Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
Further Submitter 1: Stephen Taylor						
Stephen Taylor	8.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Entire submission	Support	I would like to strongly object to the current submissions on a number of grounds. The sub-division has been completed some 40 years ago. No new homes can be built, and no sections remain in Seymour Grove. Highlighting the area will be a blight on any future sale of property in the area as will have a negative effect on perception and value. It is likely to increase insurance premiums as insurance companies are naturally risk averse. Council engineers need to evaluate risk on new developments but to carry out assessments retrospectively on developments that are many decades old seems like an overreach and totally unfair. It can only lead to owners of the properties being penalised through no fault of their own and the distinct possibility that property values will be affected. I purchased my property some years ago and no such information was on that LIM report which may well have affected my decision to buy, whether	Accept this further submission point in part, in that the High Slope Hazard Overlay has been reduced on the property, but not to the full extent sought in the original submission.

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
					the risk to the property is real or just a desktop analysis. I do not believe it is the job of the council to blight ratepayers' homes. See full further submission for additional details.	
Further Submitter 2: Ryan Baker						
Jeff Price	58.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	The fact that the flat areas of land have been tagged as high slope hazards which should not be.	Support	My home has also had flat areas of our section which have been tagged as high slope hazard. See full further submission for additional details.	**Accept** this further submission point **in part,** in that the High Slope Hazard Overlay has been reduced on the property, but not to the full extent sought in the original submission.
Further Submitter 3: M de Jong						
Martin de Jong	51	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Entire submission	Support	Why is the council developing plans guided by an act that has been repealed? The council knew a long time ago about this development, yet it continues to spend ratepayer's money on a plan that will not meet the new laws. Furthermore, if the natural hazards chapter has not been reviewed since 2004 while required to every 10 years under the old RMA act, what has the council been doing for the	**Reject** this further submission point – For the reasons outlined in the S42a report.

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
					last 18 years and why this belated effort on something which is now obsolete? What is the OPEX for this project, how much has been spent in the last 2 years and how much more is planned to be spend when the new laws are in place? Is a bylaw based on a repealed act legally viable? See full further submission for additional details.	
Further Submitter 4: Pat van Berkel						
John and Lynne Hill (also submitters 60, 62, 64, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 73, 76, 77, 80, 83, 85, 87, 90, 92,96, 97, 101 who all have similar wording)	59.1	Peat Hazard Overlay	Entire submission point	Oppose	I oppose the "more streamlined approach" as this could mean ignoring consideration of: • climate change mitigation • peat fire prevention • carbon sink protection • peatland protection • future Council liability (for consenting a building on an unsuitable site)	Accept in part this further submission point – in that the rule framework applying to the Mangaroa Peat Overlay has not changed as a result of these submissions. However, the reasons for retaining the rule framework are not for the reasons outlined in the further submission.

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
John and Lynne Hill	59.2	Peat Hazard Overlay	Entire submission point	Oppose	I oppose the renaming of the Peat hazard zones for the following reasons: • Protecting and restoring the Mangaroa Peatland is an important environmental gain. It is the largest peatland in the lower North Island. • The language of the District Plan should fully adhere to the GW Regional Policy Statement as it reflects care for the environment. GWRC goals are the goals of the people of the Wellington Region. • I am grateful that the GWRC goals lead to saving the peatland and hence do not want the language in the District Plan to distance the peatland from those goals. • Preventing the release of stored carbon is very worthwhile to reduce climate change.	Accept in part this further submission point in that the name of the Mangaroa Peat Overlay has not changed through this process. However, the reasons for retaining the name of the Mangaroa Peat Overlay are not for the reasons outlined in the further submission.
John and Lynne Hill	59.3	Peat Hazard Overlay	Entire submission point	Oppose	I oppose the renaming of the categories of risk for the Peat hazard because:	Reject this further submission point – The proposed framework has always been a risk-based approach to natural hazards.

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
					• Peatland is not just "some" risk. • If development on peat proceeds it will mean the loss of the largest wetland in the lower North Island and will result in the emission of the sequestered carbon. This is explained in RPS Change 1. • UHCC is obliged to look after the peatland on behalf of the citizens of the Wellington Region and indeed the world. • We have witnessed Cyclone Gabrielle's destructive power and there is high risk that such an event will occur in Upper Hutt, in which case houses built on the peatland will be at high risk of severe damage. • If the peatland continues to be drained it will become a fire risk. Underground peat fires are notoriously difficult to control.	
John and Lynne Hill	59.4	Peat Hazard Overlay	Entire submission point	Oppose	I oppose the withdrawal of the cost benefit analysis because: • "Lived experience" is no longer applicable as our	Accept in part this further submission point in that the name of the Mangaroa Peat Overlay has not changed through this process. However, the reasons for retaining the

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
					climate is changing. Science says that extreme weather events across NZ (including Upper Hutt) will be more often, and more intense. • Insurability will change throughout New Zealand, including Upper Hutt, as a result of Cyclone Gabrielle rather than "hazard overlays". • UHCC must ensure its liability is not under-estimated when consenting building on high-risk areas.	cost benefit analysis are not for the reasons outlined in the further submission.
John and Lynne Hill	59.5	Peat Hazard Overlay	Entire submission point	Support	I support the amendment of the peatland maps to reflect the true situation. • A comprehensive ground truthing survey using modern instruments should be used to determine the extent, type and depth of the peatland. • The landowners will need to allow the survey on their land.	Reject this further submission point – For the reasons outlined in the section 42a report.
John and Lynne Hill	59.7	Peat Hazard Overlay	Entire submission point	Support	I support accepting the invitation to visit their property and assess the extent, type and depth of the peat on their property using modern equipment.	Accept this further submission point in part, in that the High Slope Hazard Overlay has been reduced on the property, but not to the full extent sought in the original submission.

