

APPENDIX 2

s32AA summary of amendments recommended to notified provisions

Guide to annotations:

- additions are shown as underlined
- deletions are shown as ~~struck through~~
- notified provisions are shown as **yellow highlight**
- recommended amendments to notified provisions are shown as **blue highlight**

AMENDMENT NO.	CHAPTER	PROVISION	PROPOSED AMENDMENTS	SUMMARY EVALUATION OF AMENDMENTS TO NOTIFIED PROVISIONS
DEFINITIONS				
1	2	New definition – finished floor level	<p>Finished Floor Level</p> <p><u>In relation to flood inundation the height as measured to the underside of floor joists for wooden structures or to the bottom of a concrete slab.</u></p>	<p>REASON FOR THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT</p> <p>It is proposed to add a definition for finished floor level to improve the clarity for applying this term within the rule framework. This is consistent with the relevant Building Code requirements which would also apply for the subject works. It is also required for clarity and to provide certainty for the purposes of establishing where to measure the finished floor level from to determine a proposal’s activity status including whether it is a Permitted Activity.</p> <p>EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT:</p> <p><i>Scale and Significance</i></p> <p>The proposed amendment enhances the clarity of the permitted activity standards proposed in the plan change which relate to raised floor levels. It does not alter the objectives of the Plan Change or the consistency of the proposal with the purpose of the Act. The change will also assist understanding for plan users and is consistent with application by other territorial authorities such as KCDC, guidance by GWRC and the Building Code requirements. The proposed amendment does not change how the proposed methods to achieve the proposed objectives will be implemented. Overall, it is considered to be of a low scale and significance.</p> <p><i>Costs and benefits</i></p> <p>The proposed amendment is not anticipated to result in any additional costs that were not considered within the original Section 32 assessment.</p> <p><i>Appropriateness</i></p> <p>The amendment is appropriate as it enhances the clarity of the proposed activity controls and reduces the likelihood of misinterpretation. The amendment will assist in the implementation of the relevant strategic direction from the RPS and – by enhancing the clarity of the proposed rules – will make for more effective and efficient implementation of the settled and proposed objectives and policies.</p>

AMENDMENT NO.	CHAPTER	PROVISION	PROPOSED AMENDMENTS	SUMMARY EVALUATION OF AMENDMENTS TO NOTIFIED PROVISIONS
2	2	Amended definition – Flood Hazard Extent	<p>Flood Hazard Extent</p> <p>The area identified within the District Plan (Part 5) Hazard Maps. This identifies the area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • susceptible to the average flood return interval of 100 years (1 in 100-year flood), incorporating climate change to 2090 and freeboard; but • excludes land within that area where the flood depth is not anticipated to exceed 100mm. <p>The Flood Hazard Extent comprises a High and Lower Hazard Area; High Hazard Area comprises the stream and river corridor, overflow paths and the Erosion Hazard Area Lower Hazard Area comprises the ponding area and some parts of the Erosion Hazard Area.</p>	<p>REASON FOR THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the definition of the Flood Hazard Extent to improve its clarity. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • clarification is provided that freeboard has been taken into account in defining the flood hazard extent; • the modelled flood depth less than 100mm has been excluded; and • the reference to the hazard areas has been removed as these were considered to complicate the definition. <p>EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT:</p> <p><i>Scale and Significance</i></p> <p>The proposed amendment is largely administrative and seeks to clarify the definition of flood hazard extent. It does not alter the objectives of the Plan Change or the consistency of the proposal with the purpose of the Act. The proposed amendment does not change how the proposed methods to achieve the proposed objectives will be implemented. Overall, it is considered to be of a low scale and significance.</p> <p><i>Costs and benefits</i></p> <p>The proposed amendment is not anticipated to result in any additional costs that were not considered within the original Section 32 assessment.</p> <p><i>Appropriateness</i></p> <p>Overall, the amendment is the most appropriate as it accurately records key parameters used in defining the extent, and for spatial reductions in the extent to exclude areas which are not anticipated to be subject to significant risk from flood events. The amendment will assist in the implementation of the relevant strategic direction from the RPS and – by enhancing the clarity of the definition – will make for more effective and efficient implementation of the settled and proposed objectives and policies.</p>
3	2	Amended definition – Ponding area	<p>Ponding area</p> <p>The area defined on the District Plan</p>	<p>REASON FOR THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the definition of the Ponding Area to improve its</p>

