

Appendix 3 to Addendum 3 - Updated Recommended Decisions on Submissions

Submissions are sorted by Submitter ID # (see Appendix 5a), and sorted further by submission point.

Further submissions are highlighted grey, and inserted after the submission they are further to.

When a submission or further submission has been referred to within the Section 42A Report, the Sub Code is referenced.

The final column, "Recommended Decision", contains the planning officers' recommended decision on the submission point. In most cases, this refers to a section in the Section 42A Report where the submissions and recommended decisions are discussed.

Submitter Name	Type	Sub Code	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommended Decision (reference to Section 42A Report)
Kierin Oppatt	Submission	S_01_01	01	01	.	.	NH-PA, NH-R4	Oppose	Modelling [for Lake Ōkāreka] is outdated: * the current flood model for Geyserview uses 2020 climate data under RCP8.5 (worst case emissions) and a 1%AEP event. *Scientific consensus now considers RCP8.5 scenarios increasingly unlikely, using that data risks overstating flood extents. The potential impacts on property owners are: * Consent delays or refusals for buildings and land-use changes * Higher quoted insurance premiums or refusal of cover * Depressed property values due to inflated flood-risk overlay * Increased professional costs for homeowners needing bespoke hydrological assessments. * In 2021, BOPRC increased outlet capacity . These works materially reduce flood risk but are not reflected in the 2020 model provided in Geyserview.*	Amend PC8 to explicitly permit property-specific flood modelling by qualified engineers where the district-wide model is known to be outdated.	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3
Bay of Plenty Regional Council (BOPRC)	Further submission	F_45_20	01	01	45	20	NH-PA, NH-R4	.	Refer to further submission point in response to Submission 21.5 (further submission 45.4)	Neutral to original submission.	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3
Grant Olliff	Submission	S_05_01	05	01	.	.	NH-PA, NH-R4	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed PC8 Flood Zone to the 100yr (1% AEP) for Lake Ōkāreka to a new level of 354.63 +0.7 freeboard being 355.33, taken from the BoPRC report of 2022 -Table 26, as this level is both: A. Fundamentally flawed given the nature of Lake Ōkāreka Outlet control and upgrades in 2020. B. Impractical given the Private and Public Property impact that would be imposed by a publicly Defined Flood Zone of this level that would be referenced by Finance, Insurance and Building Regulatory organisations. The 2022 BoPRC report acknowledges/emphasises the 2017 Flood Levels and establishes an EV1 2020 level of 354.450, when the Outlet Flow was limited to less than half that of the Emergency Response of 2017 and the 2020 permanent remediation. This outlet today has Resource Consent to 500 l/s, but an Emergency capability of over twice that flow. *	Plan Change 8 is rejected in relation to Lake Ōkāreka Flood Zone. That new Flood Levels be calculated taking into account upgrades to the Lake Ōkāreka Outlet.	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3
Bay of Plenty Regional Council (BOPRC)	Further submission	F_45_05	05	01	45	05	NH-PA, NH-R4	.	Refer to further submission point in response to Submission 21.5 (further submission 45.4)	Neutral to original submission.	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3
Neil Oppatt	Submission	S_06_01	06	01	.	.	NH-PA, NH-R4	Oppose	Flooding of Lake Ōkāreka in 1962 caused inundation of 18 residential houses, prompting community action and a series of engineering interventions, including most recently outlet upgrades and a new resource consent (2021) and emergency measure (2025) (see submission for further details).The current engineered outlet system operating under Bay of Plenty Regional Council Resource Consents provides: - standard operating range of 3.53-3.539m RL (Moturiki Datum 1953) - maximum consented flow: 500L/s - emergency capacity: up to 1,000 L/s under section 330 RMA powers No flooding has occurred since implementation. PC8 ignores the risk reduction achieved through these interventions. It defines a broad based flood-prone zone based on a 1%AEP flood event, set at RL 355.328m (including a freeboard of 0.7m), based on the Rotorua Lakes Design Levels Technical Report 2022. PC8 failed to engage and consult with the community, does not align with risk management principles and ignores BOPRC statutory lake level management role. The 1%AEP AEP flood level of 355.328 is not consistent with the 2017 technical report by Pattle Delamore Partners Ltd (PDP), commissioned by the BOPRC, which provides hydrological modelling for Lake Ōkāreka post-upgrade of the Lake Outlet Control System (LOCS). For a 2090 high-range climate change scenario , with the outlet operating at 500 L/s, the calculated 1%AEP peak lake level is 354.45m. For the mid range 2090 mid range scenario the calculated 1%AEP peak level is 354.11*	That PC8 (flood risk) be withdrawn or substantially amended to property account for existing engineering controls and adopt a risk management approach consistent with New Zealand Standard AS/NZS ISO 31000:2018.	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3
