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RESOURCES MANAGEMENT AND REGULATION COMMITTEE

A meeting of the RESOURCES MANAGEMENT AND REGULATION COMMITTEE will be held in the COUNCIL CHAMBER, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA, on TUESDAY 17 MAY 2016 at 1.00PM.
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Committee Advisor

Recommendations in reports are not to be construed as Council policy until adopted by the Council

BUSINESS

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Conflicts of interest (if any) to be reported for minuting.

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Resource Management and Regulation Committee held on 15 March 2016

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Resource Management and Regulation Committee:

(a) Confirms as a true and correct record the minutes of a meeting of the Resource Management and Regulation Committee held on 15 March 2016.

4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

5. PRESENTATION
6. REPORTS

6.1 Public Release of Draft District Plan Change 27 – Natural Hazards Management – Trevor Ellis (Development Planning Manager) and Nicola Hunt (Communications Co-ordinator)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Resource Management and Regulation Committee

(a) Receives report No. 160421035770.

(b) Approves to make available proposed Plan Change 27 (Natural Hazards Management) to the District Plan as a draft for public discussion and comment prior to RMA notification as a proposed plan change.

(c) Approves the District Plan Portfolio holder to review any minor amendments to the proposed draft plan change prior to public engagement.

(d) Notes that the proposed engagement process on the draft plan change provides for the Committee to hear and consider comments from those that wish to be heard.

(e) Notes that feedback from the consultation period and a request to notify proposed Plan Change 27 (Natural Hazards Management) under the provisions of the RMA will follow at the conclusion of the consultation period at a date to be determined.

6.2 Waimakariri District Plan Review – Confirmation of Resourcing and Budget – Trevor Ellis (Development Planning Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Resource Management and Regulation Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 160505040697.

(b) Recommends to Council to confirm proposed additional budget of $1.75 million to undertake the accelerated District Plan review to be spread over 3 years as set out in Attachment ii.

(c) Notes that the costs of the hearings stage of the District Plan review are to be determined through the 2018/2028 Long Term Plan.

(d) Notes that a full Project Initiation Document will be reported to the Committee at its July meeting.
7. PORTFOLIO UPDATES

7.1 District Plan - Councillor Kirstyn Barnett

7.2 Environmental Health and Civil Defence – Councillor Caroline Faass

7.3 Kaiapoi and Rangiora Town Centres – Councillor Neville Atkinson

8. QUESTIONS

9. URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AND REGULATION COMMITTEE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA, ON TUESDAY 15 MARCH 2016 AT 1.00PM

PRESENT

Councillor C Faass (Chairperson), Mayor D Ayers, Councillors P Allen, N Atkinson, J Gerard and K Barnett

IN ATTENDANCE

Councillor Doody (from 1.40pm, present for the briefing), Messrs N Harrison (Manager Planning and Regulation), T Ellis (Development Planning Manager), Mrs V Caseley (Plan Implementation Manager), Ms B Bray (Senior Policy Planner), Messrs M Bacon (Resource Management Planner), C Bacon (Senior Engineer), N Law (Resource Management Planner), Mrs S O’Hara (Building Officer), Mrs A Benbrook (Planning Administrator) and Mrs A Smith (Committee Advisor)

Victoria introduced Nick Law to the committee. Nick recently commenced employment in the Planning Department as a Graduate Resource Management Planner

1. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There were no conflicts of interest.

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Resource Management and Regulation Committee held on 16 February 2016

Moved Councillor Allen seconded Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Resource Management and Regulation Committee:

(a) Confirms as a true and correct record the minutes of a meeting of the Resource Management and Regulation Committee held on 16 February 2016, with the correction to page 4, under Item 6.3 remove the following sentence in paragraph 4 - “Councillor Barnett believes there is serious undermining of the RMA”.

CARRIED

4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

There were no matters arising.

5. PRESENTATION

There were no presentations.
6. REPORTS

6.1 Accelerated District Plan Review – Activities-based and Effects-based District Plan Approaches – Bev Bray – (Senior Policy Planner)

Ms Bev Bray presented this report recommending that the accelerated District Plan Review changes from the current effects-based plan to an activity-based plan. The committee has considered this matter previously in briefing discussions. The move to an activities-based approach would enable the plan to be clearer, more concise and easily understood. It also provides more certainty for the community and developers by effectively listing activities. Ms Bray advised that the district plan review is subject to public notification under the RMA and any changes proposed would be discussed through the notification and submission process.

Moved Councillor Gerard seconded Councillor Barnett

THAT the Resource Management and Regulation Committee

(a) Receives report no. 160210010374

(b) Approves a move to an activities-based plan during the plan review process to provide for greater certainty and ease of use for users of the District Plan.

CARRIED

Councillor Barnett noted that this matter was discussed at the All Boards workshop recently.

6.2 Telescopic Pool Covers: Fencing of Swimming Pools Act 1987 – Stephanie O’Hara (General Inspector)

Mrs O’Hara was present for the consideration of this report and Nick Harrison provided some background information on this matter of the possible introduction of telescopic pool enclosures into the district. Mrs O’Hara said the intent of bringing this matter to the committee today was to get direction and to have consistency about decision making with any approaches to the Council from the public wishing to have these pool enclosures on their property. A brochure with further information on the covers was circulated to the committee at the meeting.

At 1.11pm the meeting adjourned for a workshop and resumed at 1.32pm.

Concerns were raised that these pool covers would be left open after the pool had been used but it was noted that it is up to pool owners to comply with conditions of the Act or an exemption granted by the hearing committee.

Moved Councillor Atkinson seconded Councillor Allen

THAT the Resource Management and Regulation Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 160301017471.

(b) Resolves that as guidance, telescopic pool enclosures can be assessed by the exemption hearing committee in a similar way to lockable spa pool covers.

(c) Notes that the hearing committee can place conditions on any exemption.
Notes that the Fencing of Swimming Pools Act 1987 does not have provision to grant general exemptions and each application would still be considered on its merits.

CARRIED

Councillor Atkinson said any applications for exemption will come to the Hearings Committee and this is the time for conditions to be placed on the exemption. Following discussion during the workshop, Councillor Atkinson believes when a property is sold, it is usual for the purchaser’s solicitor to request information on whether swimming pool or spa pool fencing complies with the Fencing of Swimming Pools Act or has an approved exemption.

Councillor Allen noted that each application for exemption is looked at on its merits.

Following a question from Mayor Ayers, Mrs O’Hara advised that the Hearing Panel has not dealt with any requests for these pool enclosures at this stage.

Councillor Gerard noted the role of the Hearing Panel is to allow people to comply with the Act and enjoy outdoor activities.

7. PORTFOLIO UPDATES

7.1 District Plan - Councillor Kirstyn Barnett
Nothing to report.

7.2 Environmental Health and Civil Defence – Councillor Caroline Faass
Nothing to report.

7.3 Kaiapoi and Rangiora Town Centres – Councillor Neville Atkinson
Councillor Atkinson noted that the improvements to the town centres are progressing well.

8. QUESTIONS

There were no questions.

9. URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS

There was no urgent general business.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 1.39pm.
CONFIRMED

_____________________
Chairperson

_____________________
Date

STAFF BRIEFING

At the conclusion of the meeting, a staff briefing was held to discuss:

1. Natural Hazards Plan Change and Kaiapoi – Trevor Ellis
2. Harris Plan Change and fences – Matt Bacon
3. Contestable Fund – ring fence or allocate unclaimed funds – Matt Bacon
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to request approval to make publicly available in draft form proposed Plan Change 27 to the District Plan. The draft plan change reviews existing hazard management provisions within the District Plan (the Plan) and proposes to delete, add and amend provisions in relation to natural hazards.

1.2. The plan change forms part of the rolling review of the Plan. The plan change addresses hazards events which are flooding (rainfall and river breakout), earthquake (active fault line identification and liquefaction/lateral spread) and coastal hazard (erosion). The plan change does not address or respond to other potential hazards such as fire, snow events or tsunami. Sea level rise is factored into the plan change as it applies to the flood modelling only. Sea level rise as it may affect part or the full extent of the Waimakariri District coast is not part of the scope of the plan change.

1.3. A section 32 analysis, required under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), has been prepared to ascertain the most appropriate way for the District Plan to address the issues related to natural hazards. The analysis recognises that the Plan is required to give effect to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS) which sets out clear natural hazard requirements for the Plan to contain. The analysis found that deletions, amendments and additions to the District Plan are appropriate to address the issues.

1.4. Given the matters that the proposed plan change addresses and its potential impact on properties and the community, it is considered appropriate to make the draft of the plan change available for public review and comment. This represents good practice in relation to natural hazards management and allows for any comments to be factored into the proposed plan change ahead of formal public notification under the RMA. A 6 week consultation period is proposed, beginning on the 20th of May.

1.5. At this time, a notification date to commence the statutory RMA notification period is not recommended to the Committee. This will be determined based on the level of comment and nature of feedback received on the hazards information and the proposed plan change.
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Resource Management and Regulation Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No. 160421035770.

(b) **Approves** to make available proposed Plan Change 27 (Natural Hazards Management) to the District Plan as a draft for public discussion and comment prior to RMA notification as a proposed plan change.

(c) **Approves** the District Plan Portfolio holder to review any minor amendments to the proposed draft plan change prior to public engagement.

(d) **Notes** that the proposed engagement process on the draft plan change provides for the Committee to hear and consider comments from those that wish to be heard.

(e) **Notes** that feedback from the consultation period and a request to notify proposed Plan Change 27 (Natural Hazards Management) under the provisions of the RMA will follow at the conclusion of the consultation period at a date to be determined.

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. A review of the hazard management provisions of the Plan has been signalled for some time and more recently by the requirements of the CRPS (2013). In September last year, consultation letters were made available to identified stakeholders in accordance with the RMA, Schedule 1, effectively signalling the start of the plan change drafting process. Flood modelling work has also been carried out by the Council, and peer reviewed, and this was completed in 2015. Other analyses, as set out in section 4, have also been completed recently.

3.2. The scope of the plan change is to review the Plan to address flooding (rainfall and river breakout), earthquake (active fault line identification and liquefaction/lateral spread) and coastal hazard (erosion and accretion). Other forms of natural hazard events including but not limited to wind, fire, snow, tsunami are not within the defined scope of the plan change.

3.3. The plan change does address climate change as that is a Part 2 matter under the Act and included within the CRPS. However, the change only factors in the effects of sea level rise as it relates to climate change, within the localised flood modelling undertaken by Council and ultimately the Plan amendments. This is limited to increased rainfall volume of 16% and 1.0m in sea level rise. The change does not include or set out a response to sea level rise as it applies to coastal Waimakariri inundation, pending further policy development in this regard.

3.4. Key amendments proposed within the plan change are as follows:

- **Flooding (High Hazard):** Identification of high hazard areas on the proposed Plan maps. The high hazard area mainly affects the Kaiapoi area (see attached map E4) and its immediate surroundings, plus the Southbrook area. High hazard typically means a flood depth of approximately 1.0m or greater. This is a significant hazard that under the CRPS must either be avoided or mitigated. Plan Change 27 proposes, other than where existing use rights may apply and for certain defined exemptions,
that resource consent is required in order to assess the effects of flooding on development and its context.

- Flooding (Low and Medium Hazard): This applies to areas other than high hazard. The medium hazard depth is shown on the proposed Plan maps for reference/information. Depth values to meet the 0.5% AEP (Annual Exceedance Probability) are available from the Council’s model, Environment Canterbury or from any external flood expert. Depths vary from nil to 1.0m. This information is available from the above mentioned organisations, and Council will have a range of sources to respond to information needs, including staff and an on-line website application where depths at a particular location can be determined.

- Liquefaction: An eastern liquefaction area is proposed to be shown on proposed Map L1. This information has been available for some and is translated into the Plan. Building Act 2004 provisions will continue to apply for foundations and design. The Plan provisions have been amended to better take into account the effects of liquefaction at the time of subdivision, including effects on infrastructure.

- Earthquake Fault Lines: Active faults, based on GNS Science analysis, have been included on the proposed maps. The approach taken is awareness focused. Like the liquefaction areas, the Building Act 2004 provisions will apply and Plan provisions in relation to subdivision will continue to have effect. Both these mechanisms allow for the risk associated with fault line rupture and any distortion area to be clearly signalled.

- Coastal Hazard Lines: A new series of maps is proposed identifying a Coastal Hazard Line based on CRPS requirements. The hazard line relates to coastal erosion and is set out in the CRPS. It provides a baseline for likely erosion rates, which in the case of the Waimakariri coastline is low to limited at this time. The coastal hazard line for the purposes of this plan change does not factor in the effects of sea level rise. New provisions providing for utilities within the coastal hazard line area are proposed.

3.5. The attached section 32 analysis, required under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), provides more detail on the above. It should be noted that the rules proposed with the plan change do not have legal effect until any decision is notified, meaning that they do not trigger the need for compliance or resource consent until that time. Existing provisions would continue to apply.

3.6. The process going forward includes a recommended 6 week consultation period starting on 20 May to a timetable set out in section 10 of the attached communications plan. This is ahead of the RMA process, represents best practice, and allows for any comments to be factored into the proposed plan change ahead of the formal RMA submission process. The detailed communications plan includes five drop-in sessions, comprising two at Kaiapoi and one each at the other centres. The purpose of this pre-RMA consultation period is to raise awareness of natural hazards that impact the District and the draft plan change; a plan change that responds to hazards information that has been made available to the Council and the community (see 4.1 below) in recent years. The Committee is asked to consider whether it wishes to provide an opportunity for those who made comments on the draft plan change to be heard.

3.7. The contents of the plan change and the background hazard information is anticipated to generate a high level of response within the Waimakariri community, in particular those with an interest in the wider Kaiapoi area. While the development of the plan change has been acknowledged within the Red Zone Recovery Plan process, the full contents and
implications of the draft provisions have not been in the public arena. The consultation is likely to generate a range of responses over the six week period which will help to inform when the draft plan change will be notified under the RMA.

3.8. The key steps proposed therefore are:

- 20 May to 1 July – 6 week comments period on draft plan change.
- July/early August (dates to be confirmed) – opportunity for those who made comments to present to the Resource Management and Regulation.
- 20 September – report to the Committee on the notification of the plan change taking into account comments received.

3.9. The Management Team has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

4.  **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1. Council is the recipient of and has produced reports and documents relating to natural hazards as they may affect the Waimakariri District. Key documents are:

- Waimakariri District Council: Waimakariri District Localised Flood Hazard Assessment, July 2015;
- Environment Canterbury: Waimakariri District Flood Hazard Management Strategy Ashley River Floodplain Investigation, June 2008;
- GNS Science: General Distribution and Characteristics of Faults and Folds in the Waimakariri District, North Canterbury, July 2013;
- GNS Science: Assessment of active fault ground deformation hazards associated with the Ashley Fault Zone, Loburn, North Canterbury, September 2014;
- Environment Canterbury: Review of liquefaction hazard information in eastern Canterbury including Christchurch City and parts of Selwyn, Waimakariri and Hurunui Districts, December 2012.