AMENDMENT NO.	CHAPTER	PROVISION	PROPOSED AMENDMENTS	SUMMARY EVALUATION OF AMENDMENTS TO NOTIFIED PROVISIONS
			<p>Part 5 Hazard Maps comprising areas of still, shallow or slow moving water during a flood event.</p>	<p>clarity. In particular, it is proposed to clarify that the ponding area by definition also includes shallow water, as this was one of the assessment criteria used to identify this hazard area.</p> <p>EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT:</p> <p><i>Scale and Significance</i></p> <p>The proposed amendment does not alter the objectives of the Plan Change or the consistency of the proposal with the purpose of the Act. The proposed amendment is largely administrative and seeks to clarify the definition of Ponding Area to assist with plan users’ understanding of this area. The proposed amendment does not change how the proposed methods to achieve the proposed objectives will be implemented. It is considered to be of a low scale and significance.</p> <p><i>Costs and benefits</i></p> <p>The proposed amendment is not anticipated to result in any additional costs that were not considered within the original Section 32 assessment.</p> <p><i>Appropriateness</i></p> <p>Overall, the amendment is the most appropriate as it accurately records key criteria used in defining the ponding area extent which was previously omitted, and for spatial reductions in the extent to exclude areas which are not anticipated to be subject to significant risk from flood events. The amendment will assist in the implementation of the relevant strategic direction from the RPS and – by enhancing the clarity of the definition – will make for more effective and efficient implementation of the settled and proposed objectives and policies.</p>
4	2	Amended definitions – River corridor & Stream corridor	<p>River Corridor The area as defined on the District Plan (Part 5) Hazard Maps as ‘River Corridor’ comprising the open river channel and land immediately adjacent to the river.</p>	<p>REASON FOR THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT</p> <p>Amending these two terms as proposed will reduce the likelihood of misinterpretation or associated uncertainty in applying the plan change provisions.</p> <p>EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT:</p>

AMENDMENT NO.	CHAPTER	PROVISION	PROPOSED AMENDMENTS	SUMMARY EVALUATION OF AMENDMENTS TO NOTIFIED PROVISIONS
			<p>Stream corridor The area as defined on the District Plan Part 5 Hazard Maps as 'Stream Corridor' comprising the open stream channel.</p>	<p><i>Scale and Significance</i> The proposed amendment does not alter the objectives of the Plan Change or the consistency of the proposal with the purpose of the Act. The proposed amendment is largely administrative and seeks to confine the two areas to the spatial extent shown on the proposed hazard maps to assist plan users. The proposed amendment does not change how the proposed methods to achieve the proposed objectives will be implemented. It is considered to be of a low scale and significance.</p> <p><i>Costs and benefits</i> The proposed amendment is not anticipated to result in any additional costs that were not considered within the original Section 32 assessment.</p> <p><i>Appropriateness</i> Overall, the amendment is the most appropriate as it reduces uncertainty in the provisions. For example, by referring to 'the open stream channel' the notified definitions are unclear that parts of the river and stream corridors contain piped/culverted sections. Removing this ambiguous text will provide clarity and ensure the high hazard area is appropriately identified as that shown on the proposed Hazard Maps.</p>
ISSUES, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES				
5	9	Objective 9.3.3 – addition to explanation	<p>9.3.3 To control earthworks within identified Flood Hazard Extents and Erosion Hazard Areas to ensure that the function of the floodplain is not reduced and unacceptable flood risk to people and property is avoided or mitigated.</p> <p>Earthworks can result in unacceptable risk for future</p>	<p>REASON FOR THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT The amendment better aligns the explanation with the intent of the proposed policy. As notified, the explanation insinuates that avoidance is the only outcome anticipated, whereas the objective itself clearly anticipates avoidance and mitigation as options.</p> <p>EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT: <i>Scale and significance</i> The amendment is largely for clarification purposes, and is of a low scale and significance.</p>

AMENDMENT NO.	CHAPTER	PROVISION	PROPOSED AMENDMENTS	SUMMARY EVALUATION OF AMENDMENTS TO NOTIFIED PROVISIONS
			<p>development or obstruct or divert flood flow paths. Where earthworks are proposed within the Flood Hazard Extent or Erosion Hazard Area, the natural hazard constraints should be considered and areas subject to high hazards are avoided or earthworks managed to protect the integrity of the high hazard area.</p>	<p><i>Costs and benefits</i> The proposed amendment is not anticipated to result in any additional costs that were not considered within the original Section 32 assessment.</p> <p><i>Appropriateness</i> The amendment is appropriate in that it more clearly aligns the explanation with the intent of the objective – being to avoid or mitigate risk.</p>
6	9	Policy 9.4.6 – minor amendment to explanation	<p>9.4.6 Limit earthworks in the high hazard areas within identified Flood Hazard Extents and Erosion Hazard Areas to avoid an increase in risk from flood hazards to people and property.</p> <p>Earthworks in high hazard areas are generally inappropriate and can result in the diversion of flood waters, blocking of water flow, or reduce bank stability, which can increase the risk to surrounding properties. To maintain the function of the floodplain it is important that the passage of flood waters is not impeded or blocked.</p>	<p>REASON FOR THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT Similar to the above amendment, this change better aligns the explanation with the intent of the proposed policy. As notified, the explanation insinuates that earthworks are always inappropriate in high hazard areas, whereas the policy itself is about limiting earthworks in those areas such that risk is appropriately managed.</p> <p>EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT:</p> <p><i>Scale and significance</i> The amendment is largely for clarification purposes, and is of a low scale and significance.</p> <p><i>Costs and benefits</i> The proposed amendment is not anticipated to result in any additional costs that were not considered within the original Section 32 assessment.</p> <p><i>Appropriateness</i> The amendment is appropriate in that it more clearly aligns the explanation with the intent of the policy. This will reduce the likelihood for misinterpretation of the policy to the benefit of the effective administration of the Plan.</p>

