Plan Change 85 Natural Hazard

Issues and Options

Summary of Feedback

June 2025

Contents

1. Introduction

The natural hazards plan change (Plan Change 85) is one of five key environmental policy workstreams underway to update the Tasman Resource Management Plan (TRMP). Council decided to progress Plan Change 85 in late 2023, along with the other four workstreams, after the current Government repealed the reforms that were introduced to replace the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).

To begin the process of reviewing and updating the natural hazards provisions in the TRMP, we completed an assessment of the efficiency and effectiveness of the current natural hazards objectives and policies in the TRMP in 2020.

An Issues and Options report was commissioned in 2024 to identify and inform the future work programme and direction of Plan Change 85 – with an overall philosophy of retaining the existing framework unless there is a clear need for change.

From 24 March 2025 to 5 May 2025 Council undertook community engagement on the Issues and Options identified in the report. In particular, feedback was sought on:

- Whether the right issues had been identified for each hazard,
- Whether the correct outcome had been identified for each hazard, and
- At a high level, what is the preferred way to manage the effects of the hazard through the TRMP.

Feedback received will be considered to determine whether the issues and outcomes need to be amended and whether the preferred options to manage the effects of the hazards were supported or other options need to be considered.

2. Community Engagement Methods

2.1 Natural Hazards Awareness Campaign

Prior to community engagement on the Natural Hazards Issues & Options commencing, a Natural Hazards awareness campaign was launched In February 2025. The aim of the campaign was to inform the community and raise awareness of the natural hazards in the Tasman District. In addition to raising awareness, the campaign set the scene for Issues and Options engagement commencing in March 2025.

The awareness campaign, starting at the beginning of February 2025 took place over six weeks, focusing on a different hazard group each week. A series of 'hazard icons' was developed to promote each of the hazards. Advertisements featuring the icons and where to find more information appeared in the Waimea Weekly, Motueka Guardian and the Golden Bay Weekly. The campaign was supported by refreshed and updated natural hazard information on the Councils website.

A key component of the awareness campaign was the release of the Councils Natural Hazards map viewer which was launched late February 2025. The map viewer brought together Council's natural hazards spatial data into a single, online, easy to use, natural hazards map viewer. Most of the information on the maps had been available on Council's website for some time. The maps help inform the community about areas that may be susceptible to natural hazards such as floods, earthquakes, slope instability, and sea-level rise.

2.2 Engagement content

The full Issues and Options report was distilled into a community engagement document which provided a brief description of each hazard, highlighted each issue and outcome. It also described the current approach to managing the hazard in the TRMP and the preferred change to the TRMP to better manage the effects of the hazard. The full Issues and Options report contained a more detailed analysis of the various planning options considered for each hazard to determine the preferred options presented in the community engagement document.

Hard copies of the community engagement document were available from Council Service Centres and libraries, as well as being available online through Shape Tasman. The full Issues and Options report was available online.

An introductory video featuring specialist staff talking about natural hazards was also produced and posted on the Council YouTube Chanel and on the Shape Tasman Natural Hazards Page. The video offered an alternative platform for the community to engage with and understand the purpose and content of Plan Change 85 Natural Hazards. The video has had 31 views to date.

2.3 Drop-in sessions

Eight community drop-in sessions were held throughout April 2025 to enable community members to ask questions and find out more about the issues and options proposed.

The drop-in sessions were held in combination with engagement for draft plan Change 81 Urban Growth. Combining the drop-in sessions for both plan changes enabled community members to engage and ask questions about both plan changes at the same time.

Each drop-in session featured a short presentation which included an overview of both plan changes and provided a further opportunity for community members to ask questions. The sessions were not limited by location, so the community could attend any session and ask about anywhere in the district. Over 200 community members attended the drop-in sessions, with many staying to hear the presentations.

The location, dates and times for the sessions were as follows:

Location	Date	Time	Venue
Richmond	Saturday, 5 April	1-4pm	Tasman District Council
Brightwater	Monday, 7 April	10am -1pm	Brightwater Public Hall
Wakefield	Tuesday, 8 April	3-6pm	Wakefield St Johns Centre
Māpua	Wednesday, 9 April	10am – 1pm	Māpua Community Hall
Motueka	Saturday, 12 April	1pm- 4pm	Motueka Library Te Noninga Kumu
St Arnaud	Monday, 14 April	10.30am – 12.30pm	Lake Rotoiti Community Hall

Murchison	Monday, 14 April	4 - 6pm	Murchison Sport Recreation and Cultural Centre
Tākaka	Wednesday, 16 April	2 – 5.30pm	Golden Bay Recreation Centre

Each drop-in session displayed, in poster form, information about the hazards, their issues and options, along with Plan Change 81 information. Community members could also explore and ask questions about the Natural Hazards Map Viewer which was available at the drop-in sessions.

At each of the drop-ins Council natural hazards scientists and planners were available to answer questions and guide participants through the feedback process.