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
Further Submitter 5: Mary Beth Taylor						
Teresa Homan	26	Plan Change	Entire submission	Support	Adopt PC47. The risks associated with building in seismic areas, high slope areas and on the Mangaroa Peatland can only be fully avoided by not consenting in these areas.	**Reject** this further submission point – For the reasons outlined in the section 42a report.
WREMO-Jeremy Holmes	35	Plan Change	Entire submission	Support	Adopt PC47.	**Accept** this further submission point.
Robert Anker	43	Plan Change	Entire submission	Oppose	Adopt PC47 as is. 1. Peat soil bought at the garden store is not a hazard. The hazard is human activity on a peatland. Detailed mapping of the geomorphology of individual sections of land can be done within individual resource consents. 2. Coffey report and PC50 deliberately did not include the Mangaroa Peatland as it would be considered in PC47. 3. Peat soil in itself is not a hazard. The hazard is human activity on a peatland. Detailed mapping of the geomorphology of individual sections of land can be done	**Accept** this further submission point in that the points it opposes in the original submission have been rejected. This is outlined in the Section 42a report.

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
					within individual resource consents. 4. Council is not responsible for financial or market influences on private property. Property speculation is risky, and all property owners know this. 5. There has always been risk associated with human activity on peatlands, especially building dwellings. Peat dwellers are forever vulnerable to 'upstream' neighbours' continued ditching and draining to keep the water flowing out of the peatland to provide some stability. Should the ditches be blocked and the water allowed to remain in the peatland (re-wetting) there is the risk of raising the level of the water table. With Climate Change events intensifying the risk of increased water retention and rising water levels is a reality. This must be taken into consideration with PC47. 6. S32 supports other protective legislation at regional and central government levels	

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
					that requires a risk-based approach to the management of human activities on natural hazards. The current district plan must give effect to these pieces of legislation. PC47 provides this.	
Bruce Ridley	45	Peat Hazard Overlay	Entire submission	Oppose	Adopt PC47 as is. Pro-forma Submissions (identical information) have been submitted by the KMD 'Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group. **Submissions 43 (partially) 45, 59 (relating Mangaroa peat overlay), 60, 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 73, 76, 77, 80, 83, 85, 87, 88, 89 (partially), 90, 92, 96, 97, 98, 100 are to be considered as a single submission.** This amounts to 27 identical or nearly identical pieces of information. My comments below relate to ALL of the pro-forma initial submissions. 1. "Peat is just another soil type." True. The Hauraki Peat you buy at the garden supplies store is just another soil type. 2. The peat found in the Mangaroa Peatland is part of a complex geo-morphological	**Accept** this further submission point **in part** in that the points it opposes in the original submission have been rejected. However, the reasons for the rejecting these submission points are different to those outlined in the further submission and these reasons are outlined in the Section 42a report.

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
					feature. The underlying geomorphology (physical features of the surface of the earth and their relation to its geological structures that support the surface) and hydrology of peat basins must be taken into consideration when considering subdivision consents. 3. It is prudent to take a liberal approach when determining the extent of the peatland. Better to be safe than sorry. Landowners have had the invitation to have their land re-assessed to determine the peatland extent. I took Council up on this invitation with good results. 4. The 'Hazard' is the human activity in unstable areas. 5. Climate Change is not taken into consideration. Science says that we will experience increased numbers and increased intensity of weather events including storms, rain and flooding especially on the western side of the Remutakas. This is particularly relevant for a	

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
					peatland. We can no longer rely on the past to make good planning decisions for the future. 6. Land use decision must be future proofed to reflect the expected impact of human induced Climate Change. We must protect not only the environment from humans but also humans from themselves.	
Greater Wellington Regional Council	52	Plan Change	Entire submission	Support	Incorporate all suggested changes. This will more closely align UHCC PC47 with protective legislation already in place at regional and central government levels. Especially support the wording change from 'not increase risk of damage' to '**will minimise risk of damage'**. In addition, I suggest a further wording change to this phrase, 'will minimise risk of damage to property **and the environment**.' We must begin to work towards a less human-centric view of the natural environment.	**Accept in part** this further submission point – The majority of the Greater Wellington Regional Council submission points have been accepted. However, not all the points raised in the Greater Wellington Regional Council submission were accepted.
Philip Clegg	67	Peat Hazard Overlay	Entire submission	Oppose	Human "Depopulation" of a peatland is an excellent idea. However, in light of PC47 it sounds like scare	**Accept** this further submission point **in part** in that the points it opposes a number of the original submission

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
					mongering. Putting a stop to subdividing a bog is a wise move. 'Peatland Retreat' should be considered. Remember that the Mangaroa Peatland has been known locally as the Waipango Swamp and the Wallaceville Swamp. Katherine Mansfield Drive was previously called Swamp Road. Protection and restoration of peatlands to capture carbon is appropriate and overdue and would amount to significant gains in local climate change mitigation and biodiversity restoration.	points have been rejected. However, the reasons for the rejecting these submission points are different to those outlined in the further submission and these reasons are outlined in the Section 42a report. I however note that submission points 67.2 and 67.5 were accepted and that submission point 67.4 were accepted in part. In that regard, the further submission on these original submission points are **rejected.**
Heather Blissett	79	Plan Change	Entire submission	Support	Agree in full with a change of terminology to reflect the hazardous behaviour and activities of humans in relation to the natural environment. This change of tone would embody a lot of recent environmentally protective legislation. It would also clarify the fact that the landforms, tectonic plate activity and geo-morphology of the Earth are natural and expected features of the planet. What are unnatural and hazardous are the activities humans do and where they do them in order to	**Reject** this further submission point for the reasons outlined in the Section 42a report.