AMENDMENT NO.	CHAPTER	PROVISION	PROPOSED AMENDMENTS	SUMMARY EVALUATION OF AMENDMENTS TO NOTIFIED PROVISIONS
7	14	New Objective 14.3.3 & explanation	<p><u>To control buildings and activities within the upper areas of the Pinehaven Catchment Overlay to ensure that peak stormwater runoff during both a 1 in 10-year and 1 in 100-year event does not exceed the existing run off and therefore minimise the flood risk to people and property within the Flood Hazard Extent.</u></p> <p><u>Development in the Pinehaven Catchment Overlay needs to be controlled to ensure that stormwater runoff does not exacerbate the impact of flooding in the lower catchment. Most of the upper catchment is currently undeveloped and any new development has the potential to affect the land use and peak stormwater runoff. This objective seeks to ensure that the peak stormwater runoff does not increase, thereby increasing the flood risk downstream.</u></p>	<p>REASON FOR THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT</p> <p>This new objective will support the achievement of hydraulic neutrality in the Pinehaven Catchment Overlay. Under Chapter 9 there is a proposed objective (9.3.4) that seeks to control subdivision to ensure that hydraulic neutrality is achieved. This is then supported through the proposed policy and rule framework under Chapter 9.</p> <p>Under Chapter 14, the policy and rule framework to control buildings and activities in the Pinehaven Catchment Overlay to achieve hydraulic neutrality. However, this policy and rule framework is not linked to a specific objective such as that for subdivisions within the Pinehaven Catchment Overlay in Chapter 9.</p> <p>The proposed objective therefore ensures that there is a similar objective, policy and rule framework applying to new buildings in the Pinehaven Catchment Overlay as there is to subdivisions. This proposed objective strengthens the requirement to achieve hydraulic neutrality for buildings in the Pinehaven Catchment Overlay and is consistent with the approach for subdivisions.</p> <p>EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT:</p> <p><i>Scale and significance</i></p> <p>The proposal adds an objective to the Plan Change. It relates directly to the achievement of the purpose of the Act and the implementation of direction from the RPS. It extends the proposed plan change approach to hydraulic neutrality to include structures to ensure that there is a consistent approach to subdivisions and buildings in the Pinehaven Catchment Overlay.</p> <p><i>Costs and benefits</i></p> <p>The proposed amendment is not anticipated to result in any additional costs that were not considered within the original Section 32 assessment.</p> <p><i>Appropriateness</i></p> <p>While the notified provisions included policies and other methods relating to the management of buildings and activities to achieve hydraulic neutrality, the overall outcome anticipated in this respect was not stipulated in the</p>

AMENDMENT NO.	CHAPTER	PROVISION	PROPOSED AMENDMENTS	SUMMARY EVALUATION OF AMENDMENTS TO NOTIFIED PROVISIONS
				<p>relevant objectives. The amendment remedies this oversight, consistent with the hydraulic neutrality outcomes sought in relation to subdivision. The amendment will make the Plan more effective in its implementation of the Act’s sustainable management purpose and in giving effect to relevant strategic direction from the RPS.</p>
8	14	Policy 14.4.8	<p>14.4.8: Within the Mangaroa River Flood Hazard Extent enable accesses positioned above the 1:100 year level to serve dwellings where located within the lower hazard areas and avoid locating accesses to serve dwellings when located within high hazard areas.</p>	<p>REASON FOR THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT The amendments clarify that it is only access to dwellings that are required to be above the 1 in 100-year flood hazard extent. Policy 14.4.8 is intended to ensure that it is access to dwellings that are above the 1 in 100-year flood hazard extents in accordance with the RPS requirements.</p> <p>EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT:</p> <p><i>Scale and significance</i> The amendment is largely for clarification purposes, and is of a low scale and significance.</p> <p><i>Costs and benefits</i> The proposed amendment is not anticipated to result in any additional costs that were not considered within the original Section 32 assessment.</p> <p><i>Appropriateness</i> The amendment is appropriate in that it more clearly states the intended direction of the policy as it relates to access. The added clarity will assist with the effective and efficient implementation of the proposed and settled objectives in Chapter 14.</p>
9	16	Issue 16.2.1 – amendment to explanation	<p>Network utilities and their on-going functioning can be affected by flood hazards. It is also possible for network utilities to increase the impact of flood hazards, particularly where linear infrastructure crosses stream or river corridors. The effect of flood hazards</p>	<p>REASON FOR THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT The amendment clarifies that the explanation is relevant to both the impact of flooding on utilities and vice versa.</p> <p>EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT:</p> <p><i>Scale and significance</i></p>