2.4 Webinar

Council staff hosted a webinar on Thursday, 17 April 2025 providing a further engagement platform in addition to the community drop-in sessions. As with the drop-in sessions, the webinar was held in combination with Plan Change 81. Staff presented the same overview of the plan changes as was presented at the drop-in sessions and there was the opportunity for those attending the webinar to ask questions through the question-and-answer function.

While attendance at the webinar was minimal, the webinar content was recorded and has had 95 views on Shape Tasman.

2.5 Iwi engagement

Two Natural Hazards hui were held online with ngā iwi across Te Tau Ihu. Representative from the following iwi attended one or both hui: Ngāti Rārua, Te Atiawa, Ngāti Toa, Ngāti Apa, Ngāti Kuia, Ngāti Koata and Ngāti Waewae.

The first hui, held on 5 December 2024, introduced the Natural Hazards Plan Change and work programme. It covered the natural hazard information Council has available, the statutory drivers and purpose/scope of the plan change, the high-level work programme, and provided an opportunity for questions and discussion.

The second hui, held on 7 April 2025, focused on the Issues and Options engagement and included information for each natural hazard PC 85 is addressing, provided the opportunity to seek clarification, and discussed how further feedback could be provided.

2.6 Youth engagement

Several opportunities were used to engage with youth across the District in respect to natural hazards and the Issues and Options engagement.

Council staff presented to students from the Waimea College EnviroGroup on 17 October 2024. The presentation highlighted the different natural hazards affecting the Tasman District and briefly explored the ways the effects of the hazards could be managed through the TRMP. Students were encouraged to be involved in the PC85 process by thinking about how natural hazards could affect them and their families and share their ideas on how the hazards could be managed.

An interactive workshop was held on 14 November 2024, with students (aged 11 to 13) who had completed the climate change learning programme. The workshop was designed to increase the students' understanding of what natural hazards exist in Tasman, and how Council's resource management plans can be used to influence what development happens where, to reduce vulnerability to natural hazards in the future. The aim of the workshop was to increase the students' knowledge so they would be able to provide meaningful feedback on the Issues and Options during the engagement period.

Council staff also joined the Climate Change Learning programme facilitator at Waimea Intermediate for two classes on 13 March 2025. The Climate Change learning programme module was discussing 'adaptation' and it provided the opportunity to introduce the Natural Hazards Map Viewer to students. This enabled students to explore the potential impacts of sea level rise across the District. The teaching module also provided the opportunity to talk about the Council's role in planning for land use activities and the tools we have to ensure this is done in a resilient way.

A further workshop was held on 31 March 2025, again with students who had completed the Council supported climate change learning programme. The focus of this workshop was to discuss and provide feedback on the Issues and Options engagement document and concentrated on the natural hazards impacted by climate change – flooding, coastal hazards and wildfire. Staff explained the purpose of the Issues and Options engagement and using an online interactive tool, Curipod, the students provided feedback on:

- The ways in which PC85 can reflect the interests of young people and future generations
- What are the main strengths of PC85
- Are there any weaknesses in the current plan change, or is there anything missing that they would like to see included

The students also broke into 'committees' to discuss each hazard and brainstormed ideas for how PC85 could address the impacts of the hazards.

2.7 Feedback methods

During the engagement period there were several methods available for providing feedback, including:

- Online feedback form via Shape Tasman
- Hard copy feedback form attached to the Community Engagement Document
- General email or hard copy

Feedback responses could also include an attachment.

3. Feedback – Participation

A total of 30 feedback responses were received. As well as receiving feedback from individuals and landowners/residents, there were several responses received from organisations and groups including:

- Fire and Emergency New Zealand
- Forest and Bird
- Ministry of Education
- Natural Hazards Commission

- Iwi representatives (see section 4.7.5)

4. Analysis of Feedback

The following section summarises the feedback from the responses received.

Participants were asked to give feedback on the issue, outcome and preferred option for each hazard. Participants could response to as many or as few hazards and questions as they chose.

Many participants also provided feedback on broader areas of the plan change. This feedback can be summarised into the following categories and are included in the analysis below:

- Scope of the plan change
- Planning approach
- General mapping comments
- Other/Miscellaneous

Table 1 lists the identified categories and the number of participants providing feedback on each category.

Category	**Number of participants providing feedback**
Liquefaction - Issues and outcomes	9
Liquefaction - Options	12
Faultline Rupture - Issues and outcomes	11
Faultline Rupture - Options	12
Slope Instability - Issues and outcomes	10
Slope instability - Options	10
Coastal Hazards - Issues and outcomes	8
Coastal Hazards - Options	11
Flooding and overland flow paths - Issues and outcomes	7
Flooding and overland flow paths - Options	11
Wildfire - Issues and outcomes	8
Wildfire - Options	11
Scope of the plan change	4
Planning approach	6
Mapping	3
Other/Miscellaneous	3

4.1 Liquefaction

4.1.1 Issue and Outcome

Participants were asked whether Council had correctly identified the issue for liquefaction and whether they agreed with the outcome.

