avoid the loss of archaeological sites near the coast. The historical records show that the Ruby Bay coastal plain has a number of archaeological sites.

### 3.0 POLICY 6.15.3.6

Policy 6.15.3.6 is to avoid new buildings on those parts of the coastal margins, Mapua Channel entrance, and Ruby Bay cliffs, which are most at risk from erosion, slips and inundation. There are four submissions on this policy.

C22.3034.10 gives conditional support to the policy if it means that there is an avoidance of new buildings on land that is most at risk. That is the intention of the policy to avoid new buildings within specified setbacks from the Mapua Channel entrance, Ruby Bay cliffline and the coastal margin (land most at risk). One of the purposes of the setbacks is to help ensure the protection of buildings from damage from hazards.

C22.342.3 wants to delete the reference to the "Channel entrance" in the policy. It is important that buildings are set back from the Mapua Channel entrance because of the hazard risks apparent in that location. The setback rule in the Mapua Tourist Services Zone/Coastal Environment Area (which applies on the submitter's Mapua Leisure Park site) adjoining the Mapua Channel requires at least 30 metres setback. The existing Plan provisions are seeking to have buildings well set back from the Channel. The Mapua Channel entrance to the Waimea estuary is a very dynamic area characterised by powerful tidal flows. The NZ Coastal Policy Statement supports a precautionary approach.

C22.3736.2 owns a 2.29 ha site with sea frontage located at 154 Aranui Road. The submitter opposes policy 6.15.3.6 because the property is stated to be protected by a significant seawall and the land level has been filled to 5 metres. There is no dwelling on the property – only a shed about 100 metres back from the seawall. While the property is not actively eroding, it is affected by inundation when high spring tides and strong onshore winds coincide. Storm surge can have the same effect and cause inundation as waves impact on the seawall.

C22.3739.1 who own a property zoned Residential Closed at 6 Iwa Street, north of the Mapua Wharf oppose policy 6.15.3.6 on the grounds that the new policy framework is unnecessary and inappropriate. The minimum setback from mean high water springs for the submitters' property in the Residential Closed Zone / Coastal Environment Area is 30 metres. However the existing dwelling on the site is located well inside this setback. While it is protected by existing use rights, any new building would be expected to observe the setback rule.

A district plan must give effect to the NZ Coastal Policy Statement (Section 75(3)(b) RMA). Policy 6.15.3.6 is in accord with objective 5 of the NZ Coastal Policy Statement:- To ensure that coastal hazard risks, taking into account climate change, are managed by:

- Locating new development away from areas prone to such risks;
- Considering responses, including managed retreat, for existing development in this situation.

### 4.0 POLICY 6.15.3.7

Policy 6.15.3.7 is "to identify a coastal hazard area between Mapua and Ruby Bay where all subdivision and development will be strictly limited to avoid the long term adverse effects of coastal erosion and inundation". There are six submissions which vary greatly in what they seek.

C22.1445.7 Director General of Conservation supports the policy.

C22.3034.11 opposes a blanket approach and seeks a more differentiated approach to the coastal hazard area. As explained in the report above, the setback area already provides a degree of differentiation within the Coastal Hazard Area.

C22.3710.2 is opposed to the enlargement of the coastal hazard area and, in particular, that it has been extended to include his 4 hectare property at 44 Stafford Drive.

C22.3715.2 – This submitter represents a large group of people who signed a petition seeking that the name “coastal hazard area” be changed to “protected coastal area”. The submission acknowledges that development on a large scale might need to be limited but doesn’t want those who live there unduly penalised. A “hazard” is defined as “a danger or a risk”. One of the Council’s functions is to control the effects of the use of land including for the purpose of the avoidance or the mitigation of natural hazards (Section 31(b)(i) RMA) – so all the Council is trying to do is carry out its risk management function imposed on it under the Act. Hazard avoidance rather than protection by some means is the purpose of the Coastal Hazard Area. In respect of some other hazards in the district, the Council has used the term “risk area” for example “slope instability risk area”. Changing the name as sought may create a false sense of security for residents. While the existing walls may reduce risk, they do not remove it.