AMENDMENT NO.	CHAPTER	PROVISION	PROPOSED AMENDMENTS	SUMMARY EVALUATION OF AMENDMENTS TO NOTIFIED PROVISIONS
			<p>on new network utilities and the impact of new network utilities on the flood hazards needs to be avoided or mitigated.</p>	<p>The amendment is largely for clarification purposes, and is of a low scale and significance.</p> <p><i>Costs and benefits</i> The proposed amendment is not anticipated to result in any additional costs that were not considered within the original Section 32 assessment.</p> <p><i>Appropriateness</i> The amendment is appropriate in that it more clearly states the intended direction of the issue. It will assist with the administration of the District Plan as it relates to the interface between utilities and natural hazards.</p>
10	16	Objective 16.3.5	<p>16.3.5: To ensure the continued operation of network utilities, and the development and operation of new network utilities in flood hazard extents and to maintain the function of the floodplain to convey flood waters.</p>	<p>REASON FOR THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT The amendment clarifies that the explanation is relevant to both the impact of flooding on utilities and vice versa.</p> <p>EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT: <i>Scale and significance</i> The amendment is largely for clarification purposes, and is of a low scale and significance.</p> <p><i>Costs and benefits</i> The proposed amendment is not anticipated to result in any additional costs that were not considered within the original Section 32 assessment.</p> <p><i>Appropriateness</i> The amendment is appropriate in that it more clearly states the intended direction of the issue. It will assist with the administration of the District Plan as it relates to the interface between utilities and natural hazards.</p>
11	16	Policy 16.4.19	<p>16.4.19: To control manage the design and location of network utilities in</p>	<p>REASON FOR THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT The amendments recognise that it is not always possible to build</p>

AMENDMENT NO.	CHAPTER	PROVISION	PROPOSED AMENDMENTS	SUMMARY EVALUATION OF AMENDMENTS TO NOTIFIED PROVISIONS				
			<p>identified Flood Hazard Extents to ensure their resilience to the effects of operation is not compromised during a flood events</p>	<p>infrastructure outside of flood hazard extents. The revisions enable the construction located in the Flood Hazard Extent of infrastructure that is resilient to natural hazards, when they are.</p> <p>EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT:</p> <p><i>Scale and significance</i></p> <p>The amendment refines the plan change’s approach to managing the interface between two matters of regional significance, being in relation to infrastructure and hazards. It is considered to be of moderate scale and significance.</p> <p><i>Costs and benefits</i></p> <p>Though the costs and benefits have not been quantified, the proposed amendments are anticipated to result in similar if not reduced overall costs relative to the notified provisions. This is owing to lower potential regulatory and compliance costs associated with future infrastructure proposals in hazard areas.</p> <p><i>Appropriateness</i></p> <p>The amendment is appropriate as it recognises that it is not always possible to locate infrastructure outside of the Flood Hazard Extents. In such circumstances, design, location and other mitigation responses are appropriate. The amendments will enhance the Plan’s implementation of the relevant strategic direction from the NPSET and from the RPS in relation to both Hazards and regionally significant infrastructure.</p>				
RULES								
12	23	Rules – amendments to Table 23.1 and new rule + standards 23.17	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="719 1230 1099 1294">Earthworks within the Pinehaven Flood Hazard Extent</td> <td data-bbox="1099 1230 1187 1294"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="719 1326 1099 1390">Earthworks associated with the maintenance, upgrade or</td> <td data-bbox="1099 1326 1187 1390">P</td> </tr> </table>	Earthworks within the Pinehaven Flood Hazard Extent		Earthworks associated with the maintenance, upgrade or	P	<p>REASON FOR THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT</p> <p>The amendments recognise that some earthworks associated with infrastructure are appropriate in the Flood Hazard Extent, provided they do not increase the risk from flooding. This includes works within road reserve that are carried out in the area shown as Stream/River corridor.</p>
Earthworks within the Pinehaven Flood Hazard Extent								
Earthworks associated with the maintenance, upgrade or	P							

AMENDMENT NO.	CHAPTER	PROVISION	PROPOSED AMENDMENTS	SUMMARY EVALUATION OF AMENDMENTS TO NOTIFIED PROVISIONS
			<p>installation of network utilities within the ponding area, overflow path, or river corridor of the Pinehaven Flood Hazard Extent where earthworks are located within the legal road reserve, and complies with standards under Rule 23.17.</p>	<p>EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT:</p> <p><i>Scale and significance</i></p> <p>The amendment refines the plan change’s approach to managing the interface between two matters of regional significance, being in relation to infrastructure and hazards. It is considered to be of moderate scale and significance.</p>
			<p>Earthworks within the Pinehaven Flood Hazard Extent (excluding those associated with flood protection works and network utilities that are otherwise provided for as permitted activities), which are within the overflow path or stream corridor.</p>	<p><i>Costs and benefits</i></p> <p>Though the costs and benefits have not been quantified, the proposed amendments are anticipated to result in similar if not reduced overall costs relative to the notified provisions. This is owing to lower potential regulatory and compliance costs associated with future infrastructure proposals in hazard areas.</p>
			<p>Earthworks within the Mangaroa Flood Hazard Extent</p>	<p><i>Appropriateness</i></p> <p>The amendment is appropriate as it enables benefits to be realised from infrastructure by providing for associated earthworks where they do not result in increased hazard effects. The amendments will enhance the Plan’s implementation of the relevant strategic direction from the NPSET and from the RPS in relation to both Hazards and regionally significant infrastructure.</p>
			<p>Earthworks associated with the maintenance, upgrade or installation of network utilities within the overflow path or river corridor of the Mangaroa Flood Hazard Extent where earthworks are located within the legal road reserve, and complies with the standards under Rule 23.17.</p>	
			<p>Earthworks within the River</p>	