Issue: Liquefaction has the potential to adversely affect the environment during and following an earthquake. This can include damage to buildings, structures and

infrastructure and disruption to the community. In rare cases liquefaction can also present a risk to life.

Outcome: The risks to people and property from liquefaction are avoided or mitigated.

There was general support for the issue and outcome, although one respondent noted that the issue was at too high a level to effectively guide planning or decision-making and could benefit from more specificity.

One participant suggested the wording of the outcome be changed to:

The risks to people and property from liquefaction are avoided or mitigated to a tolerable level.

This wording was intended to better reflect a risk-based approach, consistent with accepted principles of hazard management.

Another participant noted that most land (including potentially liquefiable land) can be developed safely if appropriate mitigation measures are applied. The outcome should recognise this potential for development rather than imply blanket avoidance.

A further participant agreed with the outcome, provided the correct risk analyses are undertaken in accordance with Ministry for Business, Innovation and Employment's *Planning and engineering guidance for potentially liquefaction-prone land*.

4.1.2 Preferred option

Participants were asked what their preferred option for managing the effects of liquefaction through the TRMP were. The Community engagement document summarised the status quo and the preferred option identified in the full Issues and Options report.

Should we stick with the status quo, or include liquefaction provisions in the TRMP? Why?

a. ***Status quo – continue to have the liquefaction map outside of the TRMP, manage liquefaction hazards for subdivision through the TRMP, and continue to manage liquefaction hazards for buildings, development and alterations through the Building Act; OR***
b. ***Change to include a liquefaction map in the TRMP and manage liquefaction hazards for subdivision, building alterations, and development through policies and rules in the TRMP.***

There was strong support for including liquefaction maps in the TRMP. However, many participants emphasized the need for greater precision and nuance in mapping to further distinguish between areas of differing liquefaction susceptibility, rather than applying a one-size-fits-all approach in the "liquefaction is possible" category.

One participant felt the status quo option should remain until land that is known to have a low liquefaction risk is removed from the maps. One respondent suggested that existing geotechnical investigation data from private companies should be integrated into the maps to improve accuracy and avoid unnecessary constraints.

Others suggested Level B (or Level C) assessments/mapping should be undertaken where 'liquefaction is possible' has been identified, stating that more detailed mapping would provide greater certainty, reduce regulatory burdens, and better target areas where liquefaction risk is genuinely significant. However, one participant cautioned that in the context of Tasman's gravelly

soils, the cost of conducting higher-level mapping may not be justified, especially if it does not meaningfully change the extent of the current Level A category.

Another participant raised concerns about shifting costs onto individual property owners, particularly where the Council already holds relevant geological or geotechnical information. They stressed the importance of avoiding duplication and using all available data before requiring new assessments.

There were contrasting views on the regulatory measures for liquefaction. One participant noted that most land in Tasman rarely liquefies and called for minimal restrictions to be applied accordingly. In contrast, another participant felt development should not proceed at all on land identified as potentially liquefiable, reflecting a more precautionary approach. Another suggestion was that geotechnical assessments be required for all developments, to ensure that site-specific risks are fully understood before planning decisions are made.

4.2 Faultline Rupture

4.2.1 Issue and Outcome

Participants were asked whether Council had correctly identified the issue for faultline rupture and whether they agreed with the outcome.

Issue: There are a number of known fault lines in the District. Fault rupture during an earthquake has the potential to adversely affect the environment, including damage to buildings and infrastructure, and loss of life.

Outcome: The risk to people and property from a fault rupture are avoided or mitigated.

Some participants supported the issue for faultline rupture. However, one participant considered the issue was overestimated by considering faults with recurrence intervals up to 125, 000 years, and this is further discussed in the option analysis. Another participant felt the issue was only partially identified, noting that earthquakes could also cause landslides and tsunamis.

Regarding how to manage fault rupture risk, two participants noted that mitigating the effects of ground deformation may not be practicable, and that fault avoidance zones offer a more effective approach. One participant suggested the outcome for faultline rupture could be changed to:

The risk to people and property from a fault rupture are avoided ~~or mitigated~~.

However, another participant pointed out that dwellings can be engineered and built over faults, reflecting differing views on whether engineering solutions or planning avoidance should be the preferred method for managing risk.

4.2.2 Preferred option

Participants were asked what their preferred option for managing the effects of faultline rupture through the TRMP were. The Community Engagement Document summarised the status quo and the preferred option identified in the full Issues and Options report.

Should we stick with the status quo, or make changes to the fault rupture provisions in the TRMP? Why?

a. ***Status quo – no changes to the Faultline Risk Rupture Area (FRRA) overlay in the TRMP and continue to manage subdivision in the overlay through resource consents and building construction or alteration via permitted activity (provided conditions can be met);***
   OR
b. ***Change to include updated FRRA overlay in the TRMP and manage the active fault rupture hazard through revised provisions in the TRMP;***
   OR
c. ***In addition to Option b, should we also include an overlay for faults that do not exhibit ground surface deformation and/or faults with long recurrence intervals.***

There was a mix of support for the different options to manage faultline rupture in the TRMP. Some participants preferred retaining the status quo approach, while others supported enhancing public access to information and including additional faults, such as those identified in the Beca report[1]. However, one participant felt it was not appropriate for any development within an active fault overlay to have permitted activity status.