Bay of Plenty Regional Council (BOPRC)	Further submission	F_45_22	06	01	45	22	NH-PA, NH-R4	.	Refer to further submission point in response to Submission 21.5 (further submission 45.4)	Neutral to original submission.	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3
Lake Ōkāreka Community Association (LOCA)	Submission	S_21_05	21	05	.	.	NH-PA, NH-R4	Oppose	LOCA opposes the adoption of flood levels for Lake Ōkāreka from the 2022 BOPRC Rotorua Lakes Design Levels Technical Report as it considers the methodology is technically invalid. It uses a Gumbel statistical analysis based on historical data from before the 2021 outlet upgrade and ignores the new infrastructure's physical capacity. It also fails to incorporate climate change effects, such as increased rainfall intensity. LOCA also notes that any flooding assessment should not be artificially constrained by a discharge of 500L/s because this would fail to account for the reality of how a system would be operated during an extreme flood event - the pipeline has an emergency capacity to pass flows of up to 800L/s and it would be artificial to assume that operators would be constrained by the 500L/s limit. LOCA considers freeboard should only be applied to a robustly calculated flood level and applying it to a flawed level is a meaningless exercise.*	That flood levels from the 2022 technical report are not adopted. That new flood levels are determined by a comprehensive, physically-based water balance model that accounts for the outlet's full capacity and climate change. Any determination of regulatory freeboard levels is deferred until a credible Base Flood Elevation has been established. That the 1%AEP flood hazard map for Lake Ōkāreka is removed from Council's public online mapping service (Geyserview) and any other platform. A review of resource consent RM19-0347 by BOPRC if the current discharge limit of 500L/s is a primary cause of flood risk.	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3
Natural Hazards Commission (NHC)	Further submission	F_22_18	21	05	22	18	NH-PA, NH-R4	.	NHC opposes changes to flood provisions. The flood modelling used to inform flood provisions within PC8 (outlined in the section 32 report) is considered the best available information. Much of the flood modelling has been recently completed by Bay of Plenty Regional Council, accounts for potential changes due to climate change, and considers 1% AEP events, which is becoming standard practice across the country. In our opinion the Rotorua Lakes Design Levels Technical Report 2022 is a high-quality report as it has been completed by Bay of Plenty Regional Council and follows established scientific methods. The submitters oppose using data prior to 2021, however, using historical records is a standard method for calculating AEP2. The report explicitly states that climate change modelling has been commissioned as part of separate work, and it is clear from the section 32 report that considerations for climate change have been made. While there are still uncertainties associated with the information (including recent upgrades to the lake outlet systems), the information used can still be classified as 'best available information'. The use of 'best available information' aligns to SDNH-P1 in PC8 and encourages decision-making and action to reduce impacts to people and property even when there may be limits to the information available. Further, the use of 'best available information' aligns to the proposed NPS-NH.	Disallow original submission	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (Kāinga Ora)	Further submission	F_42_03	21	05	42	03	NH-PA, NH-R4	.	Kāinga Ora support providing the most up to date flooding data, however given that PC8 proposes to have the hazard maps sit outside of the District Plan, the data can be updated at any time once PC8 is operative.	Disallow original submission	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3

Submitter Name	Type	Sub Code	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommended Decision (reference to Section 42A Report)