AMENDMENT NO.	CHAPTER	PROVISION	PROPOSED AMENDMENTS	SUMMARY EVALUATION OF AMENDMENTS TO NOTIFIED PROVISIONS
			<p>Corridor of the Mangaroa Flood Hazard Extent (excluding those associated with network utilities that are otherwise provided for as permitted activities)</p> <p>23.17 Earthworks associated with the maintenance, upgrade or installation of network utilities within the identified Pinehaven and Mangaroa Flood Hazard Extents where earthworks are located within the legal road reserve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ground levels are reinstated to those existing prior to the works; or, • Earthworks are associated with the installation of underground utilities using directional drilling or thrusting techniques. 	
13	30	Rules – amendment to Rule 30.8(a)	<p>30.8(a) Network utility structures (excluding cabinets) that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cross a stream or river; and, • are within an identified flood hazard area; <p>must either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • be located underground; 	<p>REASON FOR THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT</p> <p>The amendments enable the installation of network utility infrastructure in identified flood hazard areas, where it does not increase flood hazard risk. Specifically, the amendment recognises the flood hazard of existing crossing structures is marked by their lowest point, and provided that is not reduced by new facilities, the risk is not anticipated to be increased.</p>

AMENDMENT NO.	CHAPTER	PROVISION	PROPOSED AMENDMENTS	SUMMARY EVALUATION OF AMENDMENTS TO NOTIFIED PROVISIONS
			<p>or, • positioned above the 1 in 100-year flood level, except when attached to existing lawfully established crossing structures such as bridges in which case the Network utility structure must not be fixed or positioned any closer to the stream bed or river bed than the lowest point of the existing crossing structure.</p>	<p>EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT:</p> <p><i>Scale and significance</i> The amendment refines the plan change’s approach to managing the interface between two matters of regional significance, being in relation to infrastructure and hazards. It is considered to be of low scale and significance.</p> <p><i>Costs and benefits</i> Though the costs and benefits have not been quantified, the proposed amendments are anticipated to result in similar if not reduced overall costs relative to the notified provisions. This is owing to lower potential regulatory and compliance costs associated with future infrastructure proposals in hazard areas.</p> <p><i>Appropriateness</i> The amendment is appropriate as it enables benefits to be realised from infrastructure and adopts a pragmatic approach to managing risk of existing structures. The amendments will enhance the Plan’s implementation of the relevant strategic direction from the NPSET and from the RPS in relation to both Hazards and regionally significant infrastructure.</p>
14	30	Rules – Amended matters of discretion under 30.13	<p>Except in the case of cabinets, where located within an identified Flood Hazard Extent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whether the extent to which the utility or network utility structure will be adversely impacted during a flood event; - Where proposed to cross a river or stream, the extent to which whether the Network Utility Structure will adversely contribute to blockages or obstructing flood flows; - Whether the extent to which the 	<p>REASON FOR THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT</p> <p>The amendments recognise that it is the scale of the impact of proposed utility structures that determines whether or not they will be appropriate in a flood hazard extent. This refines the notified approach which was focussed on whether or not an effect exists.</p> <p>EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT:</p> <p><i>Scale and significance</i> The amendment refines the plan change’s approach to managing the interface between two matters of regional significance, being in relation to infrastructure and hazards. The amendments are largely editorial; however, the recommended fourth matter adjusts the overall suite of discretionary scope to consider benefits that can be realised from the infrastructure in</p>

AMENDMENT NO.	CHAPTER	PROVISION	PROPOSED AMENDMENTS	SUMMARY EVALUATION OF AMENDMENTS TO NOTIFIED PROVISIONS
			<p>utility will adversely impact the flood hazard area, exacerbating the effect on people and property on adjacent sites and/or adversely affect the function of the flood hazard extent.</p> <p>- the extent to which locating the Network Utility Structure within the Flood Hazard Extent will provide any local, regional or national benefit.</p>	<p>question. It is considered to be of low-to-moderate scale and significance.</p> <p><i>Costs and benefits</i></p> <p>Though the costs and benefits have not been quantified, the proposed amendments are anticipated to result in similar if not reduced overall costs relative to the notified provisions. This is owing to lower potential regulatory and compliance costs associated with future infrastructure proposals in hazard areas.</p> <p><i>Appropriateness</i></p> <p>The amendment is appropriate as it enables benefits to be realised from infrastructure and adopts a pragmatic approach to managing risk of existing structures. The range of matters stipulated in the notified provisions are narrower than the recommended suite, particularly in that proposals considered under this rule would not have expressly taken account of the (potentially regionally or nationally) significant benefits from infrastructure. The amendments will enhance the Plan’s implementation of the relevant strategic direction from the NPSET and from the RPS in relation to both Hazards and regionally significant infrastructure.</p>
15	33	Rules – Amended Table 33.1 relating to hydraulic neutrality provisions	<p>Amend the following entry in Table 33.1:</p> <p>Any building within the Pinehaven Catchment Overlay must achieve hydraulic neutrality for stormwater runoff.</p>	<p>REASON FOR THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT</p> <p>The proposed amendment is administrative and aligns the clause with the normal drafting used in the plan change provisions and other rule tables in the operative District Plan.</p> <p>EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT:</p> <p><i>Scale and Significance</i></p> <p>The proposed amendment does not alter the objectives of the Plan Change or the consistency of the proposal with the purpose of the Act. It is largely administrative and seeks to ensure that the proposed rule is in an appropriate format. The proposed amendment does not change how the proposed methods to achieve the proposed objectives will be implemented, and is considered to be of low scale and significance.</p>