Several participants commented on the threshold of the recurrence interval of faultline ruptures to be included in the TRMP, and that the level of avoidance should be assigned depending on the activity of each fault (as per the 2003 MfE Guidance – Planning for Development of Land on or Close to Active Faults). One participant stated that the 'new faults' identified in the Beca report should be removed from the hazard maps because they are not as active as the Waimea-Flaxmore fault, while another participant strongly supported adding the Whangamoa, Wakamarama, Kikiwa faults to the TRMP. Another participant considered that faults with longer recurrence intervals should still be mapped for public awareness, but that planning restrictions may not be appropriate within their overlays.

There was also feedback that only the Fault Rupture Risk Area (FRRA) be shown on Council maps, and that the faultline locations within these areas should not be delineated, due to the inherent uncertainty in mapping. Some participants had undertaken site-specific geological investigations and found no evidence of fault rupture on their properties, despite the faultline appearing on the Natural Hazards Map Viewer[2]. They questioned the accuracy and basis for these mapped lines.

A number of participants also commented on the surface expression of faults, where it is assumed that the faults repeatedly emerge at the surface in a consistent position, and the challenge of adding faults where there is no ground surface expression and it remains uncertain where surface rupture will occur.

[1] Review of Active Earthquake Faults in the Tasman District – Methodology Report, Beca Limited, November 2021

[2] For clarity, the FRRA overlay in the TRMP delineates a risk area corridor where TRMP rules apply. The mapping in the Natural Hazards map viewer not only shows the FRRA corridor, it also includes faultline information from various sources, primarily Johnston and Nicol 2013 GNS Report 2013_186 and published geological maps. The position of the faultline traces are mapped at varying levels of accuracy depending on the information source.

4.3 Slope instability

4.3.1 Issue and Outcome

Participants were asked whether Council had correctly identified the issue for slope instability and whether they agreed with the outcome.

Issue: Slope instability and debris run-out hazards occur in some of the District's steep topography. If new activities are not managed appropriately, structures (including buildings and infrastructure) on and below susceptible slopes are put at further risk increasing the potential for damage to property and risk to life.

Outcome: Slope instability and associated debris run-out hazard is identified in susceptible areas of the district and the risks to people and property associated with these hazards are avoided or mitigated.

Most participants supported the issue. However, one participant disagreed with the issue, arguing that it is misleading to classify the Richmond foothills as being potentially susceptible to slope instability. They believed the real issue to be the large volumes of runoff funnelling through gullies, which in turn erodes stream channels, rather than slope instability itself. They also considered slope instability contributes very little to debris outflows and that river channel erosion was the major contributor.

One participant suggested an additional issue included the role of vegetation clearance in exacerbating instability and the potential for instability events to damage downstream ecosystems.

While a number of participants agreed with the outcome, two participants disagreed. One participant considered that engineering solutions could overcome slope instability risks, and therefore it should be up to individual landowners to assess and manage their own risk. The other felt that the study area should focus specifically on catchments that have the potential to contribute to debris flows and downstream impacts during high rainfall events.

One participant suggested the wording of the outcome should be:

'Slope instability and associated debris run-out hazard is identified in susceptible areas of the District and the risks to people and property associated with these hazards are avoided or mitigated to a tolerable level'.

They further suggested that the level of risk considered tolerable by the Council should be determined through a risk tolerability assessment and clearly defined within the TRMP.

4.3.2 Preferred option

Participants were asked what their preferred option for managing the effects of slope instability through the TRMP were. The Community Engagement Document summarised the status quo and the preferred option identified in the full Issues and Options report.

Should we stick with the status quo, or make changes to the slope instability provisions in the TRMP? Why?

a. ***Status quo – no changes to the SIRA overlay in the TRMP and continue to manage subdivision in the overlay areas through resource consents and land use via a permitted activity (provided conditions can be met);***
OR
b. ***Change to include updated SIRA overlay in the TRMP and manage slope instability hazard through updated policies and rules in the TRMP;***
OR
c. ***In addition to Option b, should we also include further areas of the Separation Point Granite (SPG) geology in the overlays even though they are located in rural or backcountry areas where development is unlikely?***

There was no single option clearly preferred by respondents. Several supported Option B, with some explicitly stating that SPG geology should not be added to the slope instability overlay. These participants believed that the current earthworks and vegetation clearance rules in the TRMP (considered more stringent than those in the NES-CF) are generally appropriate.

