

# Proposed District Plan Change 22 – Hazard (Fault Line) Area Re-alignment and Rules

## SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

<b>Submission No. 1</b>	<b>Brian Hasell</b>	<b>5B Raroa Road Kelburn Wellington</b>	<b>Would like to speak at the hearing</b>
<p><b>Support and Opposition</b>            The submitter supports the identification of the likely fault rupture area. IGNS have adequately identified the likely rupture area as mapped and it is important that this is shown in the District Plan. I support this remaining (as now proposed) with the relevant building controls. However the submitter opposes the need for the buffer area. Beyond the rupture area there is a need to alert a wide area of Wellington (very much greater than the arbitrary 20 metre strip proposed) to the likely effects of severe ground movement and to construct buildings, other structures and services accordingly.</p> <p>The submitter seeks that the Hazard (Fault Line) Area [ie. the buffer area only, not the inner fault rupture area] be deleted from the planning maps and all consequential changes made to the proposed rules. The submitter also seeks that the Council continue a strong information campaign on the earthquake hazard targeted at all Wellington residents and developers.</p>			

<b>Submission No. 2</b>	<b>Susan Jane Peacock</b>	<b>32 Tinakori Road Thorndon Wellington</b>	<b>Would like to speak at the hearing and will make a joint submission</b>
<p><b>Seeks amendments</b>            The Plan should make it clear that it is only land actually in the fault hazard zone that will be affected. Under the proposed new zoning only a very small triangle of our property will be included in the hazard zone. I understand it is the intention that the rest of the land is unaffected by the rules, but that is not stated and it certainly needs to be.</p> <p>The submitter seeks that the Council clarify that only land actually within the fault hazard is subject to the rules. Thus, for example, we at our house would not be subject to the new rules providing we don't seek to build on the back triangle of our land.</p>			

<b>Submission No. 3</b>	<b>Gillian Fastier</b>	<b>43 Chatsworth Road Silverstream</b>	<b>Submitter did not indicate whether or not she wanted to be heard at the hearing</b>
<p><b>Support</b>            I support Council's proposal to consider buildings of more than two levels in the area covered by Change 22 subject to the provision of a geotechnical and an engineer's design report to a Council's satisfaction.</p>			

<b>Submission No. 4</b>	<b>Timothy Gerard Arbuckle</b>	<b>100 Tinakori Road Thorndon Wellington</b>	<b>Does not wish to speak at the hearing</b>
<p><b>Seeks amendments</b>            The submission relates specifically to the effect of the Plan Change on the submitter's property at 100 Tinakori Road. The proposed hazard area shaves the rear end of the property well clear of any structures.</p> <p>1. They submitter seeks that their property is removed from the proposed hazard area as the vast majority of the section (&gt; 98%) and the entire structure do not face any risk from the fault rupture</p>			

area.

2. If 100 Tinakori Road is retained in the hazard area then any proposed building restrictions or special standards should only apply to the small area of land (if any) that is actually within the Hazard Area.

We strongly request the Council make a decision to exclude 100 Tinakori Road from the Hazard Area. If declined then decide in favour of item 2 above.

---

Submission No. 5	Wellington City Council	PO Box 2199 Wellington	Would like to speak at the hearing and will make a joint submission
------------------	-------------------------	------------------------	---

**Seeks amendments**

The submission relates to the fourth bullet point in Rule 5.1.3.1. It is currently unclear whether the rule applies to new residential units on a site that is partly covered by the hazard area, when the residential units will actually be built away from the hazard area. The intention is that the one household unit rule should only apply in that part of the site that is covered by the hazard area.

The submission seeks that the rules in the Plan be reworded to clarify that additional development controls only apply to proposed developments which are affected by the Hazard (Fault Line) Area. The submission outlines specific decisions sought by the Council as noted below:

1. That the words in the fourth bullet point in Rule 5.1.3.1 are deleted and the following words inserted “no more than one household unit shall be permitted on any part of a site that is within the Hazard (Fault Line) Area”.