AMENDMENT NO.	CHAPTER	PROVISION	PROPOSED AMENDMENTS	SUMMARY EVALUATION OF AMENDMENTS TO NOTIFIED PROVISIONS
				<p><i>Costs and Benefits</i></p> <p>The proposed amendment is not anticipated to result in any additional costs that were not considered within the original Section 32 assessment.</p> <p><i>Appropriateness</i></p> <p>The amendment provisions are more appropriate than the notified version as they better align with the settled format of rules in the operative Plan and the plan change. The standards for the rule (as notified) contain an appropriate elevation trigger for any activities that do not achieve hydraulic neutrality in the Pinehaven Catchment Overlay. As such, the wording of the rule within the table should be clarified to avoid confusion and allow the standards to determine the activity status.</p>
16	33	Amended Rule – Table 33.1 relating to erosion hazard provisions	<p>Amend the following entry in Table 33.1:</p> <p><u>Within the Ponding Area or Erosion Hazard Area of the Mangaroa Flood Hazard Extent, the primary driveway or vehicle access serving the dwelling where below the 1 in 100 year flood level.</u></p>	<p>REASON FOR THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT</p> <p>The amendment removes the unnecessary reference to the Erosion Hazard Area from the notified rule for driveways/access point in the Mangaroa Flood Extent to acknowledge that the erosion effects are not relevant to the flood inundation effect focus of this rule.</p> <p>EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT:</p> <p><i>Scale and Significance</i></p> <p>The proposed amendment does not alter the objectives of the Plan Change or the consistency of the proposal with the purpose of the Act. It removes the unintended consequence of the notified provisions which unnecessarily require assessment of accessways for flood depth purposes. It is considered to be of a low scale and significance.</p> <p><i>Costs and Benefits</i></p> <p>The proposed amendment is not anticipated to result in any additional costs that were not considered within the original Section 32 assessment.</p> <p><i>Appropriateness</i></p> <p>The proposed amendment amounts to a more efficient suite of methods for</p>

AMENDMENT NO.	CHAPTER	PROVISION	PROPOSED AMENDMENTS	SUMMARY EVALUATION OF AMENDMENTS TO NOTIFIED PROVISIONS
				<p>achieving the proposed objectives without any reduction in effectiveness. The purpose of the rule is to capture and assess activities comprising driveway accesses where they are below the 1 in 100 year flood level. The Erosion Hazard Area need not be included for this rule because it does not relate to water inundation levels - rather it is based on the erosion risk of the river bank. Moreover, the Erosion Hazard Area is not entirely within the Flood Hazard Extent. This is a different hazard and not one that is addressed by having a driveway or vehicle access above the 1:100 flood level.</p>
17	33	Amended Rule – Table 33.1	<p>Amend the following entry in Table 33.1:</p> <p><u>Within either the Ponding Area or Erosion Hazard Area of the Mangaroa Flood Hazard Extent, where one or more of the following occurs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>the construction of new dwellings</u> • <u>the alteration and addition to existing dwellings</u> • <u>construction of otherwise permitted non-residential buildings;</u> • <u>residential accommodation for caretaker activities in the Business Industrial Zone</u> <p><u>which have a FFL below the 1 in 100 year flood level.</u></p>	<p>REASON FOR THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT</p> <p>The amendment removes the unnecessary reference to the Erosion Hazard Area from the notified rule for buildings in the Mangaroa Flood Extent to acknowledge that the erosion effects are not relevant to the flood inundation effect focus of this rule.</p> <p>EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT:</p> <p><i>Scale and Significance</i></p> <p>The proposed amendment does not alter the objectives of the Plan Change or the consistency of the proposal with the purpose of the Act. It removes the unintended consequence of the notified provisions summarised above and is considered to be of a low scale and significance.</p> <p><i>Costs and Benefits</i></p> <p>The proposed amendment is not anticipated to result in any additional costs that were not considered within the original Section 32 assessment.</p> <p><i>Appropriateness</i></p> <p>The proposed amendment amounts to a more efficient suite of methods for achieving the proposed objectives without any reduction in effectiveness. The purpose of the rule is to capture and assess activities comprising finished floor levels below the 1 in 100-year flood level. The Erosion Hazard Area need not be included for this rule because it does not relate to water inundation levels - rather it is based on the erosion risk of the river bank.</p>