One participant felt that none of the options went far enough and recommended that slope instability be assessed district-wide wherever steep hillsides exist. They proposed that any slope over 1V:2H should require geotechnical assessment for any subdivision, building, or earthworks exceeding defined parameters. Another participant echoed the call for a district-wide mapping approach, recommending a Level A assessment followed by Level B or C assessments as needed, consistent with the GNS Landslide Planning Guidance, January 2024. Both raised concerns about policy inconsistency, noting that the approach to slope instability differs from the district-wide assessment undertaken for liquefaction.

Other participants supported Option C, which includes SPG geology. Their reasons ranged from wanting to prevent increased instability risk in ecologically sensitive areas, to ensuring future development avoids areas with high susceptibility. One participant who generally supported Option C also supported Option B, given the cost of additional mapping for limited immediate and near future risk reduction in areas likely to be developed.

One participant considered the status quo should remain until it has been properly determined where the risks lie. They did not consider the Richmond foothills should be identified as potentially susceptible to slope instability.

Another participant raised concerns about the accuracy of current mapping, noting that recently engineered and stabilised land was still shown as susceptible to slope instability, suggesting a need to update hazard overlays to reflect on-the-ground conditions.

4.4 Coastal Hazards

4.4.1 Issue and Outcome

Participants were asked whether Council had correctly identified the issue for coastal hazards and whether they agreed with the outcome.

Issue: The District comprises large low-lying settled coastal areas that are susceptible to coastal erosion and inundation hazards. These hazards will only increase over time as a result of climate change and sea-level rise, putting more people, property and the environment at risk.

Sub issue: Coastal protection works to mitigate coastal inundation and erosion are costly to maintain, often create residual risk (and a false expectation of protection), can transfer risks to previously unaffected people and property, and create ecosystem and natural character feedbacks and effects that are often unanticipated and undesirable.

Outcome: The risks to people, property and the environment associated with coastal inundation and coastal erosion hazards, including the effects of climate change and sea-level rise, are avoided or mitigated in low-lying coastal areas of the District.

A number of participants agreed with the issues identified for coastal hazards. However, one participant believed the hazard was overstated, particularly based on their experience in Motueka, where they noted that stormwater control and flood gates have significantly improved drainage, especially on the east side of town.

Several participants considered tsunami needed to be considered in the coastal hazards issue. One participant also recommended that the following factors be recognised as coastal hazard contributors: land subsidence, rising water tables due to sea level rise, the inland movement of the saltwater wedge, and the District's high tidal range.

One participant suggested changing the wording of the outcome to:

'The risks to people, property and the environment associated with tsunami, coastal inundation and coastal erosion hazards, including the effects of climate change and sea level rise, are avoided or mitigated to a tolerable level in low-lying coastal areas of the district.'

They also recommended that the level of risk considered tolerable by Council should be determined through a risk tolerability assessment and explicitly defined in the TRMP.

4.4.2 Preferred option

Participants were asked what their preferred option for managing the effects of coastal hazards through the TRMP were. The Community Engagement Document summarised the status quo and the preferred option identified in the full Issues and Options report.

Should we stick with the status quo, or make changes to the coastal flooding and erosion provisions in the TRMP? Why?

a. ***Status quo – continue with restrictions in the Māpua/Ruby Bay Coastal Risk Area and resource consent requirements for new builds within the Coastal Environment Area. Building extensions, alterations, and coastal protection structures remain permitted (criteria dependent) above MHWS, while restrictions and resource consents apply below MHWS;***
OR
b. ***Change to include a coastal hazard overlay(s) for additional areas in the TRMP and make new development and alterations more resilient to coastal hazards. This could be achieved by having policies and rules that restrict land uses and activities, including coastal protection structures, in areas across the District exposed to coastal hazards. Review the Māpua/Ruby Bay Coastal Risk Area and associated provisions, and update zoning of undeveloped land to ensure land use is resilient to coastal hazards.***

Most participants preferred Option B, however, one participant preferred to support the status quo, citing concerns with the current modelling, and recommended using realistic sea level rise scenarios grounded in scientific observations. They also suggested that there should be more options for relocatable or adjustable foundation heights to accommodate future conditions.

Other respondents commented that a balanced approach is needed when considering development in low lying areas. One participant countered that coastal hazards are being underestimated. Several participants supported the use of spatial information and overlays to help inform decisions.

A number of participants advocated for exploring long-term solutions, including managed retreat or relocation pathways. One participant emphasized the need for Council to be more risk-averse to avoid being held responsible for future developments becoming flood prone. Another participant suggested identifying areas in the District where it would be sensible to implement protection measures against sea level rise.

One participant commented that hard engineered protection solutions should only be implemented in cases of necessity for significant existing development, and another suggested that restrictions on hard protection structures are vital. A further participant expressed concern with the ongoing maintenance and costs of sea walls and barriers.

In terms of environmental values, one participant stressed the importance of considering the impacts on ecosystems and species, not just humans and development. Others urged the TRMP to actively promote nature-based solutions. They considered nature-based solutions as best practice where short-term mitigation of coastal hazard is warranted.