C22.3718.12 wants to make the policy more restrictive by changing “strictly limited” to “prohibited”. Because the Coastal Hazard Area is quite a large area, such a change is not supported as it is too restrictive. A graduated response is likely to be most effective and efficient.

C22.3736.3 does not support the new policy 6.15.3.7 as the submitters are of the view that their land is not at risk from flooding, erosion or inundation because it is protected by a substantial concrete wall. The submitters land is in a wider area that is subject to sea level rise and risk of inundation. Expensive maintenance has already been required to retain the integrity of the submitter’s existing slab seawall. The submitter’s property is in a location where the forces of coastal erosion will require that the concrete sea wall has ongoing maintenance to prevent the incursion of the sea. The hazard risk will remain long term.

#### 5.0 POLICY 6.15.3.3

There is only one submission (C22.3034.9) on this policy which is to provide improved management of cross-boundary effects of residential buildings and structures on the Ruby Bay flats. The submitter who has made extensive submissions on Plan Change 22 gives conditional support for the policy provided it adds as a method of implementation that the submitter’s land is zoned as either Residential or Residential Infill. The subdivision of the submitter’s land for residential purposes is contrary to the overall strategy of having future residential development at Ruby Bay on the hillslopes above Ruby Bay. Methods do not have the function of addressing site specific circumstances.

Previously there have been problems with having no coverage or daylighting rules applying to the dwellings located along Stafford Drive. Policy 6.15.3.3 addresses that issue.

#### 6.0 POLICY 6.15.3.12

C22.3034.12 gives conditional support to policy 6.15.3.12 which is “to minimise stormwater runoff through catchment wide management and utilize low impact stormwater design, where practicable, that provides for stormwater as well as open space and recreational needs”. The submitter is concerned that some parts of Ruby Bay may not be suitable for low impact design and would like that acknowledged. The Council’s Utilities Asset Engineer agrees that not all parts of Ruby Bay would be suitable for low impact design because of the hilly topography and clay soils.

#### 7.0 ISSUE 6.15.1.9

Issue statement 6.15.1.9 is about the integrated management of stormwater using low impact stormwater solutions where practicable, and maintaining low-lying flood prone land for ponding during major flood events. Submitter C22.3034.7 wants clarification of the land the Council considers to be flood prone land for ponding and specific acknowledgement that the submitters’ land is not flood prone. The submitters’ land located between Stafford Drive and Broadsea Avenue is quite low lying with LiDAR levels from 2.5 to 3.5 metres amsl (above mean sea level). The submitters oppose the wording if their land is included as flood prone as they maintain that proves the risk analysis is outdated.

The Engineering Department is undertaking stormwater work which will reduce, but not remove, the risk of flooding on the submitter’s site. This year a new flapgate was added to the stormwater sea outfall which crosses the submitter’s property. Any filling of the property is likely to pass stormwater to other properties. With predicted sea level rise, groundwater level could increase.

#### 8.0 IWI ISSUES

Submitter C22.3684 has requested more opportunities to work face-to-face with planning staff to give practical effect to iwi values. Many of the major Council projects at Mapua have involved liaison with iwi – for example the upgrading of the Seaton Valley Stream, the Toru Street causeway upgrading, the upgrading of the archaeological site register. Iwi monitoring was also incorporated in the rehabilitation project for the ex Fruitgrowers Chemical Company site.

The submitter has also expressed concern about the loss of habitats supporting indigenous species of flora and fauna. The Council has been encouraging the restoration of habitat in areas such as Mapua wetland, Aranui Park (Tane’s Ark), esplanade planting at Mapua estuary and in preparing the future plans at Seaton Valley Stream.