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
					develop the human-centric built environment generally for financial gain.	
Pat van Berkel	95	Peat Hazard Overlay	Entire submission	Support	Adopt PC47 with amendments suggested in Submission 95. Recommend UHCC refers to their Sustainability Strategy 2020 Goal 1 (carbon reduction) and Goal 2 (prioritise protecting and enhancing natural environment). Take action to make progress toward protecting and restoring the Mangaroa Peatland in order to restore its ability to provide the ecosystem services peatlands can supply.	**Reject** this further submission point for the reasons outlined in the Section 42a report.
Mary Beth Taylor	102	Peat Hazard Overlay	Entire submission	Amend. Support if not amended.	Recommend UHCC refers to their Sustainability Strategy 2020 Goal 1 (carbon reduction) and Goal 2 (prioritise protecting and enhancing natural environment). This is very relevant for PC47. Take action to make progress toward permanently protecting and restoring the Mangaroa Peatland in order to restore its ability to provide the ecosystem services peatlands can supply. This will mean no further subdivision and no further expansion	**Reject** this further submission point for the reasons outlined in the Section 42a report.

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
					of the human-built environment deeper into the peatland. Increased urgency in prohibiting additional human-built development on peatlands is highlighted by recent climate change induced weather events. Best to avoid a potential disaster before it happens. PC47, if the above provisions are not adopted, still represents the most prudent, common-sense approach to evaluating the appropriateness of development on an individual basis on the peatland. For this reason, I support PC47.	
Tony Chad	103	Peat Hazard Overlay	Entire submission	Amend. Support if not amended.	Recommend UHCC refers to their Sustainability Strategy 2020 Goal 1 (carbon reduction) and Goal 2 (prioritise protecting and enhancing natural environment). This is very relevant for PC47. Take action to make progress toward permanently protecting and restoring the Mangaroa Peatland in order to restore its ability to provide the ecosystem services peatlands can supply. This will mean no further subdivision and no further expansion	Reject this further submission point for the reasons outlined in the Section 42a report.

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
					of the human-built environment deeper into the peatland. Increased urgency in prohibiting additional human-built development on peatlands is highlighted by recent climate change induced weather events. Best to avoid a potential disaster before it happens. PC47, if the above provisions are not adopted, still represents the most prudent, common-sense approach to evaluating the appropriateness of development on an individual basis on the peatland. For this reason, I support PC47.	
Further Submitter 6: Forest & Bird						
Teresa Homan	26	Plan Change	Entire submission	Support	The concerns raised by the submitter reflect the intent of the NPS-FM and PC1 of the Wellington RPS.	**Reject** this further submission point for the reasons outlined in the Section 42a report.
Robert Anker	43	Plan Change	Entire submission	Oppose	The submitter seeks relief inconsistent with – and which would frustrate council responsibilities under – the RMA, in particular s6(h) that all persons exercising functions and powers under it provide for the management of significant risks from natural hazards. Relief sought could also undermine council's responsibilities to manage and	**Accept** this further submission point insofar as this original submission point was rejected. The reasons for this point being rejected are outlined in the Section 42a report.

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
					assess natural hazards and manage the environment in the context of climate change, such as is required and guided through the NPS for Freshwater Management, the NPS Urban Development, the Emissions Reduction Plan, the National Adaptation Plan, and MfE's Arotakenga Huringa Āhuarangi: A Framework for the National Climate Change Risk Assessment for Aotearoa New Zealand.	
Greater Wellington Regional Council	52	Plan Change	Entire submission	Support	Submission points align with the RPS for Wellington and support the implementation of the RMA.	Accept in part this further submission point – The majority of the Greater Wellington Regional Council submission points have been accepted. However, not all the points raised in the Greater Wellington Regional Council submission were accepted.
John and Lynne Hill	59.1	Peat Hazard Overlay	Entire submission point	Oppose	The submitter seeks relief inconsistent with – and which would frustrate council responsibilities under – the RMA, in particular s6(h) that all persons exercising functions and powers under it provide for the management of significant risks from natural hazards. Relief sought could also undermine council's responsibilities to manage and	Accept this further submission point insofar as the original submission point was rejected. The reasons for this submission point being rejected are outlined in the Section 42a report.
John and Lynne Hill	59.2	Peat Hazard Overlay	Entire submission point	Oppose		Accept this further submission point insofar as the original submission point was rejected. The reasons for

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
					assess natural hazards and manage the environment in the context of climate change, such as is required and guided through the NPS for Freshwater Management, the NPS Urban Development, the Emissions Reduction Plan, the National Adaptation Plan, and MfE's Arotakenga Huringa Āhuarangi: A Framework for the National Climate Change Risk Assessment for Aotearoa New Zealand.	this submission point being rejected are outlined in the Section 42a report.
John and Lynne Hill	59.4	Plan Change	Entire submission point	Oppose	The submitter seeks relief inconsistent with – and which would frustrate council responsibilities under – the RMA, in particular s6(h) that all persons exercising functions and powers under it provide for the management of significant risks from natural hazards. Relief sought could also undermine council's responsibilities to manage and assess natural hazards and manage the environment in the context of climate change, such as is required and guided through the NPS for Freshwater Management, the NPS Urban Development, the Emissions Reduction Plan, the National Adaptation Plan, and MfE's Arotakenga Huringa Āhuarangi: A	Accept this further submission point insofar as the original submission point was rejected. The reasons for this submission point being rejected are outlined in the Section 42a report.