4.5 Flooding and overland flows

4.5.1 Issue and Outcome

Participants were asked whether Council had correctly identified the issue for flooding and overland flow paths and whether they agreed with the outcome.

Issue: Flooding from rivers and overland flow paths is a frequent and potentially significant hazard in Tasman District and has the potential to cause disruption to the community, economy, damage to buildings and infrastructure, and loss of life or injury to people. When the additional effects of climate change and sea-level rise are taken into account the risk to the District's communities from flooding increases significantly.

Sub issue: Locating buildings and structures within overland flow paths has the potential to cause risk to life, damage to property, and transfer risk to neighbouring sites if overland flow paths are not appropriately identified and managed.

Outcome: Flooding and overland flow path hazards are identified and the risks to people, property and the environment associated with these hazards, are avoided or mitigated.

Most of the participants supported the issue, however one participant did not consider the issue had been correctly identified due to modelling for their location being inaccurate.

Several participants identified additional issues that they believed should be included. One participant raised the loss of natural floodplains and wetlands, emphasizing the importance of

these features in flood mitigation and ecosystem health. They also noted the ecological impacts of flood events, particularly on aquatic ecosystems.

Infrastructure concerns were also highlighted. One participant emphasized that the district's aging and undersized infrastructure contributes to flood risk, and that continuous monitoring and maintenance is needed. They also recommended that pipes should be designed to handle 100-year flood events to reflect future climate scenarios and reduce long-term vulnerability.

One participant suggested changing the outcome to:

'Flooding and overland flow path hazards are identified, and the risks to people and property associated with these hazards are avoided or mitigated to a tolerable level.'

They further recommended that the level of tolerable risk be defined through a formal risk tolerability assessment and incorporated into the TRMP.

4.5.2 Preferred option

Participants were asked what their preferred option for managing the effects of flooding and overland flow paths through the TRMP were. The Community engagement document summarised the status quo and the preferred option identified in the full Issues and Options report.

Should we stick with the status quo, or make changes to the flooding provisions in the TRMP? Why?

a. ***Status quo – continue managing flood risk on a case-by-case basis, where the provisions enable the flood hazard to be considered for most activities. Flood hazard maps (with one exception) sit outside the TRMP;***
   OR
b. ***Change to include flood hazard overlays in the TRMP and make new development, alterations, and activities more resilient to flood and overland flow hazards by having provisions that restrict activities in areas susceptible to flood hazards across the District.***

Most participants supported Option B. However, one participant preferred the status quo expressing concern over the unreliability and frequent changes in flood mapping caused by changes to ground levels and updated storm data. They considered that challenging inaccurate mapping through the resource consent process is a significant cost to any applicant and makes the process uneconomic.

Several participants supported a risk-based framework with provisions that encourage protection/restoration of riparian margins and wetlands. One participant recommended distinguishing between high, medium and low hazard flood areas with different overlays.

One participant suggested we need to look after our rivers and use nature-based solutions such as planting around rivers and allowing rivers to naturally weave and flood. Several participants advocated for building away from rivers, stop filling in and building on flood channels, or building on poles.

4.6 Wildfire

4.6.1 Issue and Outcome

Participants were asked whether Council had correctly identified the issue for wildfire and whether they agreed with the outcome.

Issue: The climate of Tasman District is susceptible to prolonged dry periods. With climate change wildfire hazard is likely to increase in frequency and severity and affect more locations in the District, putting people, property and the environment at greater risk.

Sub issue: Landscaping amenity planting around dwellings may conflict with vegetation management used to mitigate the risk of wildfire. Conversely, vegetation removal to create a defensible space around dwellings may conflict with protecting indigenous vegetation.

Outcome: The risk to people, property and the environment from wildfire is managed.

Several participants did not support the way wildfire risk issues were framed. They disagreed with the implication that communities near pine forests are particularly vulnerable, emphasizing instead that human behaviour is the primary risk factor, with most wildfires starting outside forests.

Another participant felt the issue was not quite accurate, noting that vegetation near homes can have both positive and negative effects. For example, while clear zones may reduce risk, they often become grassy areas that dry out and become highly flammable. Participants stressed the importance of clear messaging and rules to guide landowners on the types of vegetation that reduce or exacerbate fire risk.

Some participants supported the issue but raised additional considerations. One questioned whether their existing rights to build under the rural zone rules would still apply if neighbouring land was converted to production forestry. Another participant highlighted the need to factor in traffic congestion and evacuation planning in new roadworks, urban intensification, and greenfield developments, given their relevance to wildfire response and risk reduction.

One participant suggested changing the wording of the outcome to:

The risk to people, property and the environment from wildfire is ~~managed~~ avoided or mitigated to a tolerable level.

4.6.2 Preferred option

Participants were asked what their preferred option for managing the effects of wildfire through the TRMP were. The Community Engagement Document summarised the status quo and the preferred option identified in the full Issues and Options report.