4.2 Some of the above reports have been made available through media releases by the author agencies on or near publication. In addition, the latest river flood modelling data has been factored into the draft planning maps.

4.3 Council has also been actively making its flood modelling available for development proposals, predominantly for the purposes of determining building floor heights and finished ground levels to mitigate inundation effects. Flooding information has also been made available on Project Information Memoranda and Land Information Memoranda. These processes will continue, in modified form, to include the matters included within the proposed plan change. Project Information Memoranda and Land Information Memoranda will be highlighted as ways in addition to the proposed change that hazards information can be made available to the Waimakariri community.

4.3 Upon public notification of proposed Plan Change 27 under the RMA, the community will be able to submit on the proposal through the submission and further submission process under the requirements of the First Schedule of the RMA. A hearing will then be required for a hearing panel to make a decision on the plan change, based on submissions received. The plan change will be notified directly to all rate payers in writing.

5.  **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. There may be financial risks dependent on whether the plan change is supported or opposed by interested parties and the wider public. This includes any subsequent appeal processes to the Environment Court and any further technical work that might be
required once the change is notified for submissions. Costs of the statutory process are provided for within the budget for 2016/17.

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy
This matter is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance Policy.

6.2. Legislation

6.3. Community Outcomes
There is a safe environment for all
Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised and our district has the capacity and resilience to respond to natural disasters.

6.4. Other Matters
The District Plan must give effect to the CRPS which sets out a range of policy requirements in relation to the matters included within the plan change.

Section 79 of the RMA requires the Council to undertake a review of the District Plan at least every 10 years. This plan change forms part of the rolling review of the Plan. It should be noted that Council has approved a move away from the rolling review to a comprehensive accelerated review to be completed over the next 3 years. That review process is being scoped at the moment. The change in approach may mean that the provisions within this plan change need to be factored into the accelerated review, including further public submission processes.
Attachment i: Communications Plan.
Communication Plan - Natural Hazard Management

May – June 2016

1.0 Purpose

The purpose of this plan is to provide a clear outline for communications relating to the Natural Hazards Plan Change and the communication tools and strategies that will be implemented leading up to and during the public consultation period. Due to the varied circumstances that will be presented because of the plan change, it is important that strategies are developed to ensure that all likely audiences are covered.

2.0 Background

Council now has better information on likely hazard risks, such as flood risk modelling and mapping. The District Plan needs to be updated to respond to this information and plan for management of risk situations.

The Council also needs to give effect to natural hazard management directions in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement within the District Plan. The Council has received hazard and flood modelling information which increases the understanding of risk since the previous rules were developed.

The following hazards are covered in the Plan Change:

- Flooding (the principal hazard)
- Coastal Erosion
- Movement from fault Lines
- Liquefaction

The Natural Hazards Management consultation is scheduled for May and June 2016 and relates to the proposed District Plan change dealing with natural hazard management. The proposed plan change will consider the management of natural hazards as outlined above.

The Council has a responsibility to ensure it does all it can to minimise risk to people, property and infrastructure caused by natural hazards.

The proposed plan change is in response to:

- s75 of the Resource Management Act that requires the District Plan to give effect to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and
- identified issues within the District that have been subject to recent policy or technical analysis.
3.0 Communication Strategy

The purpose of this communication strategy is to support public consultation and engagement for the proposed District Plan change and natural hazard management. Consultation will be carried out in two stages. The first stage will be an educational approach, highlighting the information that is now available relating to natural hazards in the Waimakariri District, and how these will impact on future building and development. The Council’s draft proposal on how it will manage these hazards will be put forward for public consultation.

Depending upon feedback received from the first stage of consultation, the second stage will follow with formal public notification of the proposed plan change seeking community feedback. If a high proportion of negative feedback is received, or if controversies arise, stage two will be carried out following the local body elections in the New Year. This will allow time for the incoming Council to understand the proposed plan change, and to enable further work to be undertaken as necessary.

Both stages of the public consultation and engagement for the plan change will be done by:

- Providing clear, accurate and timely information to the district, in particular to those residents in areas most affected by the proposed plan change (high hazard areas)
- Ensuring multiple audiences are reached, with information that is clear
- Engaging with and encouraging the community to provide feedback through the “Let’s Talk” public consultation process.

4.0 Communication Objectives

To support the communication strategy, the communications objectives are to:

- Create an understanding of natural hazards that impact the Waimakariri District and how these will affect building and planning requirements in the future
- Create public awareness of the Council’s proposal to update the District Plan, the way it manages natural hazards and what this means for the people of the Waimakariri district
- Create clear, ‘plain English’ communications to interpret changes to the plan, enabling the public to clearly understand how and if the changes will affect them, what they need to know and where they can go for more information.

5.0 Tactical Objectives

- To clearly interpret the rationale behind the plan change, what the changes are and the Council’s principal responsibility to protect people, property and infrastructure

- To develop a comprehensive communication campaign to support the plan change and enable people to seek out further details of the effects of the plan change

- To emphasise Council’s commitment and responsibility of protecting people, property and infrastructure to minimise risk in the inevitable event of future natural hazards
- Assist in the understanding the plan change for people in low, medium or high hazard areas by tailoring communication material to support varying circumstances and the implications presented to them based on the hazard area they are operating in.

- Provide communication material across multiple channels, to make it easily accessible to everyone.

6.0 Risk and Mitigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community apathy – flooding, earthquake risk. They have had significant exposure to information since Canterbury earthquakes</td>
<td>Clear communication emphasizing lessons learnt from recent natural hazard events. Avoid overload of environment information and target advice to different areas based on their level of risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media exaggeration of risk</td>
<td>Understandable, simple advertising campaign which states the risks from types of hazards and explains planning precautions necessary to maintain public safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism re ‘climate change’</td>
<td>Re-state clearly and simply the scientific rationale which supports the climate change concept, as it relates to sea level rise, rainfall and thereby flood hazard. Clarification of the extent of impact through climate change/sea level rise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible conspiracy theories amongst Red Zone stayers – ‘The Council is just trying to force me out by scaremongering’</td>
<td>Robust and simply expressed rationale for the proposed plan change. Specific focus on face-to-face engagement through drop-in sessions for this audience. Highlight that the high flood hazard area includes the majority of Kaiapoi and that liquefaction affects right along the eastern part of the district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception that Council is trying to reduce house values</td>
<td>Clear information that identifies the level of risk including low or no risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger directed at Council for allowing building and development to be undertaken in hazard areas in the first place</td>
<td>Re-state knowledge gained from scientific analysis carried out following the Canterbury earthquakes and new information on ground levels and tools for analyzing flooding risk – ‘what we know now is a great deal more than we did before, and the natural environment has changed markedly following the earthquakes’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents are unaware of the effects of the natural hazards plan change</td>
<td>Communications are broadcast across multiple channels to increase likelihood of public awareness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General discontent in the Kaiapoi community</td>
<td>Ensure all detail is clear evidence to back up the purpose for the plan change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.0 Target Audience

There are multiple audiences to be addressed during the consultation, based on the hazard area where the development is occurring, the type and size of the development and whether it is a new or existing development. Communication material will need to be tailored to reflect the different target audiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directly affected</th>
<th>Indirectly affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The Kaiapoi community</td>
<td>• Property owners in low hazard areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Anyone applying for resource consent or building consent</td>
<td>• Business owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Anyone thinking about developing a piece of land in the Waimakariri District</td>
<td>• Real Estate Agents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residents and landowners in medium and high hazard areas</td>
<td>• Wider Waimakariri District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• People applying for a LIM</td>
<td>• Insurance providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development and building community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>Interest groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Councillors and elected members</td>
<td>• Enterprise North Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CEO and Management Team</td>
<td>• Residents Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strategy and Engagement Manager – Simon Markham</td>
<td>• WDC Facebook followers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Manager Utilities and Roading – Gerard Cleary</td>
<td>• Ngai Tuahuiri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communication and Engagement Manager – Matt McIlraith</td>
<td>• GNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Senior Engineer – Chris Bacon</td>
<td>• Environment Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 3 Waters Manager – Kallely Simpson</td>
<td>• Marion Gadsby – Hazard Analyst Environment Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Customer Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Building and Planning Units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.0 Key messages

Key themes of communications will focus on the Council's commitment of minimising risk to people, property and infrastructure.

- Recognition of hazard and management of risk is central to protecting life, property and infrastructure
- To reduce risk to people, property and infrastructure, the Council will carry out the following:
  - In the case of flooding, set prudent floor level requirements / require mitigation
  - In the case of liquefaction susceptibility require appropriate geotechnical investigations
  - In the case of active fault areas ensure homeowners are aware of potential risks
- The Council is reviewing the District Plan in relation to how it manages natural hazards because of regional policy directives placed upon it. In light of new information on natural hazards, it has a responsibility to plan and manage the risks associated with them.
- The impacts of the plan change will differ depending upon the activity to be undertaken, and the hazard area it is to be undertaken in. A range of activities are evaluated in the Natural Hazards Risk Matrix and it will be important to ensure that key messages are adapted to each scenario.
- Technical development allows for more robust identification/management of future risk

8.0 Communications Approach

1. Media relations

- Proactively manage media relationships
- Set up a targeted media briefing with local media upon imminent release of natural hazards detail
- Supply 'plain English' news releases to local media that clearly outlines key aspects of the plan change and where to go for more information

2. Community consultation and engagement

- Comprehensive information made available on the website
- Drop-in sessions held in strategic areas in the district
- Hotline phone number to answer questions
- Interactive tool set up online for property owners to check the hazard area relating to their property.
### 9.0 Tactics and Objectives

Because of the diverse range of scenarios that will be presented resulting from the plan change, the communications approach cannot be ‘one size fits all’. Communication tactics will be varied to ensure that all audiences are targeted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tactic</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Letter to all property owners (stage two)                    | • To inform the community, in plain English, about the Council’s proposal to update the District Plan provisions that manage natural hazards, what it means for them in a broad sense and where to go to find out more information.  
• Encourage people to view information on the website, visit a drop in session or phone the hotline. |
| Hotline for phone enquiries - managed by the Development Planning Unit | • To enable the public to get accurate property and scenario specific information from an expert that can help to negotiate the technical aspects of the plan change. The phone line will be manned between the hours of 8.30am-5pm Monday-Friday. |
| Comprehensive local media coverage during consultation       | • Raise the profile of natural hazards affecting the district, and the consequences for building and development in the future  
• Encourage community engagement  
• Seek feedback/submissions  
• Provide information regarding the proposed changes. |
| Media briefing with local media                              | • To encourage a neutral press release of the plan change that does not generate panic or worry to the community. |
| Drop-in-sessions                                             | • To provide an opportunity for face-to-face discussion about the plan change and what it means for specific properties and hazard areas – provide a higher level of service to the Kailapoi community.  
• To provide technical information and consequences of plan change detail to the real estate sector and other industry bodies. |
| FAQ handout                                                  | • To answer a series of common questions to help people understand what the plan change means and to translate technical information into plain English. |
| All Community Boards briefing                               | • Ensure community leaders in the district, in particular Kailapoi, are presented with all evidence ensuring the effects of the plan change are understood and able to be clearly translated to the wider community. |
| Website                                                      | • Provide comprehensive ‘plain English’ |
information about the plan change.
- Provide an interactive tool to enable property owners to identify which hazard area their property is in, with links for further information.

Facebook
- Provide the opportunity for community discussion and informal feedback
- Encourage the community to make a submission and ask questions.

Twitter
- Invite the community to link to the Council website for comprehensive information

Internal Communications to Councillors and Community Board Members
- To ensure elected members are briefed about effects of the plan change and what it means to their constituents.

Messages on electronic media screens
- To raise public awareness of the plan change to walk-in customers.
- To raise public awareness of areas where subdivision took place in hazard areas and Council's commitment to learn from those examples. A reminder of Council's responsibilities to better manage natural hazards, based on the information that is now available to us.

Have available examples of other areas where subdivision occurred that were affected by a natural hazard i.e. Bexley's Pacific Park and Seafield Lagoon Subdivision post-earthquake http://www.stuff.co.nz/the-press/news/8072545/Report-scolds-councils-over-subdivisions
Also have available examples of the effects of climate change and the impacts that it will have in the future.

10.0 Communications Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Content lead</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal Update</td>
<td>Elected members and Management Team briefing</td>
<td>Trevor Ellis/Simon Markham</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotline</td>
<td>All stakeholders</td>
<td>Trevor Ellis/Audrey Benbrook</td>
<td>Thursday 19 May</td>
<td>Homeowners can call directly to speak to the Development Planning Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media briefing</td>
<td>All stakeholders</td>
<td>Matt McIlraith/Trevor Ellis</td>
<td>Monday 23 May</td>
<td>Journalist briefing – Northern Outlook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop in sessions</td>
<td>All stakeholders – in particular Kalapoi property</td>
<td>Trevor Ellis and Development Planning Unit</td>
<td>1 June Oxford 2 June Kalapoi 7 June Woodend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| owners                        | 8 June Kaiapoi  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9 June Rangiora</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question and Answers Handout</strong></td>
<td>All stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Media advertising – “Let’s Talk”** | Nicola Hunt | Fri 20 May KA  
Weds 25 May NO  
Thurs 26 May TN  
Sat 27 May NO  
Weds 1June NO  
Thur 2 June TN  
Fri 3 June KA and Oxford Bulletin  
Sat 4 June NO  
Final Notice  
Fri 17 Jun NO  
Wed 22 Jun TN  
Thur 23 June No  
Fri 24 Oxford Bulletin  
Sat 25 Jun June TN  
Fri 17 June KA | Full page educational advert in KA to target Kaiapoi Community |
| **Website**               | Trevor Ellis/Bev Bray/Webmaster | Live on Monday 23 May |
| **Facebook**             | Trevor Ellis/Webmaster | Ongoing throughout consultation period |
| **Twitter**             | Trevor Ellis/Webmaster | Ongoing throughout consultation period |

Attachment ii. Plan change report (section 32 analysis and background reports), including the proposed schedule of changes to the District.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Management Act 1991</th>
<th>Plan Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri District Council</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri District Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Plan Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 32 Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Proposed District Plan Change 27: Natural Hazards Management

1. Introduction

1.1 The Waimakariri District is subject to a number of natural hazards. The term 'natural hazard' is usually associated with major geophysical events or natural occurrences and in particular where those events interact with people and their assets, threatening life, property and infrastructure essential for the functioning and safety of communities.

