

**BEFORE INDEPENDENT HEARING COMMISSIONERS
IN CHRISTCHURCH**

TE MAHERE Ā-ROHE I TŪTOHUA MŌ TE TĀONE O ŌTAUTAHI

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of the hearing of submissions on Plan Change 14 (Housing and Business Choice) to the Christchurch District Plan

**SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF BRITTANY OLIVIA RATKA
ON BEHALF OF CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**

Dated: 29 November 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	2
Qualifications and experience	2
Code of conduct	2
Scope of supplementary evidence	2
THE TREATMENT OF THE SLOPE INSTABILITY OVERLAYS IN THE S32 AND S42A REPORTING	2

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. My full name is Brittany Olivia Ratka. I am employed as a policy planner in the City Planning Team of the Christchurch City Council (the **Council**).
2. I prepared a section 42A report, dated 11 August 2023, on behalf of the Council in respect of Plan Change 14 to the Christchurch District Plan (the **District Plan; PC14**). My section 42A report addressed the topics of the Industrial Interface QM, the Significant and Other Trees QM, and the Natural Hazards QMs.
3. I have prepared this supplementary statement of evidence in respect of issues raised at the PC14 hearing in relation to the Natural Hazards slope instability QMs. This includes addressing the treatment of the existing slope instability overlays in the s32 and s42A reporting for PC14. Given the differing treatment, I have provided an updated s32 analysis (which can if necessary be treated as a s32AA analysis) of the slope instability overlays with this supplementary evidence. As well as clarifying that all the existing slope instability overlays should be 'carried over' as QMs, this updated evaluation also considers retaining underlying zoning where slope instability overlays would mean intensification under MDRS is challenging or unrealistic.
4. Overall, in addition to the