Should we stick with the status quo, or make changes to the wildfire provisions in the TRMP? Why?

a. ***Status quo – continue requiring setbacks for dwellings from commercial forestry and vegetation clearance provisions for the St Arnaud Landscape Priority Area. In non-reticulated areas continue to require a water supply for firefighting purposes;***
OR

b. ***Change to strengthen setback provisions with an approach to minimise wildfire risk in terms of location of buildings to existing vegetation and placement of new vegetation near existing buildings. Clarify the requirements for servicing new developments with water for building firefighting and wildfires.***

With both options the NES for Commercial Forestry will also continue to apply regarding setbacks, where relevant.

A number of participants commented on the increased risk of wildfire in the District due to climate change noting that rising average temperatures and longer drought periods are leading to more days of extreme fire danger.

Most participants preferred Option B, however, one participant considered hazards should not be included in the TRMP arguing that it adds unnecessary complexity and costs to the planning system.

Several participants provided suggestions for wildfire management methods in the TRMP, including large setbacks or buffer zones, low flammability plantings, promotion of domestic sprinkler systems, and community wildfire preparation education. One participant recommended aligning the TRMP with the Fire Plan for Nelson-Tasman and ensuring policies reflect best practice guidance from Fire and Emergency NZ (FENZ). Another participant commented that the legislation managed by FENZ should be recognised and not duplicated in the RMA.

One participant noted that prescriptive requirements around defensible space could conflict with objectives to protect Significant Natural Areas or indigenous biodiversity under other plan changes such as PC82 and PC84. They suggested defensible space provisions should be risk-based and site specific.

Another participant specifically addressed wildfire risks in St Arnaud and suggested the Black Valley Stream wetland restoration may present a wildfire risk to the community. They also noted the need for road reserve clearance to prevent roads from becoming fire corridors and to ensure they remain safe escape routes.

4.7 Other feedback

In addition to the questions seeking feedback on the issues and options for each of the hazards, many participants provided feedback on broader areas of the plan change. This additional feedback is summarised below.

4.7.1 Gaps in scope

A number of participants commented that climate change should be mentioned in PC85. Some participants noted that climate change is a significant driver of increased hazard exposure and risk, and its effects need to be central to hazard planning, not treated as a peripheral issue. One participant suggested the role of climate change mitigation, such as emissions reduction, should be acknowledged as a component of hazard risk reduction. They also noted that PC85 does not distinguish between the hazards that are exacerbated by climate change and those that are not, which could hinder effective management.

Another participant considered that failure to comprehensively integrate climate change response and adaptation as part of an overall hazards management approach will likely lead to significant social, economic and environmental impacts in the future.

One participant also suggested that long-term adaptation such as managed retreat should be explored as part of PC85, noting that failing to do so risks locking in inappropriate development in high-risk areas, leading to legacy issues for future generations.

Another participant recommended the increase in severity and frequency of very high wind events and high heat should be considered as part of PC85, particularly given their potential to significantly affect economic activities in the district, especially those related to agriculture and primary production.

In addition to the comments mentioned in section 4.4 Coastal Hazards, one participant considered tsunami risk should be addressed not only through public education but also through spatial and regulatory tools within the TRMP, particularly in the context of urban development planning.

4.7.2 Planning approach

Several key themes emerge concerning the direction and content of the proposed plan change for managing natural hazards.

Participants emphasized that the natural hazards plan change must be risk-based, taking into account both the probability and potential impact of hazards. One participant stressed that the most effective way to manage significant natural hazard risk is to avoid development and intensification in areas with known high hazard exposure. They suggested a clear, risk-based approach, focusing restrictions where consequences would be most severe, should underpin the plan change.

Another participant encouraged the Council to take a comprehensive and forward-looking approach to natural hazard risk assessment. They recommended evaluating multiple hazards over long-term timeframes (ideally 50 to 100 years), and a variety of climate change scenarios. The participant emphasized the importance of ensuring risks are reduced to tolerable levels for both the community and the Council. They questioned whether recurring issues such as nuisance flooding should be treated as acceptable, urging Council to establish clear thresholds for what level of risk is acceptable. The participant also cautioned against accepting existing vulnerabilities (e.g., to flooding, liquefaction, or tsunamis) in current communities as a rationale for permitting similar risks in new developments. Additionally, they highlighted the importance of avoiding unintended consequences, such as transferring or exacerbating risks in neighbouring areas, and called for clear strategies to manage residual risks after mitigation measures are applied.

Another participant recommended applying a precautionary approach in light of uncertainties associated with climate change projections and hazard modelling.

Several participants emphasized the need for Plan Change 85 to be integrated and aligned with other concurrent plan changes (specifically Plan Changes 79, 81, 82, 83, 84, and Plan Change 1 to the Regional Policy Statement (RPS)) to avoid conflicting outcomes and inefficiencies. One participant noted that the natural hazards framework is critical to development feasibility and

suggested that other plan changes could be paused to allow the natural hazards workstream to catch up.