1.2 The population of Waimakariri District is located predominantly on a plains area. Within the plains area, flooding and active fault lines (including the Lees Valley area), along with ground instability resulting from ground shaking, are the main damaging effects. It is therefore important to ensure that structures, buildings and infrastructure are located where the risk from natural hazards are minimised.

2. Purpose

2.1 Section 32 of the Resource Management Act (RMA or Act) requires Council to evaluate the appropriateness of objectives in a proposed Plan or Plan Change in achieving the purpose of the Act and the appropriateness of proposed policies, rules and methods in achieving the objectives. The Council is required to prepare a section 32 evaluation report and make it available concurrently when the proposal is publicly notified pursuant to the requirements of the Act.

2.2 The purpose of this report is to fulfil section 32 evaluation requirements for Proposed Plan Change 27 - Natural Hazards Management. This report is accompanied by proposed District Plan amendments (Appendix 1) to the operative Waimakariri District Plan (the Plan) and supporting information.

2.3 The direction for this review and the proposed response in terms of amendments to the Plan relate to the following overarching matters:

- Recent technical analysis in regard to earthquake fault line and liquefaction risk; and
- Recent technical analysis and modelling of localised (rainfall) and river breakout flood risks.

2.4 The proposed plan change recognises changes in approaches to natural hazard management since the Plan was developed and to utilise recent technical information to respond to current legislative requirements. The proposal is to amend the Plan informed by the recent information reconciled with RMA and regional planning requirements.
3. **Context and Review Scope**

3.1 The Council is currently reviewing the Plan in accordance with section 79 of the Act. The Plan was made operative in November 2005 and section 79 of the Act requires that a district plan be reviewed every 10 years. In 2011, the Council resolved that the Plan would be reviewed in parts, on a ‘rolling review’ basis.

3.2 The proposed Plan provisions are in part informed by other planning and statutory documents and requirements, which are addressed in this report. Of particular relevance is the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. The other part of the broader context and scope relates to natural hazard matters, assessment and development issues that are specific to Waimakariri District.

3.3 This report evaluates Plan provisions relating to natural hazards as they apply to the entire District and the zones identified by the Plan. The term ‘natural hazard’ for the purpose of this plan change is limited to Waimakariri District specific geophysical events or natural occurrences in regard to flooding (rainfall and river breakout), earthquake (active fault line identification and liquefaction/lateral spread), coastal hazard (erosion) and to an extent climate change as it relates to flood hazard modelling and assessment only.

3.4 In regard to the above, Appendix 2 sets those matters that are outside the scope of this plan change. In addition, existing Plan provisions that are outside the scope of the plan change may be identified for a more complete view of how the Plan will manage natural hazards, but are not taken into specific consideration within the amendments. This is a particular implication given the ‘rolling review’ of the Plan.

3.5 Objectives and policies often have wide effect taking into account the structure of the District Plan. The Operative Plan is structured in such a way that Chapters 8 and Chapter 27 form the focus of this review. There are other necessary changes to other chapters based on the preferred option identified under section 32 of the Act and the proposed schedule of Plan amendments.

4. **Significance of Proposals**

4.1 Section 32(1)(c) of the Act requires that an evaluation report contains a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the proposal.

4.2 An evaluation of the scale and significance of the proposal (Plan Change 27) is set out in Appendix 3. The significance is determined as ‘high’, requiring a level of detail that focusses on key points along with expert assessments.

5. **Overview of the Issues**

**Flooding (Localised and River Breakout)**

5.1 The plains area of the District has historically witnessed flooding from both localised rainfall and breakout of the rivers, principally from the Waimakariri and Ashley Rivers. Flooding effects from localised rainfall events have been
evident in the past due to the relatively flat topography and ponding nature of low lying areas, particularly in the eastern part of the District.

5.2 The network of stop banks has largely contained the major rivers, with only major events continuing to pose some threat from breakout of those rivers. There is an extensive system of stop banks and floodgates which provide a level of protection against flood events, particularly those relating to breakout of the Ashley or Waimakariri Rivers. Recent works have improved the stop bank network on the lower Ashley River.

5.3 Flood modelling carried out by the Waimakariri District Council and Environment Canterbury has quantified the extent of potential flooding, and this has been shown on the proposed District Plan maps. While these maps are based on the best available information, flooding in specific areas may be less severe than the model predicts, and a degree of variability from the modelling results can be expected. Site specific detailed studies may therefore be required to confirm the flood hazard in certain circumstances.

5.4 The flood hazard within the District is now better understood than in the past based on modelling. The risks from flooding can be managed through controls or measures to ensure the effects of flooding on people, infrastructure and their assets are appropriately addressed.

Earthquake

5.5 GNS Science (GNS) has identified several active fault lines in the District and these have been mapped along with analysis of their likelihood of an earthquake event. While there are a relatively large number of faults regarded as active throughout the District, there is a large degree of uncertainty about the exact location of the fault line in most instances.

5.6 A significant fault in the District is the Ashley fault, running just north of and parallel to, the Ashley River near Loburn. This fault has been studied and mapped at a greater level of detail. While there are other areas of significant ground modification such as around Springbank, Cust and North Loburn, these fault areas have not been well studied and the location of the fault is therefore less certain. The Starvation Hill Fault, which runs through Oxford, falls within this category. Mapping of these faults is therefore at a large scale with an accuracy of +/- 50 - 100m at best, which has implications for detailed site development, especially within higher density residential areas or zonings.

5.7 The level of detail and certainty around fault lines is not precise. In terms of managing effects associated with fault rupture, recommendations by GNS for the Ashley Fault take a permissive approach. This approach is based on the very rare rupture frequency of the fault line, the understanding that the knowledge of the fault line will encourage people to keep clear of it, the geotechnical requirements of building consent processes, and current Building Act 2004 requirements ensuring the structural integrity of buildings such that they will not collapse, although they may suffer significant damage.

5.8 The location of the Ashley Fault means that it is very unlikely that buildings of a critical type or high habitable density will be located in close vicinity to it in the future. A similar permissive management approach is an option with all fault lines in the District due to the low risk of occurrence, and even lower risk
of harm to people over and above that which inherently exists. As set out later in this report, it is not considered necessary to overly constrain subdivision or the location of structures in areas near known active fault lines, and no fault line specific rules are proposed for inclusion in the Plan.

5.9 While the shaking associated with fault rupture cannot be avoided, it is possible to avoid areas of significant ground movement or areas where soils are likely to liquefy. The location of liquefaction susceptible soils is largely contained to the eastern portion of the District. It is therefore appropriate to provide some control over subdivision in these areas, and this is achieved in part through current subdivision matters for control, including Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment guidelines. Similarly, the location of structures, buildings and infrastructure away from such areas, or where designed to meet structural standards, would contribute towards a reduction in the severity of any effects associated with liquefaction and fault line rupture overall.

Coastal Hazard

5.10 Coastal hazard refers to erosion of the coastal area or potential inundation. The effects of sea level rise due to climate change may affect long term planning for both coastal erosion and seawater inundation, and more detailed assessment in the future will be required to identify areas likely to be at risk. Seawater inundation zones have not been identified for Waimakariri District within Appendix 5 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS).

5.11 The Waimakariri District has a significant amount of coast, with a significant population living within a short distance of it. However, in general the coastal area is protected by a strip of large sand dunes, except around the mouths of the Ashley and Waimakariri Rivers, and the coastline is generally not subject to severe erosion processes at this time.

5.12 In addition, the coastal area is not subject to development pressure due to public ownership and the influence of existing Plan provisions. While inland areas around the river mouths are susceptible to inundation from large events such as tsunamis, these potentially very damaging but very rare events are considered to be best dealt with through other mechanisms such as Civil Defence.

5.13 Both the Regional Coastal Environment Plan and the CRPS were amended in 2015. The Regional Policy Statement now includes provisions requiring the Council via its Plan to manage coastal hazards. The amendments also included provisions to either avoid or mitigate new development in urban areas located within high hazard areas.

5.14 The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 (NZCPS) provides policy direction for coastal management under the RMA 1991, and the District Plan must give effect to the NZCPS, and have regard to it when assessing resource consents.

Climate Change

5.15 Climate change may result in increased severe rainfall events and rising sea level. Both of these could lead to flooding effects, particularly in the lower lying and coastal areas. The flood modelling carried out by the Council has factored in a 1.0m rise in sea level and an additional 16% rainfall volume change. These values are considered to provide appropriate recognition of the effects of climate change.
6. Comprehensive Hazard Management

Table 1: Issue Assessment

| Is hazard management a resource management issue? | Management of hazards is a resource management issue for the District. Inappropriately managed development may result in or impose costs on the community and impact on safety of people and affect infrastructure. The ability to provide for development within a growth district in a safe, integrated and sustainable way is a resource management issue. The proposed plan change reviews existing objectives and policies, the existing environmental characteristics, and the outcomes that are being achieved, including effects on the environment. |
| Is hazard management relevant to the District? | The review of provisions is relevant to the District as the Ten Year Plan (2015-2025) identifies estimated population growth of 8,000 people in the years to 2025 (55,000 to 63,000 people). This has implications for infrastructure, development and exposure to risk in general. Community outcomes include the following:

**Environment**

*a. There is a safe environment for all*
Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised and our district has the capacity and resilience to respond to natural disasters.

The District Plan contains 3 objectives within Chapter 8 (Natural Hazards). In addition, Chapter 8 states that some information and the policy response may need revision during the life of the Plan. When reviewing plan provisions, effect must be given to any relevant national policy statements and any regional policy statement (sections 73 and 75 of the Act).

In addition, a number of other plans and strategies have been prepared by Council or other agencies that have direct relevance to the understanding of natural hazards within the District (see section 7). Collectively, these documents provide a basis for a land use and subdivision policy response within the District Plan, including methods to give effect to the policy response. |
| Is addressing the hazard issues likely to make a difference? | Addressing the issues will provide for enhanced integrated understanding of hazard issues and risk effects for development, infrastructure and importantly people and their assets. It is acknowledged that the Plan is not the only |

|
### Should the hazard issues be addressed by the District Plan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism to manage the potential effects of natural hazards. Other approaches include, but are not limited to Civil Defence; education and physical works e.g. stop banks to manage river flooding.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 31(1)(b)(i) of the RMA provides the Council with the function of controlling any actual or potential effects of the use, development, or protection of land; including for the purpose of the avoidance or mitigation of natural hazards, as required to give effect to the RMA. The CRPS also stipulates a number of methods that the Plan is to give effect to within its provisions. When prepared prior to 2005, the objectives, policies, rules and methods within the Plan gave effect to the Act. The existing Plan provisions were found to be appropriate under the RMA when the Plan was developed. This report assesses the most appropriate way for the Plan to continue to give effect to the Act. It is understood that a National Policy Statement on natural hazards is proposed to be in place by 2018 and updated non-statutory guidance on liquefaction and coastal hazards and climate change is proposed by late 2016. These are to be prepared by the Ministry for the Environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. Information and Research

7.1 There have been a number of reports prepared on natural hazards as they apply to the District. These include:

- Ministry for the Environment: Planning for development of land on or close to active faults: A guideline to assist resource management planners in New Zealand, 2003; and

7.2 Key reports are:

- Waimakariri District Council: Waimakariri District Localised Flood Hazard Assessment, July 2015;
- GNS Science: General Distribution and Characteristics of Faults and Folds in the Waimakariri District, North Canterbury, July 2013;
- GNS Science: Assessment of active fault ground deformation hazards associated with the Ashley Fault Zone, Loburn, North Canterbury, September 2014;
• Environment Canterbury: Review of liquefaction hazard information in eastern Canterbury including Christchurch City and parts of Selwyn, Waimakariri and Hurunui Districts, December 2012; and

7.3 The information contained in the above reports (see Appendix 8) informs and provides an understanding of the natural hazards included within the plan change, as set out in the following sections.


8.1 The Act promotes the sustainable management of natural and physical resources while continuing to enable people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, as well as their health and safety. The Act also sets out a range of other matters to consider in order to achieve its purpose.

8.2 Section 31 (see Appendix 4) requires the Council to give effect to the Act through the establishment of a District Plan setting out objectives, policies, and rules to achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources. Section 31(1)(b)(i) and (ii) specifically provide for control of any effects of land use, development or protection for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating natural hazards, and preventing or mitigating any adverse effects of the storage, use, disposal and transportation of hazardous substances.

8.3 The District Plan (operative in 2005) sets out the resource management issues for the District. The objectives, policies, and associated rules and methods within the Plan address those issues in order to achieve sustainable management of natural and physical resources and thereby to achieve the purpose of the Act. This includes provisions relating to natural hazards.

8.4 Section 79 requires a review of the District Plan to be commenced within 10 years of it becoming operative, except where the provisions have been previously reviewed. This plan change forms part of the District Plan review required under section 79.

8.5 Section 74 of the Act requires the Council to have regard to its functions under section 31, the provisions of Part II of the Act (purpose and principles), and its duties under section 32 when undertaking a Plan change. Section 74 also sets out a number of other matters to have regard to, including plans and strategies prepared under other acts. This includes any proposed Regional Policy Statement or Regional Plan, and any relevant planning document recognised by an Iwi Authority and lodged with the Council, and any management plan or strategy prepared under other Acts.

8.6 Significantly, section 75(3)(c) of the Act requires the Plan to ‘give effect’ to any operative Regional Policy Statement, which is particularly relevant with regard to natural hazard events and their effects. Section 75(3) of the Act also requires that a District Plan must give effect to any relevant National Policy Statement (NPS) or New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS). There are no related National Policy Statements that have bearing on this plan change, and the provisions of the NZCPS are also not impacted on by the proposed natural hazard management provisions. It is understood that an NPS on natural hazards is to be prepared by the Ministry for the Environment, although the scope of that document is not known at this time.
9. **Documents the District Plan must give effect to**

**Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS)**

9.1 The Canterbury Regional Policy Statement is an operative document (2013) and the District Plan must give effect to the provisions contained within it. The directly relevant chapter of the CRPS is Chapter 11 – Natural Hazards. The CRPS includes new or amended provisions inserted under the Land Use Recovery Plan in 2015.

9.2 Section 74(2)(a)(1) of the Act requires that any plan change ‘have regard’ to any proposed Regional Policy Statement. This is not relevant as there is no proposed Regional Policy Statement relevant to Plan Change 27.

**New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement**

9.3 The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 (NZCPS) includes ‘policies in order to achieve the purpose of the Act in relation to the coastal environment of New Zealand’. This is the key statutory document in regard to coastal development and hazard management and came into effect on 3 December 2010.

9.4 Objective 5 of the NZCPS seeks to ensure the management of coastal risk (taking account of climate change) through location away from risk areas, consideration of existing development and protecting or restoring natural defences to coastal hazards.

