

SUMMARY STATEMENT

1. My full name is **Brittany Olivia Ratka**. I am a Policy Planner in the City Planning Team of the Christchurch City Council (the **Council**).
2. I have prepared evidence on behalf of the Council on a range of qualifying matters. Today I will address only the Natural Hazard qualifying matters, being:
 - (a) the High Flood Hazard Management Area;
 - (b) the Flood Ponding Management Area; and
 - (c) areas of slope instability including the Cliff Collapse Management Areas 1 and 2, and the Rockfall Management Area 1.
3. These qualifying matters would retain existing overlays and provisions in the District Plan.
4. The management of significant risks from natural hazards is a section 6 matter of national importance. The hazards put forward as qualifying matters are considered to be areas at significant risk of natural hazards.
5. The High Flood Hazard Management Area identifies areas where water depths are greater than 1 metre or fast flowing in a 0.2% AEP¹ (1 in 500-year) flood event. The rule framework would require resource consent as a non-complying activity for intensification. The District Plan (the Plan) includes a policy seeking to avoid subdivision, use or development where it will increase the potential risk to people's safety, well-being and property.
6. The Flood Ponding Management Area is required for flood storage capacity, reducing impacts of downstream flooding in a 0.5 AEP (1 in 200-year) flood event. Intensification would require resource consent as a non-complying activity. The Plan includes a policy seeking to maintain the flood storage capacity and function of natural floodplains, wetlands and ponding areas.
7. The Cliff Collapse Management Areas 1 and 2 and the Rockfall Management Area 1 are locations where the risk from natural hazards is considered to be unacceptable and such risks cannot practically be reduced to acceptable levels. Risk is expressed as an Annual Individual Fatality Risk being the probability of a fatality for an individual occupying a specific site in any one

¹ Annual exceedance probability

year as a result of slope instability. Intensification would require resource consent as a non-complying activity, or in the case of the Cliff Collapse Management Area 1 it would be prohibited.

8. The Plan limits new development in these high hazard risk areas and it is my recommendation that these restrictions remain.
9. A number of submissions were in support of these qualifying matters, and none in opposition. In my section 42a report, I address those submissions that sought amendments to the relevant rules and policies and I explain why I do not support any changes sought.
10. A number of existing hazard overlays in the Plan have not been proposed as qualifying matters. This includes the Flood Management Area and Liquefaction Management Area, as well as the Rockfall Management Area 2 and Mass Movement Management Areas 2 and 3 as these would not limit density. Within these areas mitigation such as minimum floor levels is possible and required to manage risk. Further there is a consenting pathway, in most cases restricted discretionary. The Waimakariri Stopbank Setbacks do not apply to relevant residential zones or zones impacted by Policy 3.
11. I wanted to raise a matter that has come to my attention recently which is that the Chapter 6.1A provisions refer to the 5.6.1 Slope Instability Management Area however the intention is not to put forward all of these as qualifying matters. Rockfall Management Area 2 and Mass Movement Management Areas 2 and 3 should not be included giving they have a consenting pathway that may or may not involve mitigation. Council's view is that the Mass Movement Management Area 1 should be included as QM despite this not being explicit in evidence given this would impact on height and density.

Date: 18 October 2023

Brittany Ratka