2. That the following *consequential changes* be made to rules 5.3.4, 5.3.6, 5.3.10 and 5.4.9 as outlined below:

§ **Rule 5.3.4**

Insert the words “in the circumstances where rule 5.4.9 applies” at the start of the third bullet point

€ **Standard and Terms for rule 5.3.6**

That the words “one site” in the third line be deleted and replaced with the words “any part of a site in the Hazard (Fault Line) Area”.

€ **Assessment criteria for rule 5.3.6**

That the word “site” in the first line of assessment criterion 5.3.6.4 be deleted.

€ **Italicised explanation for rule 5.3.6**

That the last sentence of the italicised explanation (“Rule 5.3.6 only applies to single units on one site.”) be deleted.

§ **Rule 5.3.10**

After the word “except” in the fifth line of the rule, insert the words “in the circumstances where rule 5.4.9 applies”.

€ **Rule 5.4.9**

That the words “any site in” in the third line of rule 5.4.9 be deleted and replaced with the words “any part of a site within”.

€ **Assessment Criteria for rule 5.4.9**

That the word “site” in the first line of assessment criterion 5.4.9.3 be deleted.

---

Submission No. 6	Greater Wellington Regional Council	PO Box 11-646 Wellington	Wishes to be heard at the hearing
------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------

**Supports Plan Change, but seeks amendments**

Greater Wellington supports the proposed amendments to the planning maps and rules, and the addition of new rules for activities in the Hazard (Fault Line) Areas.

The submitter partially supports section 3.2.2.13 and Rules 17.3.2 and 19.4.1. In terms of section 3.2.2.13 all activities except those under rule 19.4.1 have to supply a geotechnical and engineering

reports. Section 3.2.2.13 should be amended to also apply to Rule 19.4.1. For rules 17.3.2 and 19.4.1 the submitter believes the proposed assessment criteria do not appropriately describe what will be assessed if an activity, structure or building is located in the hazard area.

The submitter requests the following relief:

1. That the council adopts Proposed Plan Change 22 to adjust the boundaries of the Hazard (Fault Line) Area and amends the rules that apply to activities within the Hazard (Fault Line) Area to reflect new information about the location of the fault.
2. That section 3.2.2.13 be amended as follows:  
3.2.2.13: Where an application for a Land Use consent is for a development within a Hazard (Fault Line) Area ~~that does not comply with the conditions of a permitted activity~~, the applicant must provide a geotechnical report and an engineering design report.
3. That the following wording, or something to like effect, replace the proposed assessment criteria to Rule 17.3.2 and 19.4.1:

17.3.2.9: ~~Whether the activity, structure or building is located in a Hazard (fault Line) Area.~~  
Where a structure or building is located within a Hazard (Fault Line) Area, the degree to which measures have been adopted to mitigate the potential adverse effects from a fault rupture hazard event.

19.4.1.6: ~~Whether the activity, structure or building is located in a Hazard (fault Line) Area.~~  
Where a structure or building is located within a Hazard (Fault Line) Area, the degree to which measures have been adopted to mitigate the potential adverse effects from a fault rupture hazard event.

<b>Submission No. 7</b>	<b>Rosemary Collins</b>	<b>204 Glenmore Street Northland Wellington 6005</b>	<b>Does not wish to speak at the hearing</b>
<p>I take issue with the report on which this proposed plan change is based and its limited application (restricted study area). The submitter argues that the analysis in the report in the area of 196 Glenmore street is an over-simplification of the issues involved. The submitter believes there are reasons (other than the existence of the fault) for the seepage and poor ground conditions at 196 Glenmore Street and believes these problems are more likely to be caused by poor land management than the fault.</p> <p>Secondly the submitter is concerned that the report only covers the portion of Wellington that lies within the urban area of Wellington City and believes that raises serious questions about the integrity of the Land Information Memorandum.</p> <p>The council maintains that properties affected by the proposed plan change are unlikely to lose value, be difficult to sell, or to attract higher premiums as a consequence. I would like an undertaking from the Council that, if the plan is implemented in its present form, it will monitor this situation. Should it become apparent that the current owners of affected properties have incurred financial losses as a result of the plan change, they should be eligible for compensation.</p>			