9.5 Policies 24 to 27 of the NCPS identify areas that are potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least 100 years. Priority is given to areas of high risk, avoiding increasing the risk from coastal hazards from subdivision, use and development and provision (where appropriate) for the protection restoration or enhancement of natural defences to protect coastal land uses, biodiversity, heritage and geological values. In areas of significant existing development where there are coastal hazards, options for risk reduction need to be assessed. Policy 9 recognises the importance of infrastructure provision and tangata whenua needs among other matters.

10. **Relevant Management Plans or Strategies**

10.1 Section 74(2)(b)(i) of the Act requires that a District Plan have regard to any management plans or strategies prepared under other Acts. The following documents are relevant to proposed Plan Change 27.
Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan (IMP)

10.2 The Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan (IMP) 2013 is part of a larger framework of regional and territorial planning documents. The IMP sits alongside the CRPS, the Land and Water Regional Plan (LWRP) among other documents that regard shall be given to.

10.3 The Council is required to take into account the IMP (pursuant to Section 74 (2A) of the RMA) to the extent that it has a bearing on resource management issues.

10.4 The IMP identifies issues and policies that include management of water and land resources. While not specifically focusing on natural hazard management, the plan identifies climate change (Issue R3) as having potentially significant impacts on the relationship of Ngai Tahu and their culture and traditions with their ancestral land, wahi tapu and other taonga. Issue R3.3 requires local authorities to...recognise and provide for the potential effects of climate change, including sea level rise, salination of rivers and hapuu (lagoons), oceanic warming, changes to rainfall, and changes to ecosystems.

10.5 Fracking is also identified in issue R18 as having 'potential to generate earthquakes, and protection from coastal erosion is sought in relation to Ngai Tahu cultural and historic heritage sites (Issue TAN0.4).

10.6 The proposed plan change incorporates climate change into the assessment for flooding, and includes provisions to recognise and regulate development within areas susceptible to coastal erosion in the next 100 years.

Waimakariri Ten Year Plan

10.7 The Waimakariri Ten Year Plan, prepared under the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA), sets out a number of community outcomes. The LGA focuses on sustainable development, and in particular social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being. The Ten Year Plan records the outcomes identified by the community, and it is expected that the Council will use this process to inform other plans and strategies. This includes RMA processes, such as the preparation of plan changes.

10.8 One of community outcomes contained within the Ten Year Plan relates to natural hazard resilience (see section 6 of this report).

Urban Development Strategy 2007 (UDS)

10.9 The UDS project was initiated in 2004 to manage growth of the Greater Christchurch sub-region to 2041. The UDS, in terms of development planning, has largely been implemented by the LURP and Chapter 6 provisions to the CRPS which provide direction around recovery, urban form, settlement patterns and hazards but broadly reflects the direction of the UDS including 'key approaches'. The UDS is subject to review.

Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016

10.10 The proposed Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 is currently open for public submissions. It aims to:

- Manage recreation activity for the benefit and enjoyment of all users;
- Minimise any negative environmental impact of beach activity;
• Promote public health and safety; and
• Minimise nuisance and offensive behaviour.

10.11 The Bylaw applies to the whole of the coast within the Waimakariri District boundary, including Kairaki, Pines, Woodend, Waikuku and Pegasus beaches. It proposes controls on buildings and structures within the beach area (as defined by the Bylaw) subject to approval by an authorised officer. The Bylaw is not proposed to apply to an activity where conducted in accordance with a resource consent issued under the RMA.

Activity Management Plans

10.12 The Council’s Activity Management Plans are forward plans for service activities such as roading, wafer, wastewater, stormwater and solid waste that include levels of service, risk assessment, capacity assessment, condition assessment and forward capital works programmes. The risk assessment component includes risk from natural hazard events to as far as possible mitigate risk on services.

Engineering Code of Practice

10.13 The Engineering Code of Practice is a set of standards developed by the Waimakariri District Council in relation to Council services, including those that are essential for community resilience during and following a natural hazard event.

11. Other Documents

11.1 Section 74(2)(b)(i) also requires regard to be given to the following:

• Any relevant entry in the Historic Places Register s74(2)(b)(iia);
• Regulations relating to sustainability of fisheries or Maori customary fishing s74(2)(b)(ii);
• The extent that the district plan needs to be consistent with the plans or proposed plans of adjacent territorial authorities s74(2)(c);
• Any relevant document prepared or recognised by an iwi authority s74(2A); and
• The effects of trade competition s74(3).

11.2 These matters have been considered as part of the evaluation, elsewhere within this report, or are not considered directly relevant to the issues associated with natural hazard management in terms of this plan change.

11.3 Other relevant statutes include the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Act 2002 and the Building Act 2004, as set out below:

Civil Defence and Emergency Management Act 2002 (CDEM ACT)

11.4 The CDEM Act has as two of its purposes the sustainable management of hazards, and encouraging and enabing communities to achieve acceptable levels of risk. Another purpose is to require local authorities to co-ordinate emergency management across the areas of Reduction (of risk); Readiness (for an event); Response (when an event occurs); and Recovery (post event).

11.5 The provisions of Plan Change 27 factor in the above purposes in order to reduce the risk to people and communities associated with natural hazards.
The plan change also includes maps showing the location/extent of the hazards, subject to the purpose of the plan change, which are an important means of improving awareness.

**Building Act 2004**

11.6 The Building Act 2004 prescribes the legal requirements for all buildings in New Zealand, including regulation of building design in relation to natural hazards. Section 37 provides the ability to delay building work until a resource consent is gained. This can be used where development is taking place on hazard-prone land and where Plan rules require a resource consent.

11.7 Sections 71 to 74 relate to building consent restrictions for the construction of buildings on land subject to natural hazards. The Building Act requirements for natural hazards are an important method outside of the District Plan for ensuring protection of people and property from natural hazard events.

12. **The Operative District Plan**

12.1 The Waimakariri District Plan was made operative in November 2005. The following analysis summarises the Plan provisions that are relevant to the issue of natural hazard management.

12.2 Chapter 8 (Natural Hazards) contains the Objectives, Policies, and Methods for natural hazard management, while Chapters 27 (Natural Hazards) and 32 (Subdivision) contain key relevant rules. Localised flooding areas are currently shown on District Plan maps, and the District Plan contains a number of Objectives, Policies, Methods and rules relating to subdivision and land use within those areas. Land use Rule 27.1.1.15 in particular restricts structures within the localised flooding areas. Other natural hazards are not specifically addressed in the rules, other than subdivision, or on the District Plan maps.

12.3 The current localised flooding areas are largely based on past experience and observation, rather than on any assessment or data resulting from modelling. The areas affected by breakout flooding from the Waimakariri and Ashley Rivers are not currently accounted for in the Plan. While lack of detailed data has meant this approach has been acceptable in the past, the detailed data now available provides for a more comprehensive outcome based on known rainfall inputs and detailed ground contour data. The current approach has the potential for inaccurate and/or inappropriate flood hazard effects management.

12.4 With regard to earthquake effects, the CRPS requires the District Council to manage subdivision and land use on or close to an active fault trace, or in areas susceptible to liquefaction and lateral spreading. While the existing matters for control relating to subdivision contain general reference to natural hazards and ground stability, the Plan currently has no comprehensive ground stability controls, and there is no representation of, or controls relating to, fault lines.

12.5 Recommendations from GNS Science and Environment Canterbury (ECan) are that proximity to known fault lines is a low risk factor, given return periods, and no specific controls to manage this issue are necessarily required. However, controls relating to ground stability help to ensure subdivision and
location of structures in liquefiable areas are appropriately addressed. These matters need to be reviewed to ensure the Plan gives effect to the CRPS.

12.6 There is currently no specific provision for management of coastal hazards within the Plan as it applies to the coastal area, other than limited references. As the District contains a significant stretch of coast, some of which may be impacted by coastal hazards, it is necessary to implement provisions within the Plan to give effect to the CRPS. Further assessment of sea level rise impacts is likely to be necessary in the future.

12.7 Overall, the function of the District Plan with regard to natural hazard management will be reinforced by addressing these issues, as will compliance with relevant statutory documents.

13. **Options to Amend the Operative District Plan**

13.1 Section 32 of the Act sets out the process by which the Council is required to change the District Plan to achieve the purpose of the Act and fulfil its statutory obligations. In particular, section 32 requires the Council, prior to public notification of any change, to carry out an evaluation to examine:

- the extent to which the objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA; and
- whether the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives by:
  - identifying other reasonably practicable options; and
  - assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of the selected provisions; and
  - summarising the reasons for deciding on the provisions.

13.2 The evaluation of efficiency and effectiveness of the selected provisions, or any relevant or remaining provisions of the current District Plan, must:

- identify and assess the benefits and costs of the environmental, economic, social and cultural effects resulting from implementation of the provisions. This assessment needs to have specific regard to opportunities for economic growth and employment that are anticipated to be provided or reduced, quantifying those benefits and costs where practicable. It also needs to assess the risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter.

13.3 After the submission period closes, the Council is required to undertake a further evaluation of costs and benefits prior to making a decision on the proposed plan change, taking into account matters raised in any submissions.

13.4 Options for achieving the purpose of the Act and other documents such as the CRPS should consider:

- Retaining the status quo;
- Consideration of other regulatory non-RMA approaches as well as non-regulatory methods; and
- Identification of preferred 'candidate options' by discarding unreasonable or impracticable options. This could include:
  - achievability in terms of the scope of the plan change, tools and resources available;
  - enforceability;
- sound principles for writing provisions; and
- effectiveness of the option to guide decision-making.

13.5 For the purposes of proposed Plan Change 27, options are identified as set out below (Options 1 to 4).

**OPTION 1** – The status quo; retain existing objectives, policies, rules, methods and maps (see Appendix 5).

**OPTION 2** – Prohibit or restrict further development within areas affected by natural hazards and in particular those affected by high hazard events.

**OPTION 3** – Provide a framework for management of the effects of natural hazards, based on recent information from flood modelling, active fault line and liquefaction research and coastal hazards, to ensure effects are avoided or mitigated.

**OPTION 4** - Use alternative methods to achieve the purpose of the Act and control effects by providing a framework of objectives and policies predominantly implemented or supported by methods that sit outside of the Plan.

13.6 Appendix 1 outlines the objective proposed as part of Option 3 in addition to retained, new or amended policies, rules and methods to the Plan. A commentary on the Plan provisions is attached as Appendix 7. Overall, Option 3 is the recommended option to amend the Plan. This is assessed below.

14. **Examining the Appropriateness of Proposed Objective(s)**

14.1 Section 32 requires the Council to be satisfied that any proposed objective(s) are the most appropriate way of achieving the purpose of the Act. When proposing a change to the objectives of the Plan, section 32(1)(a) of the Act requires an assessment of the extent to which each proposed objective is the most appropriate towards achieving the purpose of the Act.

14.2 Proposed Plan Change 27 introduces one new objective and deletes existing objectives. Table 2 below sets out an assessment of the appropriateness of the proposed objective.

15. **Evaluation of Proposed Policies, Rules and Methods**

15.1 Section 32(1)(b) of the Act directs the Council to examine whether, having regard to their efficiency and effectiveness, the policies, rules or other methods proposed are the most appropriate way to achieve the objective(s).

15.2 Table 2 sets out the evaluation of benefits and costs and efficiency and effectiveness. Opportunities for economic growth and employment, and the risk of acting or not acting if there is insufficient information available are assessed following this.

15.3 Section 32(3) requires that the examination under section 32(1)(b) must relate to the provisions and objectives of the proposal and the objectives of the existing Plan where relevant and if they would remain after the proposal takes effect. This is on the basis that a plan change cannot be justified based solely
on its own objectives, without being consistent with the broader plan objectives.

15.4 Whilst Plan Change 27 makes amendments to the operative District Plan, there are no existing objectives within the Plan that are relevant to the plan change. This is on the basis of the purpose and scope of the plan change as set out earlier in this report. The existing objectives relevant to the plan change have been deleted in their entirety and replaced with a new objective as set out in Appendix 1.

15.5 Table 2.1: Evaluation of Option 3, Objective 8.1.1.

| OPTION 3 – Provide a framework for management of the effects of natural hazards, based on recent information from flood modelling, active fault line and liquefaction research and coastal hazards, to ensure those effects are avoided or mitigated. |
| Objective – Objective 8.1.1 Natural Hazard Management |
| People, property, structures and the environment are: |
| a. protected from the adverse effects of natural hazards; and |
| b. are resilient and safe through natural hazard risk awareness. |

Achieving the purpose of the Act
- A copy of section 5 of the RMA is attached as Appendix 4.

The proposed objective specifically recognises the adverse effects that are associated with natural hazards and allows for a response that is to either avoid the hazard or to mitigate, based on the direction provided by the relevant policies, and recognising the need to give effect to the CRPS and the Act itself.

The objective gives specific consideration to enable subdivision, use and development of land as a first option. This is measured against the effects of the hazard to gauge the extent of subdivision, use or development that should or should not occur and the extent of any mitigation required, as informed by the relevant policy or policies.

| Elements that make up the purpose of the Act (in summary) | Examination of objective in meeting the purpose of the Act |
| Enabling — social wellbeing | Development activity can positively or negatively impact on individuals, the broader community, amenity and the quality of the environment for residents. Ensuring that hazards are addressed prior to any development occurring will enable people’s wellbeing, health and safety to be met through the appropriate management of the effects of natural hazards. |
| Enabling — economic wellbeing | |
| Enabling — cultural wellbeing | |
| Enabling — health and safety | |
| Sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources | Ensuring natural hazards are identified prior to development occurring will allow for the effects to be addressed and contribute to |
any adverse effects on the environment | sustaining the potential of resources now and into the future.

Overall, it is considered that the proposed objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act. The objective provides an approach based on new information on relevant natural hazards and provides a framework whereby the effects resulting from the natural hazard are able to be managed such that the effect is avoided or mitigated. This enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being and for their health and safety.

Additional Evaluation Comments

Proposed Objective 8.1.1 gives effect to the CRPS that requires, under Objectives 11.2.1 to 11.2.4, effects relating to natural hazards to be mitigated or avoided. Appendix 6 sets out the relevant CRPS objectives and policies and provides a commentary on these in relation to Option 3.

In addition, Plan information can be used to increase public awareness, via non-RMA processes, including but not limited to Project and Land Information Memorandums (PIMs and LMs). This is important for the earthquake fault lines identified on the proposed Plan maps. Awareness is provided for within Objective 8.1.1 and further reinforced through its assessment provisions, in particular the methods linked with the policies. Similarly, information from other sources can be used to achieve Objective 8.1.1, such as Civil Defence activities and the overall approach to reduce risk set out within the CDEM Act.