Bay of Plenty Regional Council (BOPRC)	Further submission	F_45_04	21	05	45	04	NH-PA, NH-R4	.	BOPRC wishes to comment on the points made in this submission as they related to material generated either by or on behalf of BOPRC, and it is considered some comment may assist for decisions on Plan Change 8. The Regional Council considers the 2022 flood level analysis to be the best available information to determine flood hazard at Lake Ōkāreka for the purpose of implementing the flood management provisions, while acknowledging its limitations of not including the impact of the pipeline and not including specific analysis of the impacts of climate change. This position is stated in a memorandum from BOPRC to RLC titled 'Lake Ōkāreka Design Levels' dated 1 September 2025 (attached to further submission). Further reasoning why other BOPRC lake level analysis (listed below) is not considered suitable for setting flood level recommendations for the purpose of setting building floor levels and is not considered the best available information for District Plan purposes. A) Lake Ōkāreka; Design of Pipeline Capacity; impacts on Lake Level Management, 17 November 2017 (as referenced in the PDP report, dated December 2017, and titled Lake Ōkāreka Outlet Pipeline Upgrade – Options Assessment); and B) Lake Ōkāreka; Modelling of Lake Level Management Guideline Options, 27 July 2018. The two reports describe water-balance modelling of Lake Ōkāreka that includes: • Specific probability-based synthetic design-rainstorms determined from statistical analysis of historic rainfall at Lake Ōkāreka; • Climate-change impacts on the design rainstorms; • A calibrated relationship between lake inflows and rainfall determined from historic rainfall and lake level data along with records of pipeline discharge estimates at the time. The purpose of the 2017 modelling was to assess the relative performance of a range of pipeline discharge capacities in terms of reducing extreme lake levels. The purpose of the 2018 modelling was to investigate the relative influence of draft Lake Management Guidelines on the system – both in terms of high lake levels, and in terms of low lake levels, and low ecological stream flows. These guidelines are used to guide the pipeline management responses to lake levels and seasonal conditions and are sometimes referred to as the Pipeline Operation Protocol. The 2018 memo specifically states: "Please note: these numbers are not provided for the purposes of setting building floor levels". The 2017 memo does not include such a statement, however neither does it mention building floor levels in its content but rather states that its purpose is to assess relative pipeline performance.	Neutral to original submission.	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3
Tūhourangi Tribal Authority	Further submission	F_59_01	21	05	59	01	NH-PA, NH-R4	.	Supports the position of LOCA - A clear fault in the proposed plan change is the unreliable data which relies on data generated before the inclusion of new infrastructure which will drastically change data relating to the flood levels of Ōkāreka.	Support original submission	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3
Jack Smith	Submission	S_31_02	31	02	.	.	NH-PA, NH-R4	Oppose	The submitter opposes the use of Bay of Plenty Regional Councils historic lake level data to define which areas constitute a flooding hazard. The data is out of date due to the substantial improvements made to the lake outlet works [in lake Ōkāreka]. The submitter supports the Lake Ōkāreka Community Association's submission that any setting of the flood hazard level be based on current available data and up to date modelling.*	Any flood hazard level be based on current available data and up to date modelling	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3
Bay of Plenty Regional Council (BOPRC)	Further submission	F_45_15	31	02	45	15	NH-PA, NH-R4	.	Refer to further submission point in response to Submission 21.5 (further submission 45.4)	Neutral to original submission.	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3
Jules Averill	Submission	S_32_04	32	04	.	.	NH-PA, NH-R4	Oppose	The submitter opposes RLC adopting the BOPRC 2022 report which collected data up to 2000 and does not include 2021 upgrade work done on an outlet pipe designed to prevent further floods [at Lake Ōkāreka]. New flood modelling is required.*	No specific relief sought.	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3
Bay of Plenty Regional Council (BOPRC)	Further submission	F_45_17	32	04	45	17	NH-PA, NH-R4	.	Refer to further submission point in response to Submission 21.5 (further submission 45.4)	Neutral to original submission.	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3
James Blakely	Submission	S_33_01	33	01	.	.	NH-PA, NH-R4	Oppose	The submitter notes the flood mitigation work by BOPRC in the 2021 increased outflow [from Lake Ōkāreka] to Waitangi Stream - which should be accepted and recorded by RLC.*	No specific relief sought.	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3
Bay of Plenty Regional Council (BOPRC)	Further submission	F_45_16	33	01	45	16	NH-PA, NH-R4	.	Refer to further submission point in response to Submission 21.5 (further submission 45.4)	Neutral to original submission.	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3