4.7.3 Mapping

One participant strongly supported the inclusion of updated, robust natural hazard mapping within the TRMP and recommended including maps within the plan provides greater regulatory certainty and transparency compared to relying on external documents.

Other participants considered more detailed mapping needed to be undertaken, particularly for slope stability and liquefaction. They noted that it is critical that zoning for geologically based hazards must be robust.

Several participants highlighted issues with the current mapping accuracy at particular locations for different hazards including liquefaction, slope instability, faultline rupture and flooding.

4.7.4 Other feedback

One participant considered we need to shift from short-term thinking to long term planning, guided by the need to operate within Earth's environmental limits.

Another participant noted the potential impact of PC85 should not be underestimated, stressing that the focus should include existing properties as well as new developments. They noted that natural hazard zoning can have major implications for insurance availability, premiums, and property values.

A separate participant noted that TDC should not rely on Wellington for post-disaster assistance, suggesting that local resilience needs to be prioritised.

A participant group advocated for young people to be included in climate change decision-making, recognising that they will bear the brunt of climate-related impacts. They felt that Plan Change 85 should create space for children and youth to contribute their ideas and emphasised that climate change is already occurring, and that immediate action is required. They appreciated that the plan demonstrates a genuine intent to ensure communities are physically safe from natural hazards.

4.7.5 Ngā Iwi

Key feedback received from ngā iwi during the two hui highlighted a number of important concerns regarding the natural hazards plan change. A consistent theme was the potential for iwi to be disproportionately affected by the proposed changes, particularly in ways that could have broad and lasting implications across their rohe.

One of the primary concerns was the wide-ranging impact the plan change could have on various interests, including biodiversity, heritage, and economic activities. Iwi noted that these are interconnected and essential to the cultural, environmental, and social wellbeing of their communities. Additionally, there was concern that the changes could affect existing deed of settlement interests throughout the rohe, raising questions about how these agreements would be upheld in the context of new planning provisions.

Iwi also expressed that the proposed changes might influence their future aspirations, including development goals and long-term planning for their people and lands. They emphasized the need

for a clear understanding of what the actual impact of the new provisions would be, urging transparency and meaningful engagement in the decision-making process.

Environmental considerations were another key point of discussion. Iwi highlighted the importance of nature-based solutions and the concept of giving rivers room to move. These approaches were seen as not only culturally appropriate but also more sustainable and in alignment with Māori values.

Practical implications, such as the effect of the changes on insurance, were also raised. Concerns were expressed about how increased exposure to hazards like flooding and sea level rise might affect the insurability of properties and infrastructure within their rohe. This led to further discussion about the interdependence between natural hazards and the need for an integrated, holistic approach to planning that reflects these connections.

5. Conclusion and next steps

5.1 Conclusion

Community engagement on Plan Change 85 has provided valuable insight into the priorities, concerns, and expectations of a wide range of stakeholders. The feedback confirms strong public support for taking a proactive, risk-based, and integrated approach to managing natural hazards across the Tasman District.

Across all hazards, participants expressed a desire for improved transparency, consistency, and certainty — particularly through better mapping, clearer policies, and alignment with other plan changes. There was general support for moving beyond the status quo, with many respondents favouring updated hazard overlays, strengthened provisions, and a greater focus on climate resilience. Participants also highlighted the importance of enabling future-proofed development, minimising exposure to high-consequence events, and promoting nature-based and community-led solutions.

Feedback also pointed to the need for stronger recognition of climate change, iwi interests, and youth perspectives, particularly in terms of intergenerational equity and long-term adaptation. Several respondents cautioned against repeating past patterns of short-term planning and underestimating future risks.

While there was a diversity of views on how best to manage specific hazards, common themes emerged around the need for robust science, risk tolerability frameworks, and integrated planning across hazards and other plan changes.

5.2 Next Steps

The feedback summarised in this report will contribute to developing more refined and targeted solutions in the next phase of work. This next stage will focus on translating the Issues and Options into a more detailed policy framework for managing natural hazards within the TRMP. The following key steps will guide this process:

Refining Issues and Outcomes
Feedback will be used to refine the identified issues and outcomes for each hazard, ensuring they reflect local context, community values, and a consistent risk-based approach.

Developing and Evaluating Planning Responses
Work will progress on drafting objectives, policies, rules, and overlays for the draft plan change. This will involve testing different regulatory and non-regulatory options to ensure they are effective, proportionate, and resilient over time.

Hazard Information and Mapping
Further analysis will be undertaken to determine the need for additional technical work and/or mapping. Where appropriate, this may include incorporating any updated modelling, geotechnical investigations, or localised mapping refinements.

Alignment with national direction
Planning responses will consider the requirements and implications of the proposed new National Policy Statement for Natural Hazards and any new spatial planning requirements.

Continued Engagement with Iwi and Stakeholders
Ongoing engagement will be undertaken with ngā iwi, key stakeholders and interest groups to ensure that the development of draft provisions meet legal requirements, consider a diverse range of perspectives and long-term community wellbeing.