15.6 Table 2.2: Evaluation of Option 3, Provisions to achieve the objective.

Evaluation of Proposed Policies, Rules and Methods

The proposed framework of provisions is considered to be the most appropriate way to achieve the outcome sought by the objective. It does this by setting out policies for each component of the purpose of the plan change, along with rules and methods to help inform development and to require resource consent decisions where necessary.

This approach provides the opportunity for site and hazard specific assessments identifying ways to avoid or mitigate the hazard, especially in regard to flood effects. This approach is considered to be strongly enabling while ensuring adverse effects of the avoidance or mitigation mechanism are themselves avoided or mitigated.

Other reasonably practical options i.e. policies, rules and methods for achieving the Objective relate primarily to Options 1 and 4 identified above. These are described further in Appendix 5.

Objective – Objective 8.1.1 Natural Hazard Management

People, property, structures and the environment are:

a. protected from the adverse effects of natural hazards; and
b. are resilient and safe through natural hazard risk awareness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 3 - Provisions</th>
<th>Efficiency and Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

DRAFT
Policy 8.1.1.1 Low and Medium Flood Hazard
Mitigate the effects of flood hazard risk within Low and Medium Flood Hazard Areas by ensuring:
- the height of floor levels are sufficient to prevent floodwater inundation.
- hazardous substance storage will not be inundated; and
- displacement or diversion of flood waters will not cause or increase adverse effects on other sites or critical infrastructure.

Policy 8.1.1.2 High Flood Hazard
Avoid new development within High Hazard Flood Areas, other than within Residential or Business Zones where the effects of flooding are mitigated.

Policy 8.1.1.3 Critical Infrastructure
Avoid new critical infrastructure in locations subject to the adverse effects of natural hazards, other than where:
- the location is essential to the function of the infrastructure; and
- the infrastructure is designed to maintain its function in the event of a natural hazard.

8.1.1.4 Physical Mitigation of Hazards
Provide for new or upgraded physical works to mitigate natural hazards where:
- the natural hazard risk cannot be reasonably avoided; and
- adverse effects of the works are avoided, remedied or mitigated.

Policy 8.1.1.5 Natural and Vegetation Features
Subdivision, use and development shall recognise and protect natural and vegetation features that assist in avoiding or mitigating the adverse effects of natural hazards.

Policy 8.1.1.6 Earthquake Fault Line Awareness
Manage the location of buildings and critical infrastructure where active fault lines are known to exist.

Flood Hazard:
Option 3 recognises the modelled flood hazard while providing for permitted activities within low and medium flood hazard areas subject to a minimum finished floor height for buildings. This has the effect of avoiding the modelled flood level in these areas, in conjunction with a freeboard. For high hazard areas shown on the proposed district plan maps, including rural land, parts of the wider coastal area, Kaiapoi and Southbrook at Rangiora further assessment of risk is required.

This approach takes into account sea level rise due to climate change to the extent that it is factored into the modelling. It also allows for more refined site specific assessment outside low and medium hazard areas based on specific site and proposal characteristics. This acknowledges that effects of flooding within high hazard areas must be mitigated or avoided under the provisions of the CRPS.

Earthquake effects (Liquefaction and fault lines):
The hazard relating to seismic events is explicitly recognised based on recent and up to date technical information. Taking this into account as part of the provisions will provide for management of the potential effects of this hazard. A policy framework is provided to assist decisions on resource consent applications and land rezoneing and to inform/make aware. The identified fault lines show an awareness area at differing dimensions based on GNS recommendations and for mapping purposes these are 20m for the well-defined Ashley Loburn Fault and 125m or 250m for other faults.

Coastal Hazard
Coastal Hazard Lines are identified, based on CRPS requirements. Controls are proposed, however the implications of these are likely to be limited due to landownership patterns. In addition, the coastal area features a large extent of sand dunes, except around the mouths of the Ashley and Waimakariri Rivers.
Policy 8.1.1.7 Liquefaction and Lateral Spread Susceptibility
Ensure liquefaction and lateral spread susceptibility is evaluated prior to subdivision, use and development.

Policy 8.1.1.8 Coastal Hazards
Avoid subdivision, development or use of land on the seaward side of the Coastal Hazard Line, other than activities that are essential for public safety or community wellbeing and include mitigation to ensure increased risk to people or the environment is avoided.

Policy 8.1.1.9 Climate Change
Recognise and understand the potential effects of climate change on weather patterns, and ensure proposals to develop and use land have particular regard to the effects of climate change so that adverse effects on the health and safety of people and to structures, including critical infrastructure, are avoided or mitigated.

and the coastline is not subject to severe erosion processes. Seawater inundation zones have not been identified for Waimakariri District within Appendix 5 of the CRPS and the Coastal Hazard Line shown on the proposed maps relates only to coastal erosion. The provisions do not restrict public access to and along the coastal marine area (RMA, s6 Matters of National Importance).

Climatic Change
Managing development in respect to the effects of climate change is a matter set out under the RMA that regard must be given to. Climate change values have been factored into the flood modelling in order to assist with the robustness of the modelling into the future. Sea level rise, associated with climate change, has not been addressed other than within the flood modelling. Policy 8.1.1.9 acknowledges that further assessment is required in order to fully understand the effects of climate change and what this may mean for the Plan to achieve the purpose of the Act. It is also noted that further national guidance is planned in the short to medium term; this policy enables this to be considered.

Overall, effectiveness is high and the efficiency is high.

### Option 3 – Benefits and Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Gives effect to the CRPS.</td>
<td>• Management controls on subdivision and land uses within identified flood/coastal hazard areas, including monetary costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The provisions are clear and practical in order to manage risk.</td>
<td>• Increased information requirements for applicants and restriction on land uses, and potentially on subdivision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identification of flooding areas and associated rules that are tailored to the perceived risk and therefore ensure flooding risk is addressed and managed.</td>
<td>• Costs in relation to any resource consent requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Setting of a minimum finished floor level for permitted activity in certain hazard flood areas</td>
<td>• Possible economic effects resulting from unnecessary loss of current and future development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
will reduce consenting burden and economic costs while also preserving land use opportunities provided an appropriate mitigation measure is available.

- Provides the opportunity for appropriate measures to avoid or mitigate earthquake related effects.
- District Plan information can be used to increase public awareness, via non-RMA processes.
- Limits costs to the community through costly public physical mitigation measures, although this is enabled.

**Opportunities for economic growth that are anticipated to be provided or reduced by the provisions under Option 3**

15.7 Economic growth could be provided by:

- Continuing to enable subdivision, use and development within the District and appropriate to the zones, which could provide employment for those involved, during the development phase and into the future.
- Enhanced clarity as to the intent of the policies and rules, including maps to aid development. This may provide increased certainty for investment and longer term growth.

15.8 Economic growth could be reduced by:

- Cost and time delay for any resource consent processes where required and costs associated with compliance with Plan standards.
- Development locational requirements especially associated with flood risk. Also, potential cost and cumulative costs for development, through additional design and/or construction costs.

**Opportunities for employment that are anticipated to be provided or reduced under Option 3**

15.9 Employment opportunities that could be provided:

- Employment opportunities that relate directly to the provisions include professionals involved in development proposals such as geotechnical, hydrological and structural engineers, surveyors, planners, and architects, site developers and contractors, builders and building trade suppliers, and subcontractors, real estate agents and other allied services and trades.
15.10 Employment opportunities that could be reduced:

- It is possible that employment opportunities could be affected by the plan change provisions, related to land use. However, it is anticipated that there will be a generally unchanged position in relation to employment.

15.11 In terms of economic growth and employment, it is anticipated that implementation of Option 3 will not result in significant adverse effects within the District. The approach proposed will ensure unnecessary costs and processes, while also ensuring the economic commitment involved with buildings and infrastructure is protected from loss or significant damage to an acceptable degree.

15.12 In terms of flooding, the cost of increased finished floor heights or restriction on location of buildings and infrastructure is considered less than significant when compared to the total cost of construction, loss of or damage to any of these assets. While urban areas are impacted on by inundation in locations, the proposal is to require a finished floor level 300mm above the flood level other than within high hazard areas where specific assessment would apply.

15.13 Areas subject to plan change requests to change the zone from rural to residential or business will need to show how they will be provided with mechanisms to avoid or mitigate any natural hazard relevant to the plan change area and its wider location. Other areas affected are largely rural; significant areas of which fall within the permitted envelope provided, thereby minimising constraints on location of, or requirements for, residential development in these areas or buildings in general. No productive land uses within the Rural Zone are impacted on by the proposed plan change.

15.14 Risk of Acting or Not Acting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

It is considered there is sufficient and certain information to identify both the location and potential extent or severity of the effects of natural hazards in the District.

It is acknowledged that the technical basis underpinning the geotechnical studies and the flood modelling does have some uncertainty based on the parameters and assumptions built into the relevant analyses. However, the information is the best available and is appropriate in order to respond to the requirements of the CRPS and to change the provisions of the District Plan; provisions themselves that acknowledge the need for further research and change.

The risks of not acting are potentially significant and include possible risk to life and damage to property and infrastructure if natural hazard effects are not managed appropriately. By not acting, the community would be more vulnerable to adverse effects, especially given the information that is available and the policy and legislative framework that the District Plan is part of.

The provisions provide an approach that is relevant at this point in time. In the foreseeable future these can be updated if required when new information becomes available or when regional policy or national legislative changes occur.
15.15 The evaluation above shows that Option 3 is the most appropriate means to address flood, active fault, liquefaction and coastal hazards issues and effects. This approach would provide appropriate provisions within the Plan with a focus on effects management consistent with the outcomes sought by the objectives and policies in the CPRS, and would lead to improved natural hazard management which is considered to achieve the purpose of the Act.

16. Consultation

16.1 Clause 3 of the First Schedule of the Act requires that the Council, when preparing a change to the District Plan, consults with a number of statutory parties. In addition, the Council may identify any other person, and consult with that person, in preparing the change. The Council consulted directly with the following statutory parties:

- Selwyn District Council
- Christchurch City Council
- Hurunui District Council
- New Zealand Transport Agency
- Ministry for the Environment
- Environment Canterbury
- Mahaanui Kurataiaio Limited
- Transpower New Zealand
- Canterbury District Health Board
- Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority
- Heritage New Zealand

16.2 Responses were received from the Ministry for the Environment, Transpower New Zealand, Environment Canterbury, the Canterbury District Health Board and Mahaanui Kurataiaio Limited.

16.3 It should also be noted that flooding information has been made available on Project Information Memoranda and Land Information Memoranda. The GNS Science reports were also publicly released.

17. Conclusion

17.1 This evaluation report has been undertaken in accordance with Section 32 of the RMA. The review of the natural hazard provisions has determined that the most appropriate way to manage natural hazards is to develop an objective, policy and rule framework which manages natural hazards as provided for by Option 3.

17.2 The recommended approach (set out in Appendix 1) is considered to bring the Plan into line with current statutory obligations and requirements, and the relevant planning documents and will contribute towards aligning the outcomes achieved through the District Plan with the purpose of the Act.
APPENDIX 1: PROPOSED AMENDMENTS (OPTION 3)

See separate document: Waimakariri District Plan Change 27 – Natural Hazards Management Proposed District Plan Amendments
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT PLAN CHANGE 27 – NATURAL HAZARDS MANAGEMENT

PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN AMENDMENTS

Note: For the purposes of this plan change, any text proposed to be added by the plan change is shown as **bold underlined** and text to be deleted as **bold strikethrough**.

Chapter 1. Definitions

Add definition of Critical Infrastructure:

**Critical Infrastructure**

Critical Infrastructure means infrastructure necessary to provide services which, if interrupted by a natural hazard event, would have a serious effect on people and communities and which would require immediate reinstatement. This includes any structures that support, protect or form part of critical infrastructure. Critical Infrastructure includes:

a. Rangiora Airfield;
b. gas storage and distribution facilities;
c. electricity substations, networks, and distribution installations, including the electricity distribution network;
d. supply and treatment of water for public supply;
e. stormwater and sewage disposal systems;
f. telecommunications installations and networks;
g. strategic road and rail networks;
h. petroleum storage and supply facilities;
i. public healthcare institutions including hospitals and medical centres;
j. fire stations, police stations, ambulance stations, emergency coordination facilities;

except that Critical Infrastructure excludes a service, facility or connection that does not have a public or community function.

Add definition of High Hazard Area:

**High Hazard Area**

High Hazard Area means:

a. land where there is inundation by floodwater, and where the water depth (metres) x velocity (metres per second) is greater than or equal to 1, or where depths are greater than 1 metre in a 0.2% Annual Exceedance Probability flood event;
b. land likely to be subject to coastal erosion and includes the cumulative effects of sea level rise over the next 100 years. This includes, but is not limited to, the land located on the seaward side of the Coastal Hazard Line shown on District Plan Maps CH 1 to CH 4; and

c. land subject to sea water inundation (excluding tsunami) over the next 100 years.

Retain definition of Natural Hazard.

Chapter 7. Coastal Environment

Retain Objective 7.1.1, Policy 7.1.1.1, Policy 7.1.1.2, Policy 7.1.1.3 and Policy 7.1.1.4.

Amend Method 7.1.1.5.8 (District Plan Rules):
Subdivision Rules that limit the expansion of the beach settlements.

**Rules that restrict activities on the seaward side of the Coastal Hazard Line.**

Rules requiring setbacks for activities from water bodies.

Rules managing earthworks, the use of motorised vehicles and vegetation removal on the margins of water bodies.

Rules that prevent the expansion of Pegasus into the coastal environment.

Amend Principal Reasons For Adopting Objectives, Policies and Methods 7.1.2, Paragraph 4:

The District Plan must **also not be inconsistent with give effect to** the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, which contains objectives, policies and methods concerning the coastal environment (Chapter 11 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement) and natural hazards (Chapter 16 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement). The District Plan also has to have regard to the Canterbury Regional Council's Regional Coastal Environment Plan which has objectives, policies and methods, including rules, relating to the coastal environment. These provisions relate to coastal hazards, access, and areas of high natural, physical or cultural value where such areas are within or landward of the Coastal Marine Area. To achieve consistency in approach to coastal hazards, the District Plan has not included rules which are already included in the Regional Coastal Environment Plan as they relate to the control of activities and development in a defined Hazard Zone.

**Chapter 8. Natural Hazards**

Add Environmental Results Expected:

The following environmental results are expected from the implementation of the objectives, policies and methods of Chapter 8, Natural Hazards:

a. Development that could be adversely affected by flood inundation is located outside flood High Hazard Areas or is designed in a manner that avoids inundation effects;
b. Known seismic or geotechnical issues are assessed and mitigated;
c. Increased awareness of, and readiness to respond to, potential natural hazard events.