Craig Cunningham	Submission	S_35_04	35	04	.	.	NH-PA, NH-R4	Oppose	The submitter opposes RLC adopting the BOPRC 2022 report which collected data up to 2000 and does not include 2021 upgrade work done on an outlet pipe designed to prevent further floods [at Lake Ōkāreka]. New flood modelling is required.*	No specific relief sought.	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3
Bay of Plenty Regional Council (BOPRC)	Further submission	F_45_12	35	04	45	12	NH-PA, NH-R4	.	Refer to further submission point in response to Submission 21.5 (further submission 45.4)	Neutral to original submission.	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3
Peter and Wendy Lewis	Submission	S_36_01	36	01	.	.	NH-PA, NH-R4	Oppose	The submitters own and reside in one of the lowest-lying properties at Lake Ōkāreka and have personal experience of the lake levels over 45 years. During this time they have experienced only some slight and short lived flooding on the lower edge of the property after heavy rain and when the manual system for controlling the lake had been neglected. Since levelling and slightly raising the lower part of their property they have experienced no flooding, except for the exceptional event in 2017. Flooding in 2017 remained on the property for almost 8 months and caused a loss of plantings. Since completion of the outlet upgrade there has been no further flooding. The submitters are astounded that the plan change is based on data from before the outlet upgrade. They consider the regional council dismissive in not considering updating flood level information when substantial work has been carried out to deal with flooding - the issue that the plan change seeks to address.*	If updated information cannot be provided until many more years of data has been collected (as they understood the regional council) then PCB should be delayed.	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3
Bay of Plenty Regional Council (BOPRC)	Further submission	F_45_24	36	01	45	24	NH-PA, NH-R4	.	Refer to further submission point in response to Submission 21.5 (further submission 45.4)	Neutral to original submission.	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3
Rotorua Planning Consultants Group	Submission	S_39_04	39	04	.	.	NH-PA, NH-R4	Oppose	The submitters state there are significant concerns with the Lake Ōkāreka flood modelling intended to support PC8 - the modelling uses historical lake level data and does not reflect substantial improvements to the outlet system. They state 'a specific concern relates to the flood prone contour adopted of 355.90m (Moturiki Datum), which is considerably higher than the 1%AEP (100-year ARI) peak lake level of 354.45m. They state that if adopted in its current form it could affect the ability to obtain building consents and have long-term implications for insurance and property values. The submitters also state that once embedded into an operative plan there is very limited ability to update or correct the model or associated maps without initiating a formal plan change process.*	Flood modelling be updated to reflect current conditions, including the 2021 mitigation works and active lake level management. This updated modelling should be publicly notified as part of a plan change to ensure that flood risk is accurately represented and appropriately managed.	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3

Submitter Name	Type	Sub Code	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommended Decision (reference to Section 42A Report)
Natural Hazards Commission (NHC)	Further submission	F_22_31	39	04	22	31	NH-PA, NH-R4	.	NHC supports further modelling to reflect improvements in the outlet system and reduce uncertainties but any further investigations should not be used to justify removing flood provisions from PC8. The flood modelling used to inform flood provisions within PC8 (outlined in the section 32 report) is considered the best available information. Much of the flood modelling has been recently completed by Bay of Plenty Regional Council, accounts for potential changes due to climate change, and considers 1% AEP events, which is becoming standard practice across the country. NHC considers the Rotorua Lakes Design Levels Technical Report 2022 a high-quality report as it has been completed by BOPRC and follows established scientific methods. Using historical records is a standard method for calculating AEP. While there are still uncertainties associated with the information (including recent upgrades to the outlet) the information used can still be classified as 'best available information' and aligns to SDNH-P1 in PC8 - encouraging decision-making and action to reduce impacts to people and property even when there may be limits to the information available and aligns to the proposed National Policy Statement for Natural Hazards.	Allow original submission provided existing flood provisions are not removed from PC8.	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3