Iwi have asked for consultation and participation at the decision-making table. Council staff have met with the Tiakina Board prior to notifying the Plan Change as part of the consultation programme for the change. Further participation at the decision-making table goes beyond the scope of this Plan Change.

9.0 REASONS AND EXPLANATION 6.15.30

There are several submissions on the reasons and explanation for the policies for Mapua and Ruby Bay. There are two submissions that support the reasons and explanation - C22.849.5 and C22.1445.9 Director General of Conservation.

Others seek some alteration to the explanation. C22.3151.7 wants to ensure that the seawall is only for erosion and not altered to stop inundation.

C22.3694.4 wants figures provided for sea level rise at Ruby Bay. While there are tide gauges at Little Kaiteriteri and Port Nelson which in time will provide a long term record for tidal activity in Tasman Bay, the Council is using the Ministry for the Environment best practice advice on sea level rise for future planning at Mapua and Ruby Bay.

Submitter C22.3710.3 wants the reference to the enlargement of the Coastal Hazard Area removed from the explanation. Submitter C22.3726.2 wants to delete reference to Tahī Street and C22.1223.2 to Iwa Street as susceptible to sea level rise effects. These are not recommended actions.

**RECOMMENDATIONS AND REASONS**

**Recommendation 563.1**

<b>C22.849.2</b>	<b>NZ Historic Places Trust</b>	<b>Allow</b>
<b>C22.3034.8</b> <i>Allow</i>	<b>Gallagher, Devin &amp; Charmaine</b> FC22.3151.46	<b>Disallow</b>
<b>C22.3701.1</b>	<b>Drewery, Graeme</b>	<b>Allow</b>
<b>C22.3722.1</b>	<b>Ngaruroro Farm Ltd</b>	<b>Allow In Part</b>

**Plan Amendments**

*Topic : 6.15.3.2*

Amend Policy 6.15.3.2 by adding "rural" before the word "residential".

**Reasons**

1. Provision has been made for future residential development to occur on the hillslopes of Ruby Bay in a low density manner.
2. New areas for development have been deferred until stormwater and other services are provided.
3. The background engineering studies for Plan Change 22 have taken a 'whole of catchment' approach and have included the assumption that there will be very little further subdivision on the coastal plain. Additional capacity for stormwater is planned to be provided in the Seaton Valley Stream upgrade which should help mitigate the elevation of groundwater levels.
4. Limiting the amount of subdivision on the coastal plain will help reduce the loss of archaeological sites.

**Recommendation 563.2**

<b>C22.342.3</b>	<b>Adventurer Leisure Properties Ltd</b>	<b>Disallow</b>
<b>C22.3034.10</b> <i>Disallow</i>	<b>Gallagher, Devin &amp; Charmaine</b> FC22.3151.48	<b>Allow In Part</b>
<b>C22.3736.2</b> <i>Allow</i>	<b>Talley, P; Ryder, J; Fitchett, J</b> FC22.3151.127	<b>Disallow</b>
<b>C22.3739.1</b>	<b>Waugh, J and Armstrong, A</b>	<b>Disallow</b>

**Plan Amendments**

*Topic : 6.15.3.6*

No Plan amendments to Policy 6.15.3.6.

**Reasons**

1. The policy applies to that part of the coastline that is most at risk from coastal erosion and inundation, and that part of the cliffline that is most at risk from instability along the Ruby Bay cliffs.
2. The avoidance of buildings in the setback area is to ensure management of coastal hazard risk is in accord with objective 5 of the NZ Coastal Policy Statement - locating new development away from areas prone to such risks.
3. For those submitters such as submitters C22.3739.1 and C22.342.3 who have existing residential and commercial buildings close to the Mapua Channel and entrance within the setback area to mean high water springs, existing use rights under Section 10 of the RMA apply.
4. It is prudent that new buildings close to the Mapua Channel entrance should be set back because coastal erosion and

inundation are a feature of this dynamic sandspit area.