Delete Issue 8.1, Objective 8.1.1, Policy 8.1.1.1, Policy 8.1.1.2, Issue 8.2, Objective 8.2.1, Policy 8.2.1.1, Policy 8.2.1.2, Policy 8.2.1.3, Policy 8.2.1.4, Policy 8.2.1.5, Policy 8.2.1.6 and associated explanations and methods.

Add new Objectives, Policies, Reasons and Methods:

**Objective 8.1.1 Natural Hazard Management**

**People, property, structures and the environment are:**

a. protected from the adverse effects of natural hazards; and

b. are resilient and safe through natural hazard risk awareness.

**Policy 8.1.1.1 Low and Medium Flood Hazard**

Mitigate the effects of flood hazard risk within Low and Medium Flood Hazard Areas by ensuring:

a. the height of floor levels are sufficient to prevent floodwater inundation.
b. hazardous substance storage will not be inundated; and

c. displacement or diversion of flood waters will not cause or increase adverse effects on other sites or critical infrastructure.

**Policy 8.1.1.2 High Flood Hazard**

Avoid new development within High Hazard Flood Areas, other than within Residential or Business Zones where the effects of flooding are mitigated.

**Reason**

Areas subject to flooding in both 0.2% and 0.5% Annual Exceedance Probability flooding events have been modelled. Parts of the District are susceptible to flood events where there is potential for the interaction of people, development and floodwaters. It is this interaction that leads to a flood hazard which is required to be managed to avoid or mitigate risk to life and assets. This is particularly relevant in areas where a high flood hazard has been identified.

**Methods**

**Information 8.1.1.2.1**

Project Information Memoranda and Land Information Memoranda to include natural hazard information.

Waimakariri District flood hazard modelling to assist with finished floor level assessments.

**Community Awareness 8.1.1.2.2**

Information, including Civil Defence preparation and response.

**Policy 8.1.1.3 Critical Infrastructure**

Avoid new Critical Infrastructure in locations subject to the adverse effects of natural hazards, other than where:

a. the location is essential to the function of the infrastructure; and

b. the infrastructure is designed to maintain its function in the event of a natural hazard.

**8.1.1.4 Physical Mitigation of Hazards**

Provide for new or upgraded physical works to mitigate natural hazards where:

a. the natural hazard risk cannot be reasonably avoided; and

b. adverse effects of the works are avoided, remedied or mitigated.
Policy 8.1.1.5 Natural and Vegetation Features

Subdivision, use and development shall recognise and protect natural and vegetation features that assist in avoiding or mitigating the adverse effects of natural hazards.

Reason

Critical infrastructure should not be exposed to hazard events as a priority. However, there may be factors that mean there is no option but to locate the critical infrastructure within a high hazard area. Where such locations are the only option, the infrastructure must be designed to ensure its ability to function with a high degree of resilience to provide for community needs. The approach to physical mitigation of hazards is precautionary in order to limit reliance on mitigation works to avoid hazard effects. Similarly, natural and vegetation features can help to avoid or mitigate the effects of natural hazard events.

Policy 8.1.1.6 Earthquake Fault Line Awareness

Manage the location of buildings and Critical Infrastructure where active fault lines are known to exist.

Policy 8.1.1.7 Liquefaction and Lateral Spread Susceptibility

Ensure liquefaction and lateral spread susceptibility is evaluated prior to subdivision, use and development.

Reason

Active fault lines have been identified. Where fault rupture may lead to ground distortion, fault awareness areas assist with the management of risk. The knowledge of fault lines is not detailed as it applies to specific sites and geotechnical assessments serve to inform development and building locations. Geotechnical assessments are also important to identify liquefaction and lateral spread risk and potential mitigation options. It is appropriate that building foundation design and consenting is managed under the Building Act 2004.

Methods

District Plan Rules and Maps 8.1.1.7.1

Requirements for specific assessments.

Identification of Fault Line Awareness and Liquefaction Susceptibility Areas on the District Plan maps.

Information 8.1.1.7.2

Project Information Memoranda and Land Information Memoranda to include natural hazard information.

Community Awareness 8.1.1.7.3

Information, including Civil Defence preparation and response.
Building and Infrastructure Integrity 8.1.1.7.4

Building Act 2004 requirements for foundations and structural integrity.


Policy 8.1.1.8 Coastal Hazards

Avoid subdivision, development or use of land on the seaward side of the Coastal Hazard Line, other than activities that are essential for public safety or community wellbeing and include mitigation to ensure increased risk to people or the environment is avoided.

Reason

The Council has responsibility for the control of the use of land to address the avoidance or mitigation of hazards where areas are likely to be subject to coastal erosion and sea water inundation. Land use activities and subdivision within the Coastal Hazard Area is limited due to public ownership, however there may be the need for some land use or subdivision to allow for infrastructure, utility works, public safety and community wellbeing.

Methods

Community Awareness 8.1.1.8.1

Information, including Civil Defence preparation and response.

Policy 8.1.1.9 Climate Change

Recognise and understand the potential effects of climate change on weather patterns and ensure proposals to develop and use land have particular regard to the effects of climate change so that adverse effects on the health and safety of people and to structures, including critical infrastructure, are avoided or mitigated.

Reason

It is recognised that climate change will lead to a rise in sea level. A rise in sea level will have consequences for inundation of the coastal areas and potentially result in increased flooding further inland. Flood modelling has recognised the potential impact of climate change by including an allowance for sea level rise and changed rainfall volume. Further assessment of the effects of sea level rise on coastal erosion and seawater inundation may be required in the future to identify any areas potentially at risk from these hazards over the next 100 years.

Methods

Research and Information 8.1.1.9.1

Information made available through development proposals and any local, regional or national sources.

Delete Principal Reasons for Adopting Objectives, Policies and Methods 8.2.2, except the last paragraph relating to existing Policy 8.2.1.7 (Pegasus and Ravenswood).

Add new Principal Reasons for Adopting Objectives, Policies and Methods 8.2.2:
Natural hazards can generate effects that damage or destroy property and infrastructure, and pose a risk to life. Reducing hazard risk requires an approach that is practical and achievable, recognising the costs and benefits involved. Hazard management requires initial development planning in addition to responding to the consequences of natural hazard events.

The resource management approach is to avoid areas where there is a high risk of a natural hazard occurring and where the consequences of the high natural hazard is severe. However, it is also recognised that there are areas where natural hazards are likely to occur, but where the risks can be managed through mechanisms to mitigate the effects. This approach is appropriate where the nature and degree of the risk, and the effects of the mitigation measure, is acceptable. It is also acknowledged that natural features may provide a degree of avoidance or mitigation of natural hazards, for example, ponding areas for flood waters.

Delete Issue 8.3, Objective 8.3.1, Policy 8.3.1.1 and associated Explanation and Methods.
Delete Principal Reasons for Adopting Objectives, Policies and Methods 8.3.2.
Delete Anticipated Environmental Results and Monitoring 8.4.

Chapter 13. Resource Management Framework
Amend Policy 13.1.12, Explanation, Paragraph 4:
The effect on natural hazards is potentially two fold: the susceptibility of development within the zone to damage and secondly the effect that the development has on the frequency and magnitude of the hazard off the site. An example is, those damages arising from flooding (Policy 8.2.1.3).

Chapter 18. Constraints on Subdivision and Development
Retain Policy 13.1.1.1 (c).

Chapter 23. Land and Water Margins - Rules
Add new Rule 23.1.1.8:

23.1.1.8 Earthworks within any Residential 4A or Residential 4B Zone shall not impede any overland flow path.

Amend Rule 23.3.2 (ix.) (Discretionary Activities (Restricted)):

23.3.2 (ix.) the short and long term effects on flood potential beyond the earthworks, including effects of displacement and diversion.

Chapter 26. Coastal Environment - Rules
Add new Rule 26.1.1.2:

26.1.1.2 Any unstaffed utility or utility structure located on the seaward side of the Coastal Hazard Line.
Add new Rule 26.2.2:

**26.2.2** Except as provided for by Rule 26.1.1.2, any structure located on the seaward side of the Coastal Hazard Line identified on District Plan Maps CH1 to CH4 is a discretionary activity.

Chapter 27. Natural Hazards - Rules

Retain Rule 27.1 (Permitted Activities).

Retain Rules 27.1.1.3 to 27.1.1.10, 27.1.1.13, 27.1.1.14 and Rules 27.1.1.17 to 27.1.1.31 and associated Figures 27.1 to 27.14.

Delete Rule 27.1.1.15 (Localised Flooding).

Add new Rules 27.1.1.3 and 27.1.1.4:

**Flood Management**

**27.1.1.3** Any building located within a Low or Medium Flood Hazard Area identified on the Natural Hazard Maps shall have a minimum floor level of 300mm above the 0.5% Annual Exceedance Probability flood level at the building location.

**27.1.1.4** Any structure located within any High Hazard Flood Area identified on the Natural Hazard Maps shall be limited to:

| All Zones | i. an increase of no more than 20m² to the gross floor area of all buildings on a site as at [insert operative date]; |
| Rural Zone | ii. an addition that does not increase the ground floor area; |
| Rural Zone | iii. fences, signs, stock yards, water tanks, tents and marquees; |
| Rural Zone | iv. structures required for the maintenance and upgrading of any electrical and associated telecommunications facilities; |
| Rural Zone | v. unstaffed utility buildings or structures of 55m² or less in floor area; |
| Rural Zone | vi. 200m² or less in floor area, other than a dwellinghouse. |

Delete Exemption Rule 27.1.2.1:

**27.1.2.1** Any structure which is replacing a structure which was lawfully established as at 20 June 1998, and was not damaged or destroyed by any flood event, is exempt from Rules 27.1.1.1 to 27.1.1.15.

Add new Exemption Rule 27.1.2.4:

**27.1.2.4** The following are exempt from complying with Rule 27.1.1.3:
a. an increase of no more than 20m² to the gross floor area of all buildings on a site as at [insert operative date];

b. any addition that does not increase the ground floor area;

c. fences, signs, stock yards, water tanks, tents and marquees;

d. maintenance and upgrading of any electrical and associated telecommunications facilities;

e. any unstaffed utility or utility building within any Residential or Business Zone of 55m² or less in floor area;

f. buildings of 200m² or less, other than a dwellinghouse, within the Rural Zone.

Add new Exemption Rule 27.1.2.5 (note: consequential renumbering to apply):

27.1.2.5 Any dwellinghouse is exempt from Rules 27.1.1.3 and 27.1.1.4 where a minimum floor level is specified by Rules 27.1.1.3 to 27.1.1.14 and Rules 27.1.1.17 to 27.1.1.31 and associated Figures 27.1 to 27.14 or where a minimum floor level has been specified within a resource consent.

Delete Rule 27.2.1 (Discretionary Activities (Restricted)).

Retain Rule 27.2.2 (Discretionary Activities (Restricted)).

Retain Rule 27.2.4 (Discretionary Activities (Restricted); Mapleham Rural 4B Zone) and associated Figure 27.6.

Retain Rule 27.2.5 (Affected persons and non-notification).

Delete Discretionary Activity Rule 27.3.1 and Add new Discretionary Activity Rule 27.3.1

27.3.1 Except where exempted under Rule 27.1.2, any building that does not comply with Rule 27.1.1.3 (Low or Medium Flood Hazard Areas) is a discretionary activity.

Retain Non-complying Activity Rules 27.4.1 to 27.4.4.

Add new Non-complying Activity Rule 27.4.5:

27.4.5 Any structure which does not comply with Rule 27.1.1.4 (High Flood Hazard Areas) is a non-complying activity.

Chapter 31. Health, Safety and Wellbeing – Rules

Add new Rule 31.14.1.5:

31.14.1.5 Within any Low or Medium Hazard Flood Area, hazardous substances shall be stored where it will not be exposed to inundation by flood water, or otherwise contaminate flood waters in a 0.5% Annual Exceedance Probability flood event.

Amend Rule 31.16.2 (iv):
iv. proposals to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects arising from flooding and the escape or spillage of hazardous substances;

Chapter 32. Subdivision - Rules

Retain Rule 32.1.3 vi. Hazards.

Add new Rule 32.3.7:

32.2.7 Any subdivision within a Medium or High Hazard Flood Area identified on the Natural Hazard maps is a discretionary activity.

Add new Rule 32.3.8:

32.3.8 Any subdivision within an area susceptible to liquefaction, as shown on Natural Hazard Map L1 is a discretionary activity.

Maps:

Add new District Plan maps showing flood hazard areas, liquefaction, earthquake fault line awareness areas and coastal hazard lines (Map series A1 to E4, L1, CH1 to CH4).

Delete Localised Flooding Area from existing District Plan maps and legends.

Apply consequential amendments throughout the District Plan, including:

- renumbering,
- removal of references to deleted objectives and policies, and
- removal of or replacement of 'localised', 'localised flooding area', 'ponding' 'breakout' in respect to flooding.
APPENDIX 2: PLAN CHANGE SCOPE EXCLUSIONS

Plan Change 27 is limited in scope to those matters set out in paragraph 3.3 and excludes the following:

- Tsunami, volcanic and geothermal activity, landslip, subsidence (other than effects associated with fault line or liquefaction events), wind, drought, fire or other natural hazards effects such as snow events.

Plan Change 27 does not address future climate change effects associated with sea level rise in relation to potential inundation. Sea level rise is factored into the plan change as it applies to the flood modelling only. Sea level rise as it may affect part or the full extent of the Waimakariri District coast is not part of the scope of the plan change.

It is noted that a National Policy Statement on natural hazards is proposed to be in place by 2018 and up dated non-statutory guidance on liquefaction and coastal hazards and climate change is proposed by late 2018. These documents are anticipated to have a bearing on the District Plan and may lead to further changes to the District Plan to address sea level rise and any other hazards.
## APPENDIX 3 SCALE AND SIGNIFICANCE RATING OF PROPOSAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>High / large +1</th>
<th>Moderate 0</th>
<th>Low / small -1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Importance of the issues that the plan changes seek to address given the context in which they arise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Extent of change from the status quo</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Size of geographical area that is affected by the plan change</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Number of people likely to be affected</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Degree of risk and uncertainty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score = 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating score</th>
<th>Scale / significance</th>
<th>Level of detail required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Comprehensive / detailed report that thoroughly addresses all aspects of s32. Expert assessments likely to be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 to 2</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate level of detail focussing on key points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3 to -5</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Basic evaluation without need for much detail.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4: RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991

Part 2, Section 5.

(1) The purpose of this Act is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.

(2) In this Act, sustainable management means managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being and for their health and safety while:

(a) sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources (excluding minerals) to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and

(b) safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil, and ecosystems; and

(c) avoiding, remediating, or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment.

Section 31.