Bay of Plenty Regional Council (BOPRC)	Further submission	F_45_28	39	04	45	28	NH-PA, NH-R4	.	Refer to further submission point in response to Submission 21.5 (further submission 45.4)	Neutral to original submission.	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3
Newwid Holdings Trust (NHT)	Submission	S_40_02	40	02	.	.	NH-PA, NH-R4	Oppose	NHT opposes the use of the flood modelling information produced by BOPRC in which Council is using to determine the minimum floor levels for a 1%AEP flood event with an allowance for climate change in respect to Lake Ōkāreka because the modelling was based on information prior to the 2021 upgrades of the Lake pumpstation which has significant impacts on managing lake levels during extreme weather events.*	Remove BOPRC Lake Ōkāreka flood modelling as a natural hazard overlay and seek BOPRC to undertake new Lake Ōkāreka lake level modelling based on upgraded systems to ensure accurate information and data is used.	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3
Natural Hazards Commission (NHC)	Further submission	F_22_36	40	02	22	36	NH-PA, NH-R4	.	NHC opposes flood hazard modelling being removed from PC8. The flood modelling used to inform flood provisions within PC8 (outlined in the section 32 report) is considered the best available information. Much of the flood modelling has been recently completed by Bay of Plenty Regional Council, accounts for potential changes due to climate change, and considers 1% AEP events, which is becoming standard practice across the country. NHC considers the Rotorua Lakes Design Levels Technical Report 2022 a high-quality report as it has been completed by BOPRC and follows established scientific methods. Using historical records is a standard method for calculating AEP. While there are still uncertainties associated with the information (including recent upgrades to the outlet) the information used can still be classified as 'best available information' and aligns to SDNH-P1 in PC8 - encouraging decision-making and action to reduce impacts to people and property even when there may be limits to the information available and aligns to the proposed National Policy Statement for Natural Hazards.	Disallow original submission	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3
Bay of Plenty Regional Council (BOPRC)	Further submission	F_45_23	40	02	45	23	NH-PA, NH-R4	.	Refer to further submission point in response to Submission 21.5 (further submission 45.4)	Neutral to original submission.	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3
Darren Huston	Submission	S_44_01	44	01	.	.	NH-PA, NH-R4	Oppose	The submitter opposes Flooding Hazard in Ōkāreka – using flood levels from a 2022 Bay of Plenty Regional Council report which uses historical lake level data from 1971-2020 and ignores the multi-million-dollar upgrade to the outlet completed in 2021. They state that the upgrade was specifically designed to prevent future flooding and using data from before the fix was put in place is illogical and ignores the best and most current information.*	That the BOPRC 2022 report for Lake Ōkāreka is rejected and new flood levels are calculated using a proper water balance model that accurately accounts for the full capacity of the upgraded outlet.	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3
Bay of Plenty Regional Council (BOPRC)	Further submission	F_45_13	44	01	45	13	NH-PA, NH-R4	.	Refer to further submission point in response to Submission 21.5 (further submission 45.4)	Neutral to original submission.	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3
Christine Caughey	Submission	S_46_02	46	02	.	.	NH-PA, NH-R4	Oppose	The submitter opposes the identification of flood areas in the planning Maps for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan has utilized an outdated Bay of Plenty Regional Council report (Rotorua Lakes Design Level Technical Report (2022)), to inform its mapping. The identified flood line in the map, extends the level of risk beyond necessity and is not supported by scientific evidence. The engineering work undertaken in 2021 increases the lake outflow, to reduce flooding risk. This, together with the natural artesian outflow into the Waitangi Stream, should have been considered to inform the Plan Change. The proposed provisions of Policy SDNH-P1 are not complied with in the proposed flood controls. The best available information/evidence has not been obtained. Existing building code regulation and other options provide risk mitigation. The submitter considers that PC8 is unnecessary and overregulates the unsubstantiated risk factors of land activity and that natural hazard risks, until further technical reporting has been undertaken in both Fault and Flood identification and management. At this point, the relevance of mapping and rules can be reevaluated. Residential building should remain a permitted activity subject to satisfactory geotechnical site assessment.*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove reference in the Strategy, Objectives, Policies and Rules of the Plan Change, relating to the risks of Flooding. Remove of the identification of Flood risk areas from the mapping in the Plan Change. Residential buildings be a permitted activity subject to geotechnical assessment 	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3