**Recommendation 563.3**

<b>C22.1445.7</b> <i>Allow</i>	<b>Director-General of Conservation</b> FC22.3151.11	<b>Allow</b>
<b>C22.3034.11</b> <i>Disallow</i>	<b>Gallagher, Devin &amp; Charmaine</b> FC22.3151.49	<b>Allow In Part</b>
<b>C22.3692.5</b>	<b>Bannister, Frederick &amp; Annamarie</b>	<b>Disallow</b>
<b>C22.3710.2</b>	<b>Jarvis, Martin D</b>	<b>Disallow</b>
<b>C22.3715.2</b> <i>Allow</i>	<b>Le Petit, Gary and 95 others</b> FC22.3151.79	<b>Disallow</b>
<b>C22.3718.12</b> <i>Disallow</i>	<b>Mapua and District Cycle-Walkways Group</b> FC22.3151.96	<b>Disallow</b>
<b>C22.3736.3</b> <i>Allow</i>	<b>Talley, P; Ryder, J; Fitchett, J</b> FC22.3151.128	<b>Disallow</b>

**Plan Amendments**

*Topic : 6.15.3.7*

No Plan amendments to Policy 6.15.3.7.

**Reasons**

1. The Council has previously identified an area of coastal hazard risk at Ruby Bay. In Plan Change 22 it has reviewed the extent of the coastal hazard area at Mapua and Ruby Bay in the light of new national guidance on sea level rise, LiDAR levels, stormwater modelling and the best available information on the likely effects of climate change on the district. The Mapua/Ruby Bay area has been given priority as an area at high risk of being affected.
2. There is a degree of differentiation in the Coastal Hazard Area in that the Council has imposed a minimum setback area from mean high water springs where permanent habitable buildings are not permitted (other than those that are already there and have existing use rights).
3. The Council has decided to strictly limit development rather than prohibit development throughout the coastal hazard area. It has differentiated an area of greater risk from the rest of the coastal hazard area.
4. Because there is not a consistent standard of hazard protection at Mapua Ruby Bay and there is a possibility that some of the current protection structures could fail, the Council has considered it prudent to define a hazard area.
5. The name of the Coastal Hazard Area has not been changed to Coastal Protection Area as this would suggest a protected area with no coastal hazard risks.
6. While existing coastal walls may reduce risk, they do not remove risk.

**Recommendation 563.4**

<b>C22.3034.9</b> <i>Disallow</i>	<b>Gallagher, Devin &amp; Charmaine</b> FC22.3151.47	<b>Allow In Part</b>
--------------------------------------	---	----------------------

**Plan Amendments**

*Topic : 6.15.3.3*

No Plan amendments to Policy 6.15.3.3.

**Reasons**

1. Policy 6.15.3.3 seeks to improve the management of the cross-boundary effects between residential buildings on the Ruby Bay flats where the previous Rural 1 Zone rules provided no daylight over and around rules and no coverage for dwellings on sites 4000 square metres or less.
2. Rezoning submitter C22.3034's 3.3 hectares land to Residential will not address the matters that the Council has been asked to address at Ruby Bay.
3. The policy decision is that the submitters' low-lying site is inappropriate for further residential subdivision and the zoning should not be amended.

**Recommendation 563.5**

<b>C22.3034.12</b> <i>Disallow</i>	<b>Gallagher, Devin &amp; Charmaine</b> FC22.3151.50	<b>Allow In Part</b>
---------------------------------------	---	----------------------

**Plan Amendments**

Topic : 6.15.3.12

No Plan amendments to Policy 6.15.3.12.

Topic : 6.15.30

Add to the end of the third paragraph after "Long Term Plan":

"While low impact stormwater systems are encouraged, they may not be appropriate on some areas such as hill or clay soil areas.

**Reasons**

The submitter has correctly identified that some areas are unsuitable for low-impact stormwater systems.

