

TABLE 2 - SUPPLEMENTARY s42A REPORT RESPONSES

Reference	Issue / Concern	Response
Paragraph 16	Effectiveness of stormwater management, flood risks not satisfactorily addressed	Lawrence 10 – refers to Mr Chapman’s assessment, net positive effect on hydrology.
Paragraph 18	Necessary changes to detailed wording, Attachment 3	Lawrence 12 and Table 1 – outlines refinements made, where appropriate, in Version 12
Paragraphs 20 and 82	Consent status for breach of subdivision standards, subdivision in Conservation Area.	Lawrence 13-20 (and 59-60) – consent status clarified and explained, generally full discretionary for breach of subdivision standards (prohibited beyond 35 lots, or in Conservation Area) in Version 12.
Paragraphs 22 and 41	Consent status for breach of development controls for buildings-suggests should be non-complying for key standards	Lawrence 21-23 – consent status clarified and explained, full discretionary or non-complying status for breach of key standards is now proposed (Versions 12 and 13)
Paragraphs 23 and 44	Staging and timing of ecological enhancement (Conservation Area plantings), stormwater implications	Lawrence 24-25 – new assessment criteria added to ensure stormwater attenuation outcome secured as and when required (matter 4 b))
Paragraphs 25-26	Building location – flexibility around Defined Building Areas (DBAs)	Lawrence 26-31 – new standard 1.1 c), GPS referenced DBAs, confined to 500m ² , limited ability to consider variation (geotechnical, archaeology, minimise earthworks)
Paragraph 28	Consent notice commitment to protect Conservation Area unclear	Lawrence 33-34 – consent notice now requires Conservation Area to remain with Incorporated Society (Rule 1.1 q).
Paragraph 33	Septic tanks	Lawrence 36 – clarification to Version 12 made, septic tanks cannot be relied on in isolation
Paragraphs 35-40	Strategic planning, role of a structure plan, confidence in district plan	Lawrence 37-41 – structure plan as appropriate strategic response, avoids ‘ad hoc’ non complying consent/precedent concern
Paragraphs 38-39	Parallels with neighbouring development (790B Hot Water Beach Road) – element of sprawl	Brown 4-6 – 790B fundamentally changes landscape (re-casts it) TCSP consistent in context (ancillary). Positive change overall.

Paragraph 45	Timing and purpose of areas LV1 to LV5, R8 and R9	Brown 4-5; Lawrence 42 – R8 and R9 have dual function, timing now driven by Landscape Management Plan (Rule 1(f))
Paragraph 47	Original owner v Incorporated Society responsibilities	Lawrence 43 – new rule 1.1p(v), Incorporated Society responsible for continuing obligations (post 224(c))
Paragraph 52	Relevant reference guideline documents (LASS/RITS)	Chapman 12 (Table) – relevant guidelines referenced as applicable to TCDC
Paragraph 53	Impervious area calculations unclear	Calculations clarified
Paragraph 54	Other catchments influence hydrology	Acknowledged, largest catchment includes TCSP land
Paragraphs 55-56	Taiwawe River mouth bottleneck	Net positive outcome will reduce bottleneck effect
Paragraphs 57-58	Pass it forward approach questioned	Net positive outcome, and avoids flows from higher/other catchments coinciding.
Paragraph 59	Hydrological modelling needed	Unnecessary, net improvement
Paragraph 60	Lot 25 prone to flooding	Appropriately addressed at subdivision/building consent stage
Paragraph 61 (Attachment 1)	Pass it forward contradicts swale management	No contradiction, swales attenuate smaller rain effects
	Swale function (infiltration) questioned, lack of modelling/calculations (as to swale size needed)	Swales will receive dispersed flows; planting will promote infiltration, ample room within TCSP land to accommodate; size determined at subdivision
Paragraphs 62-64 (Attachment 2, Bluewattle Ecology)	Insufficient site surveys of threatened species and habitats	Goldwater 5-10 – significance assumed, protection and enhancement proposed accordingly
	No application of EclA guidelines to ecological effects assessment, range of potential effects may arise	Goldwater 11-13 – very low to low adverse effects under EclA assessment, range of positive effects

	No assessment of wetlands (NES-FW)	Goldwater 14 – all wetland areas as defined protected, and restored, no earthworks within 20 m, no wetlands drained
	Uncertainty over quantum of benefits, extent and design of mitigation to address adverse effects (baseline surveys needed now rather than being delayed)	Goldwater 16-23 – baseline surveys not warranted (not a ‘no net loss proposition’); significance assumed, resources protected, mitigation and enhancement would far outweigh potential adverse effects.
Paragraphs 67-71 and Attachment 1	Traffic flows from adjacent development (no calculations, data provided)	Burgess 6-8 - details and modelling provided, modelling scenarios explained
	Use of intersection by pedestrians/cyclists	Burgess 10 – intersection design (as approved for campground) accommodates pedestrians
	Potential for more properties to be developed (than modelled)	Burgess 12-13 – modelling scenarios accommodate conservative traffic flows
	Entry vehicle swept path alignment	Burgess 15 – swept path aligns to existing road as formed
	Forward visibility at intersection/road safety audit	Burgess 17-19 – intersection design as previously approved, awaiting road safety audit
Paragraph 73	Comparison with structure plan 344.10 (790 Hot Water Beach Road)	Lawrence 44-47 – TCSP superior control framework
Paragraph 74	No good resource management reason for scale of development	Lawrence 48-52 – resource management reason is level of stewardship and investment needed to sustain positive outcomes
Paragraph 78	Objectives and policies of TCSP ‘toothless’	Lawrence 53-55 – TCSP objectives and policies set framework for development of subdivision standards, applied alongside broader District Plan objectives and policies
Paragraph 80	Earthworks controls lacking	Lawrence 56-57 – Version 12 and 13 now apply coastal environment overlay controls (Table 3)