Bay of Plenty Regional Council (BOPRC)	Further submission	F_45_10	46	02	45	10	NH-PA, NH-R4	.	Refer to further submission point in response to Submission 21.5 (further submission 45.4)	Neutral to original submission.	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3
Dani Holt-Lyman	Submission	S_48_01	48	01	.	.	NH-PA, NH-R4	Oppose	The submitter supports the submission on Flooding Risk made by Neil Oppatt and states that at the community meeting involving Rotorua Lakes Council & Bay of Plenty Regional Council, it was concerning the Regional Council had not used a model reflecting active lake management with the outlet and that the council was not willing to review their dataset, model and analysis as it did not fall into their 'schedule'.*	That Plan Change 8 (flood risk) be withdrawn or amended to properly account for existing engineered risk controls & adopt a risk management approach consistent with AS/NZS ISO 31000:2018 standards.	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka
Bay of Plenty Regional Council (BOPRC)	Further submission	F_45_11	48	01	45	11	NH-PA, NH-R4	.	Refer to further submission point in response to Submission 21.5 (further submission 45.4)	Neutral to original submission.	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3
Simon and Megumi Ward	Submission	S_50_02	50	02	.	.	NH-PA, NH-R4	Oppose	.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove reference in the Strategy, Objectives, Policies and Rules of the proposed Plan Change, relating to Flooding; Remove the identification of flood risk areas from the mapping for Lake Ōkāreka in the Plan Change; Until further technical investigation has been undertaken in relation to potential flooding and management at Lake Ōkāreka, the parts of Plan Change 8 relating to flooding at Lake Ōkāreka be withdrawn. 	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3
Bay of Plenty Regional Council (BOPRC)	Further submission	F_45_26	50	02	45	26	NH-PA, NH-R4	.	Refer to further submission point in response to Submission 21.5 (further submission 45.4)	Neutral to original submission.	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3
Ross Wilmoth	Submission	S_52_01	52	01	.	.	NH-PA, NH-R4	Oppose	The risk of flooding at Ōkāreka has been mitigated by works in 2021 and is no longer relevant. This should be struck off. Overall this plan change seems rushed and any decisions should be postponed until after the above issues are addressed in the plan.*	Decisions be postponed for at least a year or until after the stated issues are addressed in the plan.	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3
Bay of Plenty Regional Council (BOPRC)	Further submission	F_45_25	52	01	45	25	NH-PA, NH-R4	.	Refer to further submission point in response to Submission 21.5 (further submission 45.4)	Neutral to original submission.	Refer to 3.9.2.3 High Lake Levels at Lake Ōkāreka and Addendum 2 and 3

Submitter Name	Type	Sub Code	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommended Decision (reference to Section 42A Report)
Ngāti Māhino and members of Te Urunga a Kea (Te Arawa Climate Change working Group)	Submission	S_57_03	57	03	.	.	NH-PA, NH-R4	Amend or Support in Part	The submitters note that rules fix floor levels to a 1% AEP lake event plus freeboard, yet Rotorua's water levels are actively managed and wetland restoration is a priority.*	Relief Sought *Allow alternative lake-level definitions based on operational controls and Ngāti Māhino cultural indicators (e.g., mahinga kai inundation patterns). *Create a consenting pathway with expedited timeframes and reduced fees for wetland enhancement and floating platform designs. *Permit papakāinga and marae-based structures in the Lakes A Zone as controlled activities, subject to resilient foundation and landscaping standards rather than full consent	Refer to 3.9.2.4 Other Flood Mapping Concerns
Ngāti Māhino and members of Te Urunga a Kea (Te Arawa Climate Change working Group)	Submission	S_57_04	57	04	.	.	NH-PA, NH-R4	Amend or Support in Part	The submitters note that rules fix floor levels to a 1% AEP lake event plus freeboard, yet Rotorua's water levels are actively managed and wetland restoration is a priority.*	Relief Sought *Create a consenting pathway with expedited timeframes and reduced fees for wetland enhancement and floating platform designs. *Permit papakāinga and marae-based structures in the Lakes A Zone as controlled activities, subject to resilient foundation and landscaping standards rather than full consent	Refer to 3.9.2.4 Other Flood Mapping Concerns