AMENDMENT NO.	CHAPTER	PROVISION	PROPOSED AMENDMENTS	SUMMARY EVALUATION OF AMENDMENTS TO NOTIFIED PROVISIONS
				<p>Moreover, the Erosion Hazard Area is not entirely within the Flood Hazard Extent.</p> <p>It is also noted that all buildings require resource consent under Table 33.1 as a Restricted Discretionary Activity and an appropriate assessment of the Erosion Hazard would be undertaken as part of this assessment. As such, by removing the Erosion Hazard Area from this rule, it avoids duplication rather than creating any gaps in the plan change’s proposed regulatory approach.</p>
18	33	Table 33.1 – new note for utility structures	<p>NOTE</p> <p>Network Utility Structures are addressed through the provisions within Chapters 16, 23 and 30. For the avoidance of doubt any Network Utility Structure activity undertaken by a network utility operator within the Flood Hazard Extent subject to the provisions of Chapters 16, 23 and 30, will prevail over the provisions of Chapter 14 and 33.</p>	<p>REASON FOR THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT</p> <p>The notified provisions did not make it clear whether utility structures in the flood hazard extent are subject to the provisions in Chapters 14 and 33 or 16, 23 and 30 (or both). The proposed amendment clarifies this ambiguity and reduces the potential for unnecessary duplication.</p> <p>EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT:</p> <p><i>Scale and significance</i></p> <p>The amendment clarifies the plan change’s intended approach to managing the interface between two matters of regional significance, being in relation to infrastructure and hazards. The amendments are largely clerical and are considered to be of low scale and significance.</p> <p><i>Costs and benefits</i></p> <p>Though the costs and benefits have not been quantified, the proposed amendments are anticipated to result in similar if not reduced overall costs relative to the notified provisions. This is owing to lower potential regulatory and compliance costs associated with future infrastructure proposals in hazard areas.</p> <p><i>Appropriateness</i></p> <p>The amendment is clerical in nature and will assist with the efficient administration of the Plan as relates to new utility structures in flood hazard areas.</p>

AMENDMENT NO.	CHAPTER	PROVISION	PROPOSED AMENDMENTS	SUMMARY EVALUATION OF AMENDMENTS TO NOTIFIED PROVISIONS
19	33	33.9 Rule amendment	<p>Any building within the Pinehaven Catchment Overlay must achieve hydraulic neutrality for stormwater runoff.</p>	<p>REASON FOR THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT</p> <p>Similar to the amendment to the hydraulic neutrality provisions in Table 33.1 described above, this proposed amendment is administrative and aligns the clause with the normal drafting used in the plan change provisions and other rules in the operative District Plan.</p> <p>EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT:</p> <p><i>Scale and Significance</i></p> <p>The proposed amendment does not alter the objectives of the Plan Change or the consistency of the proposal with the purpose of the Act. It is largely administrative and seeks to ensure that the proposed rule is in an appropriate format. The proposed amendment does not change how the proposed methods to achieve the proposed objectives will be implemented, and is considered to be of low scale and significance.</p> <p><i>Costs and Benefits</i></p> <p>The proposed amendment is not anticipated to result in any additional costs that were not considered within the original Section 32 assessment.</p> <p><i>Appropriateness</i></p> <p>The amendment provisions are more appropriate than the notified version as they better align with the settled format of rules in the operative Plan and the plan change. The standards for the rule (as notified) contain an appropriate elevation trigger for any activities that do not achieve hydraulic neutrality in the Pinehaven Catchment Overlay. As such, the wording of the rule itself should be clarified to avoid confusion and allow the standards to determine the activity status.</p>
20	33	33.11 Rule amendment	<p>Within the Ponding or Erosion Hazard Area of the Mangaroa Flood Hazard Extent, the primary driveway or vehicle access serving the dwelling where below the 1 in 100-year flood level is a Restricted Discretionary Activity.</p>	<p>REASON FOR THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT</p> <p>The amendment removes the unnecessary reference to the Erosion Hazard Area from the notified rule for driveways/access point in the Mangaroa Flood Extent to acknowledge that the erosion effects are not relevant to the flood inundation effect focus of this rule. The proposed amendment also ensures that Rule 33.11 is consistent with the rule wording in Table 33.1.</p>

AMENDMENT NO.	CHAPTER	PROVISION	PROPOSED AMENDMENTS	SUMMARY EVALUATION OF AMENDMENTS TO NOTIFIED PROVISIONS			
				<p>EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT:</p> <p><i>Scale and Significance</i> The proposed amendment does not alter the objectives of the Plan Change or the consistency of the proposal with the purpose of the Act. It removes the unintended consequence of the notified provisions which unnecessarily require assessment of accessways for flood depth purposes. It is considered to be of a low scale and significance.</p> <p><i>Costs and Benefits</i> The proposed amendment is not anticipated to result in any additional costs that were not considered within the original Section 32 assessment.</p> <p><i>Appropriateness</i> The proposed amendment amounts to a more efficient suite of methods for achieving the proposed objectives without any reduction in effectiveness. The purpose of the rule is to capture and assess activities comprising driveway accesses where they are below the 1 in 100 year flood level. The Erosion Hazard Area need not be included for this rule because it does not relate to water inundation levels - rather it is based on the erosion risk of the river bank. Moreover, the Erosion Hazard Area is not entirely within the Flood Hazard Extent. This is a different hazard and not one that is addressed by having a driveway or vehicle access above the 1:100 flood level.</p>			
OTHER METHODS							
21	16	Anticipated environmental results – amendment to 16.6	Amend the proposed entry in the table under 16.6 as follows: <table border="1" data-bbox="725 1217 1184 1367"> <tr> <td data-bbox="725 1217 1184 1273">Anticipated environmental results</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="725 1273 1184 1329">...</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="725 1329 1184 1367">The avoidance of the potential for</td> </tr> </table>	Anticipated environmental results	...	The avoidance of the potential for	<p>REASON FOR THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT The amendments clarify that the Anticipated Environmental Result only applies to <i>new</i> network utilities as opposed to existing network utility structures</p> <p>EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT: <i>Scale and Significance</i></p>
Anticipated environmental results							
...							
The avoidance of the potential for							