<b>Submission No. 8</b>	<b>Pieter and Anne van Melle</b>	<b>26 Upton Tce Thorndon Wellington</b>	<b>Does not wish to speak at the hearing</b>
<p><b>Seeks amendments</b></p> <p>The submission relates to the wording on Land Information Memorandums relating to the earthquake hazard and the inclusion of definition of risk relating to public land that falls within the newly defined earthquake-risk zones.</p>			

The submitters seek the following relief:

1. amend the format of all LIM reports to list all types of noted risk on all LIM reports
2. prior to the changes to the Plan being approved:
  - a. commission at its own expense an investigation by the IGNS into the stability and structure of the large rock (known locally as 'elephant rock') located in the Town Belt on public walkway – above our house and one other at the top of Upton Terrace, and which is located in the newly defined hazard zone and make this report available to affected residents.
  - b. Document a process for management of the ageing pine trees in the Town Belt that are located within either of these two newly defined zones.

<b>Submission No. 9</b>	<b>Martin Phillip Sidoruk</b>	<b>15 Barton Tce Thorndon Wellington</b>	<b>Wishes to speak at the hearing</b>
-------------------------	-------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------

**Oppose**

1. Provisions 5.3.6.5, 5.4.9.4, 7.3.9.2, 13.16.7.2, 13.3.5.2. The submitter opposes the current wording for the description Buffer Zone as the Hazard (fault Line) Area and also the lack of clarity between the arbitrary buffer zone and the hazard rupture area. The submitter believes this wording mis-represents the findings and accuracy of the GNS work and creates the perception that the buffer zone is in fact the fault line danger zone.

The submitter seeks that the three paragraphs of text describing the hazard zone need to be reworded to refer to the Hazard (Fault Line) Area as the Buffer Zone which is consistent with the rest of the GNS report and other references to the buffer within the plan changes ie. table 1 option 1.3.

2. The submitter also opposes the 20m buffer zone inclusion within the hazard area without more accurate evidence to support this decision. For properties that are only partially affected, I believe the negative perceptions and additional compliance costs of having a buffer zone on 5m of the property are not justified unless further evidence is presented to support this decision. The submitters seeks that the buffer zone be reduced to between 5m and 10m or do the extra work necessary to provide more accurate information. Alternatively, remove properties only partially affected by the buffer (5 or less metres) from the hazard area. This applies mostly in the Barton Tce area.

3. Provision 5.1.3. I would like to see the section amended to provide more clarity for decisions on an around partially affected properties. The submitter seeks that additional explanation to clarify these situations is added and that the plan is specific about what properties are affected and that it only applies to the part within the Buffer Zone.

<b>Submission No. 10</b>	<b>Vector Limited</b>	<b>c/- Luke Barfoot Minter Ellison Rudd Watts BNZ Tower PO Box 3798 Auckland</b>	<b>Wishes to speak at the hearing</b>
--------------------------	-----------------------	--	---------------------------------------

**Seeks Amendments**

The submission relates to section 3.2.2.13. A number of the small above ground utility structures that VECTOR is likely to need to install in Wellington City (such as berm substations and gas regulator stations) will not comply with the permitted activity standards and VECTOR will need to comply with the new section 3.2.2.13. VECTOR considers the requirement for geotechnical and engineering design reports in such cases as unnecessary and onerous.

The submitter seeks that the Council delete the requirement to provide, in relation to network utility structures, a geotechnical report and engineering design report. Alternatively, if that relief cannot be provided the deletion of the proposed new section 3.2.2.13.

<b>Submission No. 11</b>	<b>Tony Robert Clode and Eileen Lynette Clode</b>	<b>19/A Myrtle Street</b>	<b>Does not wish to speak at the hearing</b>
<b>Oppose Rule 5.1.3.1</b> The submitter opposes Rule 5.1.3.1 on the grounds that assuming site coverage and height restrictions will still apply, two small dwellings each of 2 or 3 bedrooms are inherently safer for the occupants than one large 4 or 5 bedroom dwelling. Also, this provision disadvantages those who planned to construct two units on our site. The submitter seeks that no change be made to Rule 5.1.3.1.			