**Recommendation 563.6**

<b>C22.3034.7</b>	<b>Gallagher, Devin &amp; Charmaine</b>	<b>Disallow</b>
<i>Allow</i>	FC22.3151.45	

**Plan Amendments**

Topic : 6.15.1.9

No Plan amendments to issue statement 6.15.1.9.

**Reasons**

1. The submitters seek clarification as to whether their land is subject to being flood prone. The current stormwater works in the Ruby Bay area will reduce but not remove the risk of flooding on the submitter's land.
2. The submitter's 3.3 hectares land at 32 Broadsea Avenue is identified on LIDAR maps as being 2.5 to 3.5 metres above mean sea level. Any filling of the property is likely to pass stormwater to other properties nearby.

**Recommendation 563.7**

<b>C22.3684.4</b>	<b>Tiakina te Taiao Ltd</b>	<b>Allow In Part</b>
<b>C22.3684.6</b>	<b>Tiakina te Taiao Ltd</b>	<b>Allow</b>
<b>C22.3684.7</b>	<b>Tiakina te Taiao Ltd</b>	<b>Allow</b>

**Plan Amendments**

Topic : C22 GEN

No Plan amendments.

**Reasons**

1. The Council is encouraging the restoration of habitat to support indigenous species both within the Waimea Estuary and around its margins at Mapua. Eventually this will enhance the ability of tangata whenua to undertake customary practices associated with flora and fauna.
2. Iwi monitoring of significant sites in Mapua such as the remediation of the ex Fruitgrowers Chemical Company site has been occurring.
3. Consultation with tangata whenua is an integral part of Council's project management at Mapua.
4. Tangata whenua representation at the decision-making level is an issue that goes beyond the scope of Plan Change 22.

**Recommendation 563.8**

<b>C22.849.5</b>	<b>NZ Historic Places Trust</b>	<b>Allow</b>
<b>C22.1223.2</b>	<b>Garnett, Colin J &amp; Hulse, Carol</b>	<b>Disallow</b>
<b>C22.1223.6</b>	<b>Garnett, Colin J &amp; Hulse, Carol</b>	<b>Disallow</b>
<b>C22.1445.9</b>	<b>Director-General of Conservation</b>	<b>Allow</b>
<i>Allow</i>	FC22.3151.13	
<b>C22.3034.15</b>	<b>Gallagher, Devin &amp; Charmaine</b>	<b>Disallow</b>
<i>Allow</i>	FC22.3151.53	
<b>C22.3151.7</b>	<b>BibbySmith, Fiona and Family</b>	<b>Allow In Part</b>
<b>C22.3694.4</b>	<b>Blair, Malcolm &amp; Natalie</b>	<b>Disallow</b>

C22.3710.3	Jarvis, Martin D	Disallow
C22.3715.3	Le Petit, Gary and 95 others	Allow In Part
<i>Disallow</i>	FC22.3151.80	
C22.3726.2	Rhodes, Charles R	Disallow

**Plan Amendments**

Topic : 6.15.30

No Plan amendments to explanation 6.15.30.

**Reasons**

1. The Council has tide gauges at Little Kaiteiteri and Port Nelson to rely on for local tidal measurements.
2. Guidance on projected sea level rise has been obtained from the Ministry for the Environment and the NZ Coastal Policy Statement 2010. This guideline has application nationally.
3. It is relevant to include part of Iwa Street and Tahurangi Street in the explanation about coastal hazard risk because they are very low-lying areas close to the coast.
4. The new consent requirement for coastal protection structures will enable the Council to take a more consistent approach to protection works on private and public land.
5. Council believes that its approach in Plan Change 22 reflects a management strategy that is prudent for the present and adjustable over time in the light of new information.
6. Any increase in existing rock revetment height will be subject to a resource consent. One of the matters to be addressed will be whether such an action fits into Council's Long Term Plan for hazard risk management when considered alongside the NZ Coastal Policy Statement.