AMENDMENT NO.	CHAPTER	PROVISION	PROPOSED AMENDMENTS	SUMMARY EVALUATION OF AMENDMENTS TO NOTIFIED PROVISIONS
			<p>network utilities to increase ing flood hazard risk or impacting on flood hazard structures.</p>	<p>The proposed amendment is clerical only and of a low scale and significance</p> <p><i>Costs and benefits</i> The proposed amendment is not anticipated to result in any additional costs that were not considered within the original Section 32 assessment.</p> <p><i>Appropriateness</i> The minor change is consistent with the scope of the PC42 provisions being to manage future activities, rather than existing. It is for clarification purposes only and reduces the potential for the provisions to be misinterpreted by Plan users.</p>
22	Part 5 - Planning Maps	Urban and Rural Hazard Maps	<p>Amend the flood hazard maps by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - removing all portions of the flood hazard extent anticipated to have a maximum depth of 100mm (or less) during a 1% AEP event; and - making several minor alterations to the Pinehaven Catchment overlay area to rationalise the area against property boundaries. 	<p>REASON FOR THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT The amendments are in response to submissions seeking that portions of the flood extent are removed where they present no notable risk to people or property, and to ensure that hydraulic neutrality is implemented in the Pinehaven Catchment.</p> <p>EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT: <i>Scale and Significance</i> The proposed guide is of low-to-moderate scale and significance. By removing portions of the overlay area from the flood extent, there is a potential for some land affected by the 1%AEP event to remain subject to risks from that flood hazard that would otherwise be mitigated by the proposed provisions.</p> <p><i>Costs and benefits</i> The proposed amendment is anticipated to result in similar, if not lower overall costs than were considered within the original Section 32 assessment for the notified provisions. The benefits will be similar as well, particularly the avoidance of significant risks to people and property from flood hazard events; however, some additional benefits may be realised through the reduction in the flood hazard extent by way of regulatory and</p>

AMENDMENT NO.	CHAPTER	PROVISION	PROPOSED AMENDMENTS	SUMMARY EVALUATION OF AMENDMENTS TO NOTIFIED PROVISIONS
				<p>compliance cost savings (relative to the notified provisions).</p> <p><i>Appropriateness</i></p> <p>The proposed guide will assist with the effective administration of the Plan and the general understanding of the provisions by interested parties. It will reduce the likelihood for misinterpretation and provide a comprehensive and centralised resource for the public to access relevant information from on this matter.</p>
23	N/A	Users' guide to provisions	<p>Creation of a users' guide to be available digitally and in hard form for access by the public. The guide should contain clear information about the plan change to assist affected property owners, prospective buyers, insurers, lenders and other interested parties, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the origins of the flood maps, how they were generated, and what <i>specific</i> information they project; - a description of the policies and rules and the interrelationship between them and the flood maps; - FAQs and responses about technical information used and relied upon (freeboard, overland flow, 1%AEP event, etc); - practical guidelines / suggestions to assist future applicants with resource consent applications made in relation to the plan change provisions; and 	<p>REASON FOR THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT</p> <p>The guide is proposed to assist Plan users, affected landowners and other interested parties in understanding the plan change provisions and their implications on subdivision and land use in the Pinehaven and Mangaroa catchments.</p> <p>EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT:</p> <p><i>Scale and Significance</i></p> <p>The proposed guide is of low scale and significance. It does not affect the Plan provisions directly, though it will assist with their effective implementation.</p> <p><i>Costs and benefits</i></p> <p>The proposal will result in additional capital costs for the Council to generate the information, and to distribute the information digitally and in hard copy. This cost has not been quantified; however, it is not anticipated to be significant given that the information is already to hand, and the guide is within the normal operating capacity and skills of the Council to administer. Moreover, the guide will result in benefits above the methods afforded by the notified provisions by virtue of enhanced understanding of the provisions by interested parties.</p> <p><i>Appropriateness</i></p> <p>The proposed guide will assist with the effective administration of the Plan and the general understanding of the provisions by interested parties. It will</p>

AMENDMENT NO.	CHAPTER	PROVISION	PROPOSED AMENDMENTS	SUMMARY EVALUATION OF AMENDMENTS TO NOTIFIED PROVISIONS
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - links to supporting information, reports, and other useful resources for interested parties. 	<p>reduce the likelihood for misinterpretation and provide a comprehensive and centralised resource for the public to access relevant information from on this matter.</p>