

Issues identified	Issue Description – Outcomes/ effects for communities and the environment	Source of information/Evidence	Provisions giving rise to the issue	Statutory framework
<p>The District Plan does not give effect to national and regional policy direction</p>	<p>The Council has statutory responsibilities to implement national and regional direction in the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS) and the Regional Policy Statement (RPS) which define how subdivision, land use activities and development should be managed in areas at risk from coastal hazards. The District Plan provisions currently do not give full effect to the NZCPS or RPS insofar that the use and development of land is not managed in some areas that are at risk of coastal hazards and there is an absence of controls on some activities. For example, the City Plan has rules only for an area 20m from Mean High Water Springs (MHWS), and the Banks Peninsula District Plan only considers the risk of coastal hazards for subdivision, not development. This gap in the District Plan could give rise to potential for harm to people and property and could result in economic and social costs. A further consequence is uncertainty for landowners on the use and development of their land as the coastal hazard risk is not identified in affected areas and there is no Council direction on managing this risk. Communities are therefore unable to make informed decisions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New data in the form of the Tonkin + Taylor Coastal Hazard Assessment is available on sea level rise and climate change which are key drivers for changing coastal hazard risk. This report identifies the future extent and magnitude of areas potentially at risk of coastal erosion and coastal flooding across the district. It also identifies low-lying land that could be susceptible to rising groundwater for a range of different sea level rise scenarios and storm events. • An identification of different levels of risk was based on work by Jacobs with input from Council planners and technical specialists. It draws on data in the Coastal Hazards Assessment to define a range of ‘thresholds’ for different levels of risk, using different scenarios. To account for climate change and the impact of sea level rise, Jacobs and Council staff selected 60cm sea level rise by 2080 and 1.2m sea level rise by 2130 as the most appropriate to apply to both erosion and coastal flooding hazard scenarios assessment. • A number of studies have been undertaken that model the effects of different tsunami scenarios, with most assuming a worst-case scenario of a 1 in 2,500 event. • Issues raised by resource consent planners in processing consent applications. 	<p>The current District Plan provisions were developed prior to the NZCPS and the RPS. Consequently, those provisions do not define the full extent of areas at risk of coastal hazards, and only manage some activities. Parts of the City Plan and Banks Peninsula District Plan remain operative and contain restrictions on filling, excavation and building within 20m of MHWS (City Plan only) and subdivision. These provisions are neither comprehensive nor up-to-date.</p> <p>The Council has previously notified possible changes to the District Plan on coastal hazards as part of the District Plan review in July 2015. However, the government (at the request of the Council) amended the Canterbury Earthquake (Christchurch Replacement District Plan) Order in Council in 2015 to recognise that coastal hazards were not a recovery matter that required a fast-tracked process. The amendment removed coastal hazard provisions from the District Plan review and directed that the Council address that separately.</p>	<p>The District Plan does not give effect to Policy 24 of the NZCPS. This policy requires identification of areas in the coastal environment that are potentially affected by coastal hazards (including tsunami), giving priority to the identification of areas at high risk of being affected. Hazard risks, over at least 100 years, are to be assessed.</p> <p>Furthermore the District Plan does not give effect to Policy 25 of the NZCPS which directs that councils avoid increasing the risk of social, environmental and economic harm from coastal hazards, in areas potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next 100 years.</p> <p>The RPS requires in Objective 11.2.1 that new subdivision, use and development of land which increases the risk of natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure is avoided or, where avoidance is not possible, mitigation measures minimise such risks.</p> <p>The District Plan must not be inconsistent with the Canterbury Regional Coastal Environment Plan (RCEP) 2005. Method 9.6 indicates that the City Council has responsibility to identify areas likely to be subject to coastal erosion and sea water inundation including the cumulative effects of sea level rise over the next 100 years through the provisions of their district plans and include objectives, policies and methods to control the use of land within those areas.</p>
<p>There is a risk of communities being exposed to the impact of coastal hazards that will become more prevalent in the future</p>	<p>The District Plan does not currently have up-to-date and comprehensive provisions that manage areas exposed to identified coastal hazards. The consequence is that land use activities and development will continue to occur in areas exposed to coastal hazards without appropriate ways to manage the risk. This means there is a high likelihood that people and communities are exposed to harm/adverse effects at some time in the future.</p> <p>The District Plan does not currently enable people and communities in areas susceptible to coastal hazards to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being and their health and safety through subdivision,</p>			

use and development. Options for better enabling communities to adapt and live with the changing hazards are not specifically identified in the District Plan. In areas exposed to the risk of harm, depths of coastal flooding pose a risk to life. In addition, there is uncertainty for landowners with no clearly defined extent of areas exposed. Assets in these areas will become increasingly exposed to damage, and some may become uninsurable. There will likely be increased costs of recovery, together with reduced productivity and associated impacts on economic growth for both property/business owners and the district. Furthermore, the potential harm to future residents and visitors could be significant. This will also increase social costs as people and communities recover from natural hazard events that have adversely impacted them.