

Questions asked at the f Coastal Hazards webinar - 28 April 2022

Interested to see general case studies on the policy and process for subdivision, rebuild, new build and extension in the high and mid inundation and the high and mid erosion zones. Past issue of escape access- Boat access escape hatches!

We haven't developed case studies.

The draft rules set out the assessment criteria and matters of discretion. These do not include safe ingress and access as currently provided for in the High Flood Hazard Management Area Rule 5.4.6.2(RD2).

How and what costs can be placed on the thousands of hill homes that use roads in the flat that are in the very likely to fail due to coastal erosion after surface flooding from storm events.

Council's Coastal Hazards Adaptation Planning programme will involve working with rūnanga and communities in low-lying coastal and inland areas across the district that are likely to be impacted by sea level rise through coastal flooding, erosion and rising groundwater. Engagement in each of these Adaptation Areas will involve residents who are directly impacted as well as those impacted by access dependencies and other interested stakeholders. To find out more visit <https://ccc.govt.nz/environment/coast/adapting-to-sea-level-rise/>

My primary area of interest of is the coastal inundation area on the flat at Sumner and how this may be a Qualifying Matter for the NPS-UD

Coastal Hazards are identified as a Qualifying Matter in relation to intensification as enabled by draft proposed Plan Change 14 Housing and Business Choice. The Qualifying Matter will reflect the proposed approach in the Coastal Hazards Plan Change. This would mean that intensification otherwise enabled won't be provided for or limited across the areas affected. The intention is to not further increase risk exposure, which in some areas, may only provide for the current density of development (like-for-like).



Inundation hazard lines over baches at Taylors Mistake/Hobsons Bay - do they take account of baches being built up on bank/cliffs?

Yes – hazard categories reflect inundation depths with sea level rise, taking account of the ground level. So houses at Rotten Row, Taylors Mistake located above the bank are shown to not be in any of the hazard categories, while those to the north of the Surf Club and into Hobson Bay will only be included if the ground levels at these properties is below the projected future storm sea level with 1.2 m of rise over a 100 yr period.

Why does the erosion line go through our established front garden - 18 Tern Street, when from far end of spit it is in front of all other properties? Why is this different to original map 'Areas susceptible to Erosion' on CCC website?

The alignment of the erosion line draws on the latest data from the technical studies undertaken in 2021. The erosion line is in the same position as indicated on the mapping that accompanied the Issues & Options engagement.

Erosion hazard is a separate matter to natural character in the District Plan. To be clear, the proposed erosion hazard line is not based on the previously removed natural character line and it is not necessary for the erosion hazard line to match the adjusted natural character line.

As per Tim Sintes - why does the erosion line suddenly cut through our property?? Why has this changed from original map where erosion line follows the beach - doesn't make sense??

The 'original map of areas susceptible to coastal erosion' may also be the projected shoreline positions shown from the 2021 Tonkin and Taylor assessment, in which case, the lines are of the projected position of the front edge of the dune system. From a planning perspective, this provides no protection for the dune environment, which is an important natural component for erosion protection. The erosion hazard lines as presented in the draft planning maps recognise this important erosion buffer function of the dunes, and these lines are along the landward edge of the dune to the extent that is appropriate. This was done from aerial photographs and has not been ground truthed by site visits or survey criteria (e.g. elevation, slope, vegetation cover). Nor has the actual width of dune required for erosion buffering over a 100 year period been determined. Both of pieces of work are currently in progress. Therefore it is expected that any anomalies in the position of the hazard lines would be corrected as an outcome of the work in progress.



Will reasoning behind decisions made be clearly stated, and will the impact of the decisions be explained literally- as in actual effect on communities? Will interpretation of the changes be put forward on topics :building, renovation, infrastructure.

Background information is available on the Council's website.

An explanation for the Plan Change will be provided in the Council report and Section 32 evaluation of costs and benefits. Decisions will be minuted.

We have not developed topic specific guidance, noting that the actual effect on communities will vary by location.

Will the Sumner hills continue to be built on seeing as their access is highly likely to wash out during large rain event and SLR. Can access be guaranteed from the summit road.

Access to areas and any risks to that access is being considered further incl. the mapping of areas at risk. This will inform both the plan change and adaptation planning for areas affected. Decisions about the future provision of infrastructure like roads will be made through adaptation planning which involves Council working with runanga and communities.

Why has the council not taken into account the NIWA Sand Report?

The recently released Coastal hazards Assessment by Tonkin and Taylor incorporated the sediment budget data.

You are saying a better way than RUO - would you please explain what you mean by a better way - how better?

We propose to introduce rules for coastal inundation and erosion areas but rather than being additional to the High Flood Hazard Management Area and Residential Unit Overlay, we can simplify the approach by having fewer layers that reflects the level of regulation appropriate to the level of risk.

I do not understand why Tsunami is included: like earthquakes they are not predictable...

While the source of a Tsunami differs from coastal flooding, how we respond to this can be achieved through provisions in the District Plan to avoid or mitigate the effects of tsunami.

Tsunami response is also achieved via emergency management, via evacuation zones.



About the mapping. It is quite furious the fact that my property is Low risk.. and the one next door is Very low. How this was done and how we can change it?

This is dependent on the relativities of ground levels to anticipated inundation. So if ground levels differ across a boundary, the risk will differ.

This was also answered verbally during the webinar – which is available on the recording which is accessible by going to <https://ccc.govt.nz/the-council/plans-strategies-policies-and-bylaws/plans/christchurch-district-plan/changes-to-the-district-plan/planchange/pc13/>

So in short if a property is on coastal inundation low, to build a second house on a 700smq land and subdivide, I would need 100% apply for consent?

Yes, resource consent for the new dwelling would be required but as a Controlled Activity, resource consent must be granted providing certainty that consent can be obtained. The consent for the subdivision would be a Restricted Discretionary activity.

Some limitation here: "resource consent must be granted providing certainty that consent can be obtained: Translate please

This means that if you meet the standards set by a 'Controlled Activity' then Council is obliged to grant to consent.

The answer for my last question on the minor dwelling was "we will further consider" What that means exactly, please?

We are still evaluating how development will be dealt with alongside the government's policy direction to intensify.

With the NPS-UD residential intensification becoming legal in august, and the coastal hazard plan change being notified in august, how will building consent submissions that are affected by the coastal hazard notification/qualifying matters be addressed?

Any site that currently has a qualifying matter (restriction on intensification) overlay applied, or is proposed to have a qualifying matter applied (such as coastal hazards), will not have MDRS applied to it automatically when the Housing and Business Choice (PC14) plan change is notified in August this year. How the qualifying matter and MDRS applies will need to be affirmed through the hearing process and must be made operative by 20 August



2023. Only those sites that do not have any restrictive overlay – currently or proposed – will have MDRS applied to them upon notification in August this year.

Will Brighton central be able to participate in the intensification programme or is it affected?

We welcome your feedback on the suite of plan changes. The pre-notification consultation period closes on 13th May. There will be an opportunity to further participate when the plan changes are notified in August this year.

Note some of the changes we're making are legal requirements of the new national direction and cannot be influenced by the Council, or community feedback.

You can provide feedback here: <https://ccc.govt.nz/the-council/haveyoursay/>

The interactive mapping can be found here:

<https://gis.ccc.govt.nz/portal/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=3873b31c95bb45ef8e1f3c1d05b26d1a>

Will the risk category map (i.e very low to high) be dynamic. In other words will property owners and developers be able to submit site specific topographical surveys following development where site levels may change or simply to correct council records to ensure a properties classification is accurate. This is critical given that other parties such as insurers, banks, solicitors etc may rely heavily on the data in making decisions involving the risk profile of the property.

We are looking at methods of how the District Plan can be more responsive to new information. Changes to the District Plan are subject to a statutory process under the Resource Management Act that we must follow and limits the ability for changes without the ability for the public to have a say on changes.

There would be a pathway to enable assessment of proposals including updated technical information on a case by case basis through consenting.

We will continue to update the District Plan as new information emerges.

What level of hazard will prohibit intensification?

Prohibited activity status in the District Plan precludes someone from applying for resource consent and Council has proposed Non-complying activity status as the most restrictive. This is used for activities generally not anticipated but enables proposals to be assessed that demonstrate there is not an increased risk of harm.

This was answered verbally during the webinar – which is available on the recording which is accessible by going to <https://ccc.govt.nz/the-council/plans-strategies-policies-and-bylaws/plans/christchurch-district-plan/changes-to-the-district-plan/planchange/pc13/>



Impact on commercial areas?

The activities to be managed by the proposed Plan Change are not specific to particular zones (such as commercial or residential). The proposed rules focus on different types of building or land use we are looking to control. Also there are provisions coming through in other plan changes including PC14 that look at commercial areas.

This was also answered verbally during the webinar – which is available on the recording which is accessible by going to <https://ccc.govt.nz/the-council/plans-strategies-policies-and-bylaws/plans/christchurch-district-plan/changes-to-the-district-plan/planchange/pc13/>