(1) Every territorial authority shall have the following functions for the purpose of giving effect to this Act in its district:

(a) the establishment, implementation, and review of objectives, policies, and methods to achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district:

(b) the control of any actual or potential effects of the use, development, or protection of land, including for the purpose of—

(i) the avoidance or mitigation of natural hazards; and

(ii) the prevention or mitigation of any adverse effects of the storage, use, disposal, or transportation of hazardous substances; and

(iiia) the prevention or mitigation of any adverse effects of the development, subdivision, or use of contaminated land:

(iii) the maintenance of indigenous biological diversity:

(c) [Repealed]

(d) the control of the emission of noise and the mitigation of the effects of noise:

(e) the control of any actual or potential effects of activities in relation to the surface of water in rivers and lakes:

(f) any other functions specified in this Act.

(2) The methods used to carry out any functions under subsection (1) may include the control of subdivision.
APPENDIX 5: OTHER REASONABLY PRACTICAL OPTIONS

Option 1 – Status Quo: Retain existing policies, rules, methods and maps

The current approach within the Operative District Plan specifically identifies only a relatively small physical part of the District as being impacted on by flood hazard, and therefore does not comprehensively manage development in terms of providing for social, economic and cultural wellbeing. This is in regard to localised flooding shown on the relevant District Plan maps.

In addition, the Plan does not provide a particularly robust basis on which to assess the flooding potential in various areas. Not only is this in respect to the spatial area identified on the District Plan maps but also to the development types that trigger the need for resource consent and ultimately the assessment process that follows as part of any resource consent application.

Therefore, while this approach may minimise any restriction on location of activities it does not necessarily provide for the best long term outcomes (for example the need to repair damage from natural events) and does not enable people to provide for their health and safety due to less reliable information on the location and likely occurrence of natural hazards.

The Plan sets out an earthquake and liquefaction related objective and associated policy, although these provisions acknowledge that further analysis is required to better understand the potential effects of these events. Existing subdivision controls within the Plan do allow for geotechnical effects to be considered.

Flooding:

Option 1 is not considered to help achieve clear outcomes sought by Objective 8.1.1 on the basis that the policies, such as Policy 8.2.1.5, and through explanations and methods, acknowledge that further understanding on flooding and its effects is required. Related to this is that not all flooding areas identified by recent modelling are addressed by the existing rules (or identified on the District Plan Maps), and the rules relating to flooding are relatively blunt in that they are not tailored to address specific levels of risk or consequence.

Earthquake:

No active fault lines are identified in the Plan and like the provisions relating to flooding the Plan identifies the need for further assessment to be carried out (see Policy 8.3.1.1 and its explanation and methods). As not all earthquake active fault and liquefaction areas are identified, people are not protected and the ability of these provisions to meet the proposed objective is consequently not achieved. However, geotechnical issues (liquefaction predominantly) are covered by the existing matters for control in the subdivision chapter of the Plan.

The understanding of earthquake fault and liquefaction effects has improved in recent years. The operative provisions acknowledge the need for improved understanding, which is now available, meaning it is also appropriate to update the Plan provisions.

Coastal hazard and climate change:

There are no provisions within the Plan that relate specifically to climate change. This does not provide for effective on-going management of any associated risks and therefore does not result in an efficient or effective means to meet Objective 8.1.1. Climate change is a Part 2 matter under the Act and the proposed policy along with
those relating to flood management are considered to be most appropriate as opposed to those of the Operative Plan. There are no specific coastal hazard rules within the Plan, acknowledging that these were previously found within the RCEP and have recently been subject to changes in conjunction with the CRPS.

Option 2 - Prohibit or restrict further development within areas affected by natural hazards and in particular those by high hazard events.

This option recognises that natural hazard events can pose significant threats on people and property. Whilst at a coarse level this approach would be reasonably practical given the nature and possible extent of effects related to those hazards addressed by the plan change, this approach would not provide the opportunity to assess the nature of the effect and formulate responses that would avoid or mitigate the effect of the natural hazard.

Therefore, while being very likely to enable people and communities to provide for their health and safety, it is also very likely to not enable them to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being. It would be overly blunt acknowledging that potential effects can and will vary across the District and different outcomes may therefore be appropriate.

Flooding/coastal and climate change:

This option will not provide a management framework which will allow for assessment of the natural hazard issues relevant to particular sites, and thereby provide for the use of mitigation or avoidance measures which may be available. While it may be effective in avoiding the effects of natural hazards on people and their assets, it will not be efficient due to the availability of avoidance or mitigation measures within individual sites or areas.

Earthquake:

The effects of fault rupture on structural integrity and ground stability are able to be managed through building structural requirements and by identifying areas subject to ground movement and liquefaction. It is also possible to mitigate effects by avoiding location of buildings in certain areas, for example, directly on top or close to a fault line. It is therefore more effective and efficient to identify areas where earthquake related effects are likely to occur and ensure that those effects are managed to avoid or mitigate adverse effects to people and structures.

Option 4 - Use alternative methods to achieve the purpose of the Act and control effects by providing a framework of objectives and policies predominantly implemented or supported by methods that sit outside of the District Plan.

This option would set out objectives and policies in order to meet RMA and CRPS requirements. However, it would rely predominantly on guidelines or other mechanisms outside the District Plan to indicate the information or requirements for development.

This could include any relevant Bylaws, engineering guidance or other legislation, such as the Building Act 2004. This is opposed to rules that can be provided under Section 75 of the Act. For example, for floor levels, the Building Act 2004 requires that the floor level for the habitable part of a dwelling is set above the 0.2% annual exceedance flood level. Where land is subject to flood hazard, sections 71-73 of the Act can mean that dwellings can be erected. However, this is subject to an assessment beyond the 0.2% level and determinations by MBIE have found it "reasonable" to use the 1% level to set floor levels. This is not aligned to the CRPS
requirement that the 0.5% level be used. This difference between the Building Act 2004 and the CRPS makes the option of using the building consent process to set floor levels a less certain pathway.

Option 4 may also need to rely on public awareness and the provision of information to inform landowner decisions or development planning. It may also necessitate the need for Council or other agencies to investigate and carry out works to protect the public, beyond current levels of service. This could include for example, flood protection works or land improvement schemes.

This option would generate fewer resource consent applications and therefore would translate into limited appraisal and consideration of effects under the Act. The extent that the objectives and policies within the Plan could be met could therefore be limited.
## Appendix 6: Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, Relevant Provisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Relevant CRPS Provision</th>
<th>B. Response related to Plan Change 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Chapter 6 (Objective 6.2.1 (8)): Recovery, rebuilding and development are enabled within Greater Christchurch through a land use and infrastructure framework that: 
... (8) protects people from unacceptable risk from natural hazards and the effects of sea level rise. | Chapter 6 of the CRPS sets out the intended land use distribution for greater Christchurch for the period to 2028. The CRPS includes an objective of protecting people from unacceptable risk from natural hazards. The purpose of this objective is to provide for an outcome where appropriate urban development is enabled within specified areas reconciled against a need to protect people from natural hazard risk. In terms of greenfield priority areas and any residential or business rezoning requests, hazard risk must be considered and this has been occurring to date within Waimakariri District. |
| Policy 6.3.3 - Development in accordance with outline development plans includes the following: 
(11) Show how the adverse effects associated with natural hazards are to be avoided, remedied or mitigated as appropriate and in accordance with Chapter 11 and any relevant guidelines. | |
| Chapter 11 – Natural Hazards (shown below in short list form): | |
| Objective 11.2.1 – Avoid new subdivision, use and development of land that increases risks associated with natural hazards | Chapter 11 seeks to manage the adverse effects and risks associated with natural hazards through a range of provisions. |
| Objective 11.2.2 – Adverse affects from hazard mitigation are avoided or mitigated | In terms of flooding, Policy 11.3.2 directs that subdivision, use and development be avoided in areas subject to a 0.5% AEP flood event but provides for mitigation as an alternative in circumstances where there is no increased risk to life subject to several individual requirements including floor levels for new buildings to be above a 0.5% AEP design flood level. The plan change proposes a floor height requirement in order to give effect to this requirement. Objective 8.1.1 seeks to ensure protection for the effects of natural hazards. How this is achieved is set out in Policy 8.1.1.1. |
| Objective 11.2.3 – Climate change and natural hazards | |
| Objective 11.2.4 – Effective integration of the management of and preparedness for, natural hazards | |
| Policy 11.3.1 – Avoidance of inappropriate development in high hazard areas | Policy 11.3.1 relates to high flood hazard areas. This policy requires avoidance of development in high hazard areas, although it provides for mitigation or avoidance within existing urban zoned areas. High hazard risk based on background analysis predominantly affects Kaiapoi, parts of the coastal area and land in and around |
Policy 11.3.6 – Role of natural features

Policy 11.3.7 – Physical mitigation works

Policy 11.3.8 – Climate change

Policy 11.3.9 – Integrated management of and preparedness for natural hazards

Southbrook at Rangiora. Proposed Objective 8.1.1 and Policy 8.1.1.2 give effect to this CRPS provision and are associated with Rule 27.1.1.4 that enables certain development, in addition to any existing use rights under s10 of the RMA, and assessment through the resource consent process stipulated by the RMA for other development.

In addition, Policy 11.3.1 requires Council to identify land subject coastal erosion, as set out in the CRPS definition of ‘High Hazard Areas’. The proposed plan change (Policy 8.1.1.8 and rule changes to Chapter 26) inserts the hazard line identified by the CRPS (and the RCEP) into the Plan, noting that neither of these set out a seawater inundation area or line along the Waimakariri District coastline.

Policy 11.3.2 identifies as a criterion for subdivision and development, that hazardous substances will not be inundated during a 0.5% AEP flood event. This specifically addressed within the context of existing hazardous substance provisions.

Liquefaction and fault lines are specifically managed by Policy 11.3.3. This policy requires that new subdivision use and development on land close to an active fault trace or in areas susceptible to liquefaction and lateral spreading, be managed in order to avoid or mitigate the adverse effects. Liquefaction effects have been assessed post Canterbury Earthquakes and an eastern liquefaction susceptibility area identified. Building Act 2004 foundation and structural requirements apply and the plan change seeks to specifically address liquefaction effects via Policy 8.1.1.7 and subdivision requirements, noting that all subdivision requires resource consent and approval.

Fault line awareness areas are mapped and are supported by proposed Policy 8.1.1.6. Specific structure or building setbacks are not included within the plan change due to the inability to accurately define these in a practical and enforceable way, such as the Starvation Hill Fault at Oxford. The plan change, based on the CRPS, such as
set out in Policy 11.3.9(5), promotes awareness and this is expressed throughout the plan change amendments, including Objective 8.1.1.

Critical infrastructure is specifically addressed by the plan change as this is a requirement of Policy 11.3.4. The District Plan, currently manages utilities in order to achieve the Act, although the critical infrastructure definition within the CRPS has a slightly differing focus and for the purposes of this plan change has been tailored to specifically relate to natural hazard management. The plan change gives effect to the CRPS through proposed policies relating to low and medium flood hazard (Policy 8.1.1.1), a specific policy (Policy 8.1.1.2); Policy 8.1.1.6 (Earthquake Fault Line Awareness) and the proposed rules package.

The remaining policies of the CRPS set out in column A of this appendix are also given effect to by the plan change as set out by specific policies. It is important to note the methods that relate to each policy, including non-district plan approaches such as community awareness.
# APPENDIX 7: COMMENTARY PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN PROVISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective Policy, Rule or Method</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition – Critical Infrastructure</td>
<td>Critical Infrastructure is a matter contained within the CRPS that the District Plan must give effect to ensure such infrastructure is located outside known high hazard areas, unless there is no reasonable alternative. The proposed definition is applicable to natural hazards only and applies to those services that have a wider public or community function as opposed to individual services or connections. Critical Infrastructure is subject to Policy 8.1.1.3 to meet the requirements of the CRPS. It is also a matter referenced within Policy 8.1.1.5 in order to emphasise that it should not be located on or in close proximity to an active fault line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition – High Hazard</td>
<td>This definition reflects the definition and policy direction set out in the CRPS. It primarily relates to Rules 27.1.1.4, 27.4.5, Policy 8.1.1.2 and the high hazard areas shown on the District Plan maps. High hazard for the purposes of the plan change has been based on depth and velocity as set out in the definition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition – Natural Hazard</td>
<td>This is an existing definition within the District Plan. It covers a number of events that constitute a natural hazard event or events, of which some are relevant to the purpose of the plan change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 7 (Coastal Environment)</td>
<td>The relevant provisions of Chapter 7 are retained, although an addition is made to existing Method 7.1.1.5 to recognise the coastal hazard line provisions set out in the CRPS that the District Plan is required to give effect to. The Principal Reasons (7.1.2) is amended accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 8 (Natural Hazards)</td>
<td>Chapter 8 is significantly amended in order to most appropriately reflect the requirements of the RMA and also those matters set out in the CRPS. The amendments also take into account new information regarding hazards as set out earlier in this report. The chapter is effectively re-packaged to more clearly articulate the outcomes sought and how these are to be achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules 23.1.1.8 and 23.3.2 (ix)</td>
<td>The Residential 4A and 4B Zones are lower density living environments located within or adjacent to the District’s rural areas. These are commonly referred to as ‘rural residential’. This rule recognises that changes to the ground level or drainage paths can influence overflow flow during flood events and generate flooding effects. The Plan currently has earthwork rules that trigger resource consent over certain volumes. The proposed rules allow for these effects to be considered where consent is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 26 (Coastal Environment – Rules)</td>
<td>Two new rules have been added to Chapter 26. Rule 26.1.1.2 provides for unstaffed utilities that may need to be located within the coastal hazard area. The rule recognises that some utility structures may need to locate in this area, such as beacons. The requirement that they are unstaffed means that any staffed utilities would require resource consent and assessment of risk. A new discretionary activity is added for any other structure that is proposed to locate within the coastal hazard area, to ensure appropriate assessment of effects is carried out through the resource consent process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 27 (Natural Hazards – Rules)</td>
<td>Rule 27.1.1.15 is deleted as this relates only to localised flooding areas. Flood understanding has now been updated through recent river breakout and localised flooding modelling. New Rules 27.1.1.3, 27.1.1.4 along with Rules 27.3.1 and 27.4.5 are proposed, reflecting flood categorisation and the policies contained within the CRPS. Both provide for exemptions to allow for buildings and structures, that given the size or nature of the matter within the exemption, are not consider to impact on flood effects management. It is important to note that existing use rights under the RMA (s10) would continue to apply. Current bulk and location requirements, such as building height and recession planes continue to apply. Rule 27.1.2.5 recognises those instances to date where existing flood avoidance/mitigation rules apply or where flood effects and been addressed by resource consent approval. Likewise, Rules 27.1.1.3 to 27.1.1.10, 27.1.1.13, 27.1.1.14 and Rules 27.1.1.17 to 27.1.1.31 and associated Figures 27.1 to 27.14 are retained as these sites/areas have been subject to flood assessments and have been developed or are being developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 31 (Health, Safety and Wellbeing – Rules)</td>
<td>New Rule 31.14.1.5 sits with existing hazardous substance rules within the Plan. This rule gives effect to the CRPS that requires inundation of hazardous substances to not be inundated in a 0.5% AEP flood event. The relevant assessment matter under Rule 31.16.2 is amended accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 32 (Subdivision – Rules)</td>
<td>Existing subdivision matters of assessment in relation to hazards are retained. These are supported by new discretionary rules for subdivision within the identified liquefaction area and medium and high hazard flood areas. These recognise the potential effects of these hazards, including but not limited to effects on infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps</td>
<td>New map series are proposed for flooding, liquefaction, active fault lines and coastal hazards. These link to the proposed rules and show the liquefaction area, fault line awareness areas, flooding and the coastal hazard lines. Existing rezoned areas with agreed flood mitigation floor heights are shown in red and are subject to specific on going floor height rules. The fault line awareness areas shown on the maps and their dimensions are based on GNS recommendations and are applied in regard to definite and likely fault lines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 8: TECHNICAL REPORTS
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: DDS-06-05-06 / 160505040697

REPORT TO: Resource Management and Regulation Committee

DATE OF MEETING: 17 May 2016

FROM: Trevor Ellis, Development Planning Manager

SUBJECT: Waimakariri District Plan Review – Confirmation of Resourcing and Budget

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to recommend to the Resource Management and Regulation Committee that the proposed additional budget of $1.75 million to undertake the accelerated District Plan review is confirmed by Council when finalising the 2016/2017 Annual Plan. This is supported by external advice from Resource Co-Ordination Partnership (RCP).

1.2. It should be noted that RCP recommend that within this provision the proposed budget allocated for hearings, hearing evidence and appeals of $200,000 be reallocated as funding for technical advice (contract or consultant). It is further recommended that additional funding for the hearing process be sought as part of the 2018/2028 Long Term Plan process when costs are more fully appreciated with this part of the District Plan review process, falling in the 2019/2020 year.

Attachments:
   i. RCP Project Initiation Report – Review and Recommendations
   ii Revised summary of Indicative Budget (from report dated 10 February 2016)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Resource Management and Regulation Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 160505040697.

(b) Recommends to Council to confirm proposed additional budget of $1.75 million to undertake the accelerated District Plan review to be spread over 3 years as set out in Attachment ii.

(c) Notes that the costs of the hearings stage of the District Plan review are to be determined through the 2018/2028 Long Term Plan.

(d) Notes that a full Project Initiation Document will be reported to the Committee at its July meeting.
3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. In a report dated 10 February 2016 (160126005673) the following recommendations were carried by Council:

(c) **Approves** additional budget of $1.75 million over three years to be loan funded over ten years as set out in this report to fund an ‘accelerated staged’ review of the District Plan review to enable the Review to be substantially completed by the end of the 2018/2019 financial year.

(d) **Notes** that should this budget proposal be confirmed for inclusion in the Draft 2016/17 Annual Plan, a detailed District Plan Review programme scoping report will be prepared for consideration by the Resource Management and Regulation Committee on 17 May, just prior to deliberations on the Draft 2016/17 Annual Plan.

3.2. Within that report, it was acknowledged that the proposed budget did not change overall net staffing or other expenditure associated with the District Plan Review within the draft 2016/17 budget. However, in order to advance an accelerated Plan review over a 3 year timeframe additional budget will be required, including core project staffing, specialist advice, project management, community engagement and hearings support.

3.3. In response to recommendation (d) above, further analysis has been undertaken by Resource Co-Ordination Partnership (RCP), a project management consultancy with extensive relevant experience. In particular, RCP have recently been involved with the management of the Queenstown District Plan Review. RCP were primarily asked to review the draft project plan, resource allowances including staff requirements and test the proposed budget increase sought through the 2016/2017 draft Annual Plan.

3.4. The attached short report from RCP (attachment i) summaries the budget and resourcing review process carried out to assess the scope and size of the accelerated District Plan review. In doing so, they took into account:

- background information prepared to date;
- the budget approved for Annual Plan consultation (report dated 10 February 2016);
- staff resourcing available with the Development Planning Unit and other units; and
- the timeframe to substantially the Plan review within 3 years, by mid-June 2019.

3.5. RCP have confirmed that the proposed budget of $1.75 million to undertake the accelerated District Plan review is, on the information available at this time, appropriate. However, a key finding of RCP is that additional fixed term staff resourcing will be required in order to deliver the project, both in terms of the timeframe proposed but also in terms of ensuring efficient progress. The extra resourcing can be funded from the proposed budget as set out in the report of 10 February 2016 (see attachment ii).

3.6. In addition, RCP recommend the proposed budget allocated for hearings, hearing evidence and appeals of $200,000 be reallocated as funding for technical experts (contract or consultant). It is further recommended that additional funding for the hearing process be sought as part of the 2018/2028 Long Term Plan process once costs are more fully appreciated for this part of the District Plan review process. These costs are difficult to quantify at this time. These costs would fall in the 2019/2020 year.

3.7. The Management Team has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.
4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1 The opportunity for public submissions on the proposed District Plan review budget was available as part of the development of the Draft Annual Plan.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1 Financial implications and risks were set out in the report dated 10 February 2016 (160126005673). The recommendations of this report do not change the implications or risk profile set out in the earlier report, with the exception that a specific budget will be required to fund the hearings and any appeals processes in the 2019/2020 year. Risk can be mitigated to some degree by project management and regular financial reporting through the project so that any additional expenditure required is identified and reported as part of the draft 2018/2028 Long Term Plan.

6. CONTEXT

6.1 Policy
This matter is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance Policy.

6.2 Legislation
Resource Legislation Amendment Bill.

6.3 Community Outcomes
A wide range of community outcomes are impacted by the District Plan, including:

There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making by local, regional and national organisations that affects our District

- Local, regional and national organisations make information about their plans and activities readily available.
- Local, regional and national organisations make every effort to take account of the views of people who participate in community engagement.
RCP Project Initiation Report – Review and Recommendations
03 May 2016

Waimakariri District Council
215 High Street
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora 7440

Attention: Trevor Ellis

Dear Trevor,

Re: WAIMAKARI DISTRICT COUNCIL, DISTRICT PLAN REVIEW
PROJECT INITIATION REPORT - REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1.0 Background

Waimakariri District Council (WDC) has recently engaged RCP over the period of April and May 2016 to provide a recommendation report that assesses the scope and size of the future accelerated District Plan Review programme. The project management services RCP were tasked to undertake included developing a high level District Plan Review (DPR) programme, scheduling of resources and testing of the budget allowance against these outputs. RCP will also provide advice on the sub-project of e-plan conversion in 2016/17 to improve accessibility of the existing District Plan and using e-plan for the future District Plan as well as review potential synergies in project management and resourcing between the WDC and Selwyn District Council’s DPR programmes.

As part of this initial review RCP has undertaken a review of draft plan briefing documents and formed an initial assessment, in conjunction with WDC, of the District Plan strategy, vision, governance and communications structure. RCP have also reviewed whether current resources are adequate and what further skilled resources need to be recruited in order to establish and implement the accelerated District Plan Review programme.

Key documents supplied to RCP by WDC to enable this work include:
- Brief for Project Management Support Services from RCP Project Management 7 April 2016.
- WDC PDP Chapters proposed sequencing/complexity/priority table issued 19th April 2016.
- DDS Project Plan – preliminary DRAFT revision 2.0 dated March 2016.
- District Plan review Budget Table examples issued 15 April 2016.
- District Plan Review Progress Summary dated 11 November 2015.
- Anticipated environmental results in operative district plan issued 15 April 2016.
- Issues addressed in current district plan dated 10 February 2016.
- Estimated budget for scoping and funding - DRAFT dated 7 December 2015.
- WDC Organisation Chart as at March 2016.
Several strategic workshops and review meetings have been held with WDC representatives to form a basis of understanding and to develop and review the draft deliverables.

This letter summarises RCP’s observations, recommendations and outputs to date:

**2.0 District Plan Review Process – High level programme and phasing**

### MAY – NOV 2016
- Plan effectiveness/gap analysis.
- Categorisation/effort/prioritisation.
- Sections/chapters – establish priority order.
- Review of national and regional policy.
- Draft Structure/Sections/topics/content and framework.
- Confirmation of drafting style and templates.
- E-plan format –
  - Phase 1 – Conversion of current plan to e-format.
  - Phase 2 – Create future District Plan in e-format, develop programme plan.
- Governance structure, roles and responsibilities established and implemented.
- Communication and engagement plan established.

### DEC 2016 – MAY 2019
**REVIEW PHASES FOR EACH CHAPTER OR TOPIC**

### JUNE 2019
**MILESTONE**
- Public release and notification of the proposed plan.

### JULY 2019 ONWARDS
**TASKS**
- Receive and summarise submissions.
- Notify further submissions.
- Schedule hearings.
- Prepare officer reports and evidence.
- Hearings.
- Decisions.
- Notify decisions.
Following the initial District Plan Effectiveness and Programme establishment phase, RCP have programmed that each chapter and topic go through the following phases as part of the District Plan Review process. The key tasks for each review phase are provided below for information purposes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER REVIEW PHASE</th>
<th>KEY PHASE TASKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Define/Scope         | - Background work undertaken/technical assessments.  
                        - Analysis of issues for each topic and effort required (external/internal).  
                        - Scoping of internal/external resources required.  
                        - Sign off of resources by Project Control Group.  
                        - Monitoring and reporting to Management Team. |
| Strategic Review/Direction | - Develop position/approach/strategy (Sec 32 Options)  
                             - Setting out objectives/policies/rules.  
                             - Applying template/style.  
                             - Commissioning of technical reports.  
                             - Initial community engagement.  
                             - Reference groups as required.  
                             - PCG: Review – confirm direction. |
| Prepare Draft        | - Draft plan amendments & Sec 32 Reports  
| Test/Review Draft    | - Peer Review/ “Make it or break it” testing.  
                        - Workshop with stakeholders/reference groups.  
                        - TAG: confirm feedback. |
| Update Initial Draft | - Finalise Draft.  
                        - TAG: Review/recommend draft is released for incorporation.  
                        - PCG: Decision.  
                        - RMR Endorsement. |

3.0 Summary of Programme Chapter Categories and Review Schedule

RCP have worked with the WDC Development Planning Unit to categorise each of the topics and chapters that will make up the District Plan Review process by complexity in order to develop the programme of work and establish the internal resources required. The below table summarises the number and complexity of chapters requiring review, including an estimate of how many draft chapters will be completed at the end of each financial year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complexity of Chapter / Topic</th>
<th>Est. No. of chapters/topics</th>
<th>No. completed by June 2018</th>
<th>No. completed by June 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.0 Governance structure

The structure below outlines the overall governance structure proposed for the district plan review programme. This structure is able to be used as the governance and PCG structure for both the District Plan Review and the District Development Strategy (DDS). The District Development Strategy will be required to inform the DPR as it will the Long Term Plan and Infrastructure Strategy. The DDS project will be further developed to be undertaken in parallel to the DPR programme through to June 2017.

The proposed governance structure will form part of the Project Initiation Document which will be put forward for approval at the 17 May 2016 Resource Management and Regulation Committee meeting (RMR).

5.0 Resourcing

RCP have carried out a detailed resourcing analysis against the phasing profile outlined above and against the proposed chapter categorisation that has been given to us by WDC. In order to deliver the tasks for each of the district review plan phases between December 2016 and June 2019, it is estimated that a total of 3-4 additional FTE policy planners are required in the Development Planning Unit for a 2 to 3-year period. These additional resources will be crucial to WDC to keep the “momentum” of the programme moving forward in an efficient and focussed manner in conjunction with a streamlined governance and engagement structure.
6.0 DPR Indicative Budget

Reviewing the budget information set out in the WDC District Plan Review – Revised approach and budget document issued to Council on 10 February 2016, we recommend that the $200k budget allocated for hearings from the $1.75m budget to accelerate the review be reallocated as funding for technical experts. Based on the current draft DPR programme it is estimated that the Plan will be publically notified in June 2019 and so the hearing process will fall outside the three year review period and into the 2019/20 financial year.

We recommend the additional funding for the hearing process is reviewed in the 2018/28 LTP process, as based on RCP’s previous experience with the Queenstown District Plan Review hearing process, the current estimate of $200k may be insufficient.

7.0 E-plan subproject

It has been identified in the early establishment/effectiveness review stage that the recruitment of a policy planner resource is required to work on the e-plan project. As well there will be a work demand arising from the approved Red Zone Recovery Plan. Phase 1 would consist of converting the current Operative District Plan to a simplified e-format with the use of hyperlinks and any other means to assist use. Phase 2 would be setting out how e-plan will inform the new Proposed District Plan.

8.0 Synergies with Selwyn District Council DPR programmes

It has been highlighted by WDC that there are potential synergies with Selwyn District Council in project management processes and resourcing, format structure and policies that need to be assessed. RCP have been advised that WDC are holding initial meetings with Selwyn District Council to discuss this further and to obtain programme information, in order to review and produce both efficiency and effectiveness gains. These opportunities for collaboration will be subject to further review.

We trust the above provides a clear summary of progress and deliverables provided to date, but do not hesitate to contact the undersigned should you wish to discuss any of the above.

Yours sincerely,

RCP

[Signature]

Marcus Read
Senior Associate
# Summary of Indicative Budget

## Deliverables and Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Year and indicative additional budget required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background and process.</td>
<td>DPR framework, issues and content scoping, structure and format, governance and engagement, templates, e-plan development (operative plan)</td>
<td>2016/2017 - $500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of drafts.</td>
<td>Scope papers, technical reports, issues and options/position papers prepared, consultation (non RMA), drafting of provisions including s32</td>
<td>2017/2018 - $625,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final draft(s)</td>
<td>Notification (stakeholders), draft released, review of consultation responses, finalise draft and s32, publicly notify (RMA), decisions including hearings and any appeals</td>
<td>2018/2019 - $625,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Anticipated technical and external project costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue or topic</th>
<th>Anticipated Overall Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural environment, transport, rural, open space, hazards, business, residential, cultural, designations, environmental, rural residential, temporary activities, utilities and energy, heritage, strategic directions</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearings, hearing evidence and appeals*</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project management, template and database development and staff (contract or consultant)</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration and disbursements, including printing, postage, advertisement and community engagement</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Advice</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total: $1.75m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Budget to be reviewed and sought as part of the 2018/2028 Long Term Plan process.*