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
					Framework for the National Climate Change Risk Assessment for Aotearoa New Zealand. Engineering is not a sustainable or safe solution to addressing natural hazards in most cases. In most cases, working with nature and within environmental limits is the only way to address natural hazards and keep communities safe.	
John and Lynne Hill	59.5	Peat Hazard Overlay	Entire submission point	Oppose	The submitter seeks relief inconsistent with – and which would frustrate council responsibilities under – the RMA, in particular s6(h) that all persons exercising functions and powers under it provide for the management of significant risks from natural hazards. Relief sought could also undermine council's responsibilities to manage and assess natural hazards and manage the environment in the context of climate change, such as is required and guided through the NPS for Freshwater Management, the NPS Urban Development, the Emissions Reduction Plan, the National Adaptation Plan, and MfE's Arotakenga Huringa Āhuarangi: A Framework for the National Climate	**Accept** this further submission point insofar as the original submission point was rejected. The reasons for this submission point being rejected are outlined in the Section 42a report.

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
					Change Risk Assessment for Aotearoa New Zealand.	
Pat van Berkel	95.1	Peat Hazard Overlay	Entire submission point	Support	This aligns with Aotearoa's Emissions Reduction Plan and the Climate Commission's advice "Ināia tonu nei: a low emissions future for Aotearoa" which states peatlands are a carbon sink.	Reject this further submission point for the reasons outlined in the Section 42a report.
Pat van Berkel	95.2	Peat Hazard Overlay	Entire submission point	Support	Development of peatland is in contravention of s5(2) of the RMA and the NPS-FM.	Reject this further submission point for the reasons outlined in the Section 42a report.
Pat van Berkel	95.3	Peat Hazard Overlay	Entire submission point	Support	PC47 fails to give effect to the NPS-FM, specifically policy 6, the RMA, Aotearoa's Emissions Reduction Plan, the NPS Urban Development, and the National Adaptation Plan.	Reject this further submission point for the reasons outlined in the Section 42a report.
Pat van Berkel	95.4	Peat Hazard Overlay	Entire submission point	Support	This submission point aligns with Forest & Bird's original submission on PC49 calling for Mangaroa to be rezoned Natural Open Space. It would also be consistent with council responsibilities under – the RMA, in particular s6(h) that all persons exercising functions and powers under it provide for the management of significant risks from natural hazards, and responsibilities to manage and assess natural hazards	Reject this further submission point for the reasons outlined in the Section 42a report.

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
					and manage the environment in the context of climate change, such as is required and guided through the NPS for Freshwater Management, the NPS Urban Development, the Emissions Reduction Plan, and the National Adaptation Plan.	
Pat van Berkel	95.5	Peat Hazard Overlay	Entire submission point	Support	This is appropriate and would be consistent with the RMA, particularly the preservation of the natural character of wetlands and the protection of them from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development; and the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna.	Reject this further submission point for the reasons outlined in the Section 42a report.
Mary Beth Taylor	102	Peat Hazard Overlay	Entire submission	Support	This submission aligns with the RMA, the NPS-FM, the climate provisions in the NPS-UD, the Emissions Reduction Plan, the RPS for Wellington, and the National Adaptation Plan.	Reject this further submission point for the reasons outlined in the Section 42a report.
Tony Chad	103	Peat Hazard Overlay	Entire submission	Support		Reject this further submission point for the reasons outlined in the Section 42a report.
Further Submitter 7: Tony Chad						
Teresa Homan	26	Plan Change	Entire submission	Support	Adopt PC 47 The risks associated with building in seismic areas, high slope areas and on the Mangaroa	Reject this further submission point for the reasons outlined in the Section 42a report.

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
					Peatland can only be fully avoided by not consenting in these areas.	
WREMO-Jeremy Holmes	35	Plan Change	Entire submission	Support	Adopt PC 47. WREMO are the ones who have to handle local disasters and emergencies. As if it wasn't clear enough already we are likely to have more and more extreme weather events as a result of Climate Change. Any changes such as PC47 should have two objectives: 1) work to reduce Climate Change 2) work to protect people and homes from the likely effects of extreme weather caused by Climate Change. Cyclone Gabrielle has given us a catastrophic reminder of what will continue to happen in the future if we do nothing. PC47 is an important tool in implementing this vision (see GWRC comments also). See full further submission for additional details.	Accept this further submission point.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	52	Plan Change	Entire submission	Support	Incorporate all suggested changes. This will more closely align UHCC PC47 with protective legislation already in place at regional and central government levels. Particularly like extract from GWRC RPS Change 1 Section 32 "Taking adaptation action to increase the	Accept in part this further submission point – The majority of the Greater Wellington Regional Council submission points have been accepted. However, not all the points raised in the Greater Wellington

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
					resilience of our communities, the natural and built environment to prepare for the changes that are already occurring and those that are coming down the line. Critical to this is the need to protect and restore natural ecosystems so that they can continue to provide the important services that ensure clean water and air, support indigenous biodiversity and ultimately, people."	Regional Council submission were accepted.
John and Lynne Hill	59	Peat Hazard Overlay	Entire submission	Oppose	Adopt PC47 as is. Pro-forma Submissions (identical information) have been submitted by the KMD 'Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group. **Submissions 43 (partially) 45, 59 (relating Mangaroa peat overlay), 60, 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 73, 76, 77, 80, 83, 85, 87, 88, 89 (partially), 90, 92, 96, 97, 98, 100 are to be considered as a single submission**. This amounts to 27 identical or nearly identical pieces of information. My comments below relate to ALL of the pro-forma initial submissions. **"Current peat maps do not provide details on height and depth of peat". & "Please feel free to arrange to**	**Accept** this further submission point **in part** in that the points it opposes in the original submission have been rejected. However, the reasons for the rejecting these submission points are different to those outlined in the further submission and these reasons are outlined in the Section 42a report.

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
					come and see my property." Excellent! It would be great to have some independent Peatland experts come to assess the extent, depth and condition of the area in question and how best to protect and restore this particular natural ecosystem. This assessment would be done with the expectation and requirement that the most accurate and beneficial environmental assessment be made. Note that this is the best result for the environment, not the best result for a developer seeking to sidestep development constraints. **The boundaries of peatland are probably smaller than currently identified and should be based on an existing report called "Soils of Mangaroa-Whitemans Valley, Upper Hutt, New Zealand".** The much vaunted "Soils of Mangaroa - Whitemans Valley" is unashamedly written from a "What can we use this soil for" perspective rather than what role does this land play in the greater picture of unique natural ecosystems and the environment. Based on research from 1988, refer to previous comment on new, comprehensive assessment.	

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
					"UHCC aims to only use provisions and maps for new building or subdivision" UHCC needs to go much further and make more of an effort to help achieve nationally stated goals " to protect and restore natural ecosystems". Recommend UHCC refers to their Sustainability Strategy 2020 Goal 1 (carbon reduction) and Goal 2 (prioritise protecting and enhancing natural environment). Take action to make progress toward protecting and restoring the Mangaroa Peatland in order to restore its ability to provide the ecosystem services peatlands can supply. 1. "Peat is just another soil type." True. The Hauraki Peat you buy at the garden supplies store is just another soil type. 2. The peat found in the Mangaroa Peatland is part of a complex geo-morphological feature. The underlying geomorphology (physical features of the surface of the earth and their relation to its geological structures that support the surface) and	

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
					hydrology of peat basins must be taken into consideration when considering subdivision consents. 3. The 'Hazard' is the human activity in unstable areas. 4. Climate Change is not taken into consideration. Science says that we will experience increased numbers and increased intensity of weather events including storms, rain and flooding especially on the western side of the Remutakas. This is particularly relevant for a peatland. We can no longer rely on the past to make good planning decisions for the future. 5. Land use decision must be future proofed to reflect the expected impact of human induced Climate Change. We must protect not only the environment from humans but also humans from themselves. Human "Depopulation" of a peatland is an excellent idea. However in light of PC47 it sounds like scare	

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
					mongering. Putting a stop to subdividing a bog is a wise move. 'Peatland Retreat' should be considered. Remember that the Mangaroa Peatland has been known locally as the Waipango Swamp and the Wallaceville Swamp. Katherine Mansfield Drive was previously called Swamp Road. Protection and restoration of peatlands to capture carbon is appropriate and overdue and would amount to significant gains in climate change mitigation and biodiversity restoration.	
Heather Blissett	79	Plan Change	Entire submission	Support	Agree in full with a change of terminology to reflect the hazardous behaviour and activities of humans in relation to the natural environment. This change of tone would embody a lot of recent environmentally protective legislation. It would also clarify the fact that the landforms, tectonic plate activity and geo-morphology of the Earth are natural and expected features of the planet. What is unnatural and hazardous are the activities humans do and where	**Reject** this further submission point for the reasons outlined in the Section 42a report.

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
					they do them in order to develop the human-centric built environment.	
Grant O'Brien	88	Peat Hazard Overlay	Entire submission	Oppose	Adopt PC47 as is. PC47 is not discriminatory; rather it is inclusively protective in that it seeks to avoid future disasters that can seriously affect life and property. It is also protective of the environment. Win-win.	Accept this further submission point insofar as this original submission point was rejected. The reasons for this point being rejected are outlined in the Section 42a report.
Pat van Berkel	95	Peat Hazard Overlay	Entire submission	Support	Adopt PC47 with amendments suggested in Submission 95. Recommend UHCC refers to their Sustainability Strategy 2020 Goal 1 (carbon reduction) and Goal 2 (prioritise protecting and enhancing natural environment). Take action to make progress toward protecting and restoring the Mangaroa Peatland in order to restore its ability to provide the ecosystem services peatlands can supply.	Reject this further submission point for the reasons outlined in the Section 42a report.
Mary Beth Taylor	102	Peat Hazard Overlay	Entire submission	Amend. Support if not amended.	Recommend UHCC refers to their Sustainability Strategy 2020 Goal 1 (carbon reduction) and Goal 2 (prioritise protecting and enhancing natural environment). This is very relevant for PC47. Take action to	Reject this further submission point for the reasons outlined in the Section 42a report.

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
					make progress toward permanently protecting and restoring the Mangaroa Peatland in order to restore its ability to provide the ecosystem services peatlands can supply. This will mean no further subdivision and no further expansion of the human-built environment deeper into the peatland. Increased urgency in prohibiting additional human-built development on peatlands is highlighted by recent climate change induced weather events. Best to avoid a potential disaster before it happens. PC47, if the above provisions are not adopted, still represents the most prudent, common-sense approach to evaluating the appropriateness of development on an individual basis on the peatland. For this reason, I support PC47.	
Tony Chad	103	Peat Hazard Overlay	Entire submission	Amend. Support if not amended.	My original submission should not be seen as Opposition to PC47, rather as a request that the provisions of the plan change go further than just dealing with subdivision and development. I recommend UHCC refers to their Sustainability Strategy 2020 Goal 1	Reject this further submission point for the reasons outlined in the Section 42a report.

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
					(carbon reduction) and Goal 2 (prioritise protecting and enhancing natural environment). This is very relevant for PC47. Take action to make progress toward permanently protecting and restoring the Mangaroa Peatland in order to restore its ability to provide the ecosystem services peatlands can supply. This will mean no further subdivision and no further expansion of the human-built environment deeper into the peatland. Increased urgency in prohibiting additional human-built development on peatlands is highlighted by recent climate change induced weather events. Best to avoid a potential disaster before it happens. PC47, if the above provisions are not adopted, still represents the most prudent, common-sense approach to evaluating the appropriateness of development on an individual basis on the peatland. For this reason, I support PC47.	
Further Submitter 8: Heather Blissett						
John and Lynne Hill	59	Peat Hazard Overlay	Included in reasons	Oppose	Submitter 59 and others state *"These mistakes of fact lead to assumptions about risk to life and property that*	**Accept** this further submission point **in part** in that the points it opposes in the original submission have been

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
Submissions 60, 62, 64, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 73, 76, 77, 80, 83, 85, 87, 90, 92, 96, 97, 101 all have similar wording.					*make the conclusions unrecognisable from the Mangaroa Peatland community's lived experience."* There are stories aplenty from people locally who recall a tractor disappearing and there was no solid ground with which to plant a tow vehicle so it is still submerged to this day I believe. I've also been told that both people and horses had to walk around the outside of the 'swamp' because of the risk of sinking. These are just two stories that tell of a land that was naturally wet and boggy, a natural wetland/peatland. Sometimes the whenua tells its own story and so do the people who walked it before us or overlapped our lives. Cyclone Gabrielle should be a reminder that these natural areas exist for a reason. The submitter recommends changing high risk to *"three levels of risk – no risk, some risk, high risk".* I oppose this change and believe that the peatland/wetland should remain classified as a 'high risk'.	rejected. However, the reasons for the rejecting these submission points are different to those outlined in the further submission and these reasons are outlined in the Section 42a report. I would note that the further submission reasoning pertaining to not ranking the hazards is not supported. The entire plan change takes a risk-based approach and as part of this the hazards are ranked as outlined in the Section 32 assessment.

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
					Cyclone Gabrielle should be recent proof of what happens when we try to control a natural environmental asset that was naturally created for purpose that was subsequently destroyed for human desire. My reasons are because we now know what our ancestors knew (they must have because they lived with the land and did not destroy it. The peatlands/wetlands were still functioning in the lifetime of many still alive today to tell the stories. There is plenty of scientific research that supports the protection of peatlands/wetlands and many Councils around Aotearoa are now restoring this taonga. In summary. I oppose anything that seeks to destroy what remains of the Peatland/Wetland taonga. I support the changing of the name 'hazard' to something else such as 'sensitive land zone, environmental asset or environmental taonga to acknowledge the whenua for the resource that she is. For it is people who are the hazard. Not the whenua.	

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
	59	Peat Hazard Overlay	Included in reasons	Support	The submitter suggests *"Change the names of the zones to something like "Sensitive land planning zone".* I agree with a name change. Perhaps Environmental taonga or Environmental Assets instead.	**Reject** this further submission point for the reasons outlined in the Section 42a report.
Further Submitter 9: Emma Zee						
Alec Hobson	12	High Slope Hazard Overlay	PC47 incorrectly identifies steep slope on the site […] Same is true for neighbouring properties	Support	The proposed hazard map appears to be a desktop application, a more accurate map would be more appropriate.	**Accept** this further submission point **in part**, in that the High Slope Hazard Overlay has been reduced on the property, but not to the full extent sought in the original submission.
Teresa Homan	26	Peat Hazard Overlay	Support for provisions that limit development {in hazard areas} and provide ongoing protection for potential homeowners. Any development of Mangaroa Peatlands can't guarantee safety.	Support	I agree that it is important to provide ongoing protection for homeowners and I am also concerned about the safety of peatlands.	**Reject** this further submission point for the reasons outlined in the Section 42a report.

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
Greater Wellington Regional Council	52.2	Objective NH-01	Replace wording 'does not significantly increase' with 'minimises':	Support	For the reasons that Greater Wellington have outlined in their submission.	Accept this further submission point for the reasons outlined in the Section 42a report.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	52.8	Policy NH-P6	Delete 'will not unacceptably increase' from clause (a) and replace with 'minimise	Support	For the reasons that Greater Wellington have outlined in their submission.	Accept this further submission point for the reasons outlined in the Section 42a report.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	52.9	Policy NH-P7	Delete 'will not increase or accelerate' and replace with 'does not cause'	Support	For the reasons that Greater Wellington have outlined in their submission.	Accept this further submission point for the reasons outlined in the Section 42a report.
John and Lynne Hill	59.5	Peat Hazard Overlay	...modified by the sites that have been ground truthed.	Support	From the aerial and what I can see of the areas I am familiar with, I expect that the hazard overlay's are not accurately represented. An accurate extend of the peatlands and indication of depths would be beneficial.	Reject this further submission point for the reasons outlined in the Section 42a report.
	59.7		The property is poorly represented by the current proposed slope hazard overlay/peatland overlay.			Accept this further submission point in part, in that the High Slope Hazard Overlay has been reduced on the property, but not to the full extent sought in the original submission.

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
John and Lynne Hill	59.1	Peat Hazard Overlay	Peat is just another soil type. PC47 is required to ensure that viable building platforms are available before subdivision is consented.	Oppose	Peat is a very interesting soil type that has properties unlike any other. Peat is a hazard of great concern. I have included some excepts and links of other peat hazards. There are so many great places in Upper Hutt to develop, and there are so many reasons why peatlands are best suited as peatlands. • They are a massive carbon sink (areas of which may be valuable in the future with carbon trading) • Dry peatland is extremely flammable • Peatland fires cost • The play an important role in water supply, water tables, regulating and reducing floods • Insurance may be an issue • The general public are unaware of the peatlands, including the asset as a carbon sink and natural environment as well the risks. The fallout of cyclone Gabrielle was very upsetting, including the loss of life, homes, and livelihoods. These	**Accept** this further submission point insofar as this original submission point was rejected. The reasons for this point being rejected are outlined in the Section 42a report.
	59.2		RPS change 1 proposes the protection and restoration of peat- based soils to prevent the release of any stored carbon. It is likely that rules will be applied to peat soils that are similar to rules applying to wetlands. Similar rules would significantly constrain land use for little			**Accept** this further submission point insofar as this original submission point was rejected. The reasons for this point being rejected are outlined in the Section 42a report.

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
			environmental gain.		extreme events are exacerbated by carbon emissions such as when peatlands are drained and developed. Those who preserve the peatlands are champions in the fight against climate change. See full further submission for additional details.	
	59.4		It discounts the impact of hazard overlays on land values and insurability and the risk of regulatory misfeasance by GWRC. It also over-estimates the risk to existing buildings and discounts the feasibility of engineering solutions.			**Accept** this further submission point insofar as this original submission point was rejected. The reasons for this point being rejected are outlined in the Section 42a report.

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
Roger O'Brien	70	Peat Hazard Overlay	Peat is neither hazardous from a liquefaction perspective or a foundation design viewpoint. Peat is only hazardous if it catches fire.	Oppose	Peat is a hazard of great concern. I have included some excepts and links of other peat hazards. • There are so many great places in Upper Hutt to develop, and there are so many reasons why peatlands are best suited as peatlands. They are a massive carbon sink (areas of which may be valuable in the future with carbon trading) • Dry peatland is extremely flammable • Peatland fires cost • The play an important role in water supply, water tables, regulating and reducing floods • Insurance may be an issue • The general public are unaware of the peatlands, including the asset as a carbon sink and natural environment as well the risks. The fallout of cyclone Gabrielle was very upsetting, including the loss of life, homes, and livelihoods. These extreme events are exacerbated by carbon emissions such as when peatlands are drained and	Accept this further submission point insofar as this original submission point was rejected. The reasons for this point being rejected are outlined in the Section 42a report.

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
					developed. Those who preserve the peatlands are champions in the fight against climate change. See full further submission for additional details.	
Mary Beth Taylor	102	Peat Hazard Overlay	Delay further work on the peatland portion of PC47 until the draft NPS IB has been finalized and is operative.	Oppose	I oppose the delay of PC47 until NPSIB is operative. PC47 does provide a modicum of protection through the requirement of engaging a geotech engineer in the meanwhile (geotech engineering solutions would likely be cost prohibitive due to the poor bearing capacity of peat).	**Accept** this further submission point insofar as this original submission point was rejected. The reasons for this point being rejected are outlined in the Section 42a report.

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
					NPSIB will filter through once operative if the council has not already considered the anticipated aspects from the draft plan.	
Tony Chad	103	Peat Hazard Overlay	Recognise that building development is completely inappropriate on the Mangaroa Peatland. Zone the Mangaroa Peatland so that it is protected and able to be restored. The Mangaroa Peatland is a draft SNA and should be protected from development. The peatland is a damaged carbon sink that should be protected and restored.	Support	Agree with the submission.	Reject this further submission point for the reasons outlined in the Section 42a report.

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
			The peatland has never been assessed and geo-technically mapped to determine its depth. The risk from development of the peatland is too great especially for the environment. Delay further work on the peatland portion of PC47 until a thorough assessment has been made of the hydrology, geology, flora, fauna of the peatland. Include an assessment of carbon currently being released.			

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
Further Submitter 10: Teresa Homan						
John and Lynne Hill	59	Peat Hazard Overlay	Entire submission	Oppose	I challenge the submitter's premise that soil on a swamp is just soil. It is not just soil but a particular soil. The soil covers over a carbon sink aggressively drained by the historic owners of the property for farming. If permission to do this was requested today it would not have been consented. As we have seen in recent flooding in the Hawkes Bay area water goes where water wants no amount of human activity or engineering will stop the path of water. Before we consider the Mangaroa peat swamp's benefit to the whole community in the storage of carbon we must consider it is a swamp. A swamp that feeds into the Mangaroa river. As has been seen in Hawkes Bay water in a flood cannot be predicted. The Whiteman's Valley area has experienced flooding a number of times historically the natural holders of water are swamps and rivers. The Hutt River is constantly graded to protect from the 1/100-year flood. The likelihood of flooding has and is increasing with climate change not	**Accept** this further submission point **in part** in that the points it opposes a number of the original submission points have been rejected. However, the reasons for the rejecting these submission points are different to those outlined in the further submission and these reasons are outlined in the Section 42a report. I however note that submission point 59.3 was accepted and that submission point S59.6 and S59.7 were accepted in part. In that regard, the further submission on these original submission points are **rejected**.
Weston Hill	60	Peat Hazard Overlay	Entire submission	Oppose		**Accept** this further submission point **in part** in that the points it opposes a number of the original submission points have been rejected. However, the reasons for the rejecting these submission points are different to those outlined in the further submission and these reasons are outlined in the Section 42a report.

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
					that will happen but has happened. The increased risk of flooding and major flooding in and around Upper Hutt needs to be assessed and mitigated. Housing development allowed on swamp land is irresponsible and effects the wellbeing of possible property owners, people living in the district and the whole community. As well as this this soil is peat and part of a natural carbon sink. The soil is unstable for housing development and would require specialised engineering to make it secure for this purpose. The coverage of housing on the peat soil will inevitably cause the soil to become dryer releasing carbon from the impact on the peat. There will also be increase carbon run off because of the increased necessity to further drain the swamp to maintain the integrity of housing. Any consent to allow building development on this land will be the loss of the potential to restore this land to its natural state as a swamp and carbon sink. It is imperative that this natural carbon regulator is preserved to assist with the mitigation of carbon the driver of climate change.	I however note that submission point 60.3 was accepted and that submission point S60.6 and S60.7 were accepted in part. In that regard, the further submission on these original submission points are **rejected**.

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
					Not to preserve this taonga is to further increase the hazard that climate change has proven to be in New Zealand. Housing development on this land should not be consented as it poses a very real threat to the community of flooding, carbon loss, and increased threat in reducing natural options for climate mitigation. Is the position held by the submitter that the area has mixed soils such as clay and peat come to by geological soli report or is this his best guess. There would need to be further investigation into the depth and extensiveness of the peat soil. And indisputable evidence to support his claim.	
Further Submitter 11: Stephen Pattinson						
Lance Burgess	18	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Review all high hazard maps to ensure they are accurate. To reassess properties to remove the flat portions from	Support	The council should not be imposing an arbitrary map on the residents of Upper Hutt without further specialist in person validation. It is of little value in its current form and will not achieve the aims it was intended for and will also cause the residents additional unnecessary costs.	**Accept** this further submission point as the maps have been amended and the concerns raised in the original submission has been addressed.
David Beachen	19					**Accept** this further submission point as the maps have been amended and the concerns raised in the original submission has been addressed.

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
Daniel Buhler	36		the 'high slope hazard' area.		The proposed slope hazard maps have been arbitrarily computer generated or generated from aerial photographs and not been adequately verified by specialist professionals in person. The defined areas of slope hazard do not meet the intended definition which undermines the validity of what the council is trying to achieve. The current overlay is inaccurate and does not reflect the actual topography. It could therefore result in unwanted outcomes. The high slope hazard map is not accurate and includes flat land. Report seems to be generic without considering actual land layout	**Accept** this further submission point **in part,** in that the High Slope Hazard Overlay has been reduced on the property, but not to the full extent sought in the original submission.
Simon Wall	20	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Entire submission	Support	Like the submitters I am supporting, I am particularly concerned with the assessment of a high slope hazard over part of my property at 27 Elmslie Road, Pinehaven. If this assessment is made publicly available, it is likely that it will be used by insurers to adjust rates. It will also reduce the value of the property for any potential buyers. As there are considerable financial implications for property owners, a	**Accept** this further submission point as the maps have been amended and the concerns raised in the original submission has been addressed.
Karsten Kroeger	27	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Entire submission	Support		**Accept** this further submission point as the maps have been amended and the concerns raised in the original submission have been addressed.

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
					robust approach to hazard assignment is required, which is not the case as far as I can see in the present assessment. I don't have confidence on the Coffey report, because, in addition to other reasons given by submitters I am supporting, I note that the Coffey Report states that the valley floor of Pinehaven is within the Hutt River flood extent, which is clearly incorrect. Even the Hutt River 400-year flood extent comes nowhere near within the vicinity of the valley floor of Pinehaven.	
Further Submitter 12: Abbie Spiers						
John and Lynne Hill (also multiple other submissions that are virtually identical in wording).	59	Peat Hazard Overlay 59.1 59.5	I disagree with the submitter on the need to streamline building consents and subdivisions on Mangaroa Peatland.	Oppose	I am very concerned that after Christchurch's experience with wetland subdivisions and liquefaction, NZ's recent experience with the Cyclone Gabrielle disaster, and Auckland's recent flooding, that the interests of the general public are not being adequately protected by Councils when sections are offered for sale in potential flood zones, and on potentially unstable soils like peat. There are prospective purchasers who may view a subdivision in the middle of summer, and will trust that	**Accept** this further submission point insofar as this original submission point was rejected. The reasons for this point being rejected are outlined in the Section 42a report.

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
					their local Council has protected their interests in approving the subdivision, and/or who fail to ask the 'right' questions of the sale agent or developer, then buy a property with an inadequate understanding of the likely costs and hassle they'll incur in engineering a suitable building platform and/or cleaning up after their house and paddocks have flooded. This has happened time and time again, so I support any efforts by UHCC to ensure building platforms are safe for people to live on. With specific regard to Mangaroa Peatland, I am opposed to any further subdivision on the peatland itself but have no issue with rural area-appropriate development on the hills around it. Our 'lived experience' of flooding and slippage may well be out of date now, with record-level flooding occurring more often, and globally insurers are increasingly calling for a moratorium on wetland developments, so I believe UHCC would do well to be cautious. I support more extensive, expert mapping of the peatland with a view	

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
					to better understanding this important geomorphological feature which is the last remaining deep valley peatland in the lower North Island.	
Further Submitter 13: Stephen Pattinson						
Mary Beth Taylor	102	Peat Hazard Overlay	Entire submission	Support	I agree with the Submitters.	**Reject** this further submission point for the reasons outlined in the Section 42a report.
Tony Chad	103	Peat Hazard Overlay	Entire submission	Support		**Reject** this further submission point for the reasons outlined in the Section 42a report.
Further Submitter 14: Graham Bellamy						
Pat van Berkel	95	Peat Hazard Overlay	I support the opinion that the Mangaroa Peatland should not be allowed to be used for building and retained as a Significant Natural Area and fully developed as a natural wetland and designated as a reserve.	Support	This area is a peatland and was originally designated as a "Flood Plain". It is a significant "Carbon Sink" and must be retained as such. Allowing building on this area would release all the stored carbon, adding to the decline of the area and negative impact of climate change. The NPS for Freshwater does not allow development on any wetland, and as this area is a wetland by nature of being a peatland, no development should be allowed. This area should have rules over it to restrict the use to Significant Natural	**Reject** this further submission point for the reasons outlined in the Section 42a report.
Mary Beth Taylor	102					**Reject** this further submission point for the reasons outlined in the Section 42a report.
Tony Chad	103					**Reject** this further submission point for the reasons outlined in the Section 42a report.

Original Submitter	Submission Point	Provision	Part of the Submission	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision on the further submission
					Area and be used as a reserve and allowed to be returned to its natural state of a wetland. Is this council prepared to take the risk of allowing building on an unsuitable soil type and take on the future liability of future claims from property owners for failure of the properties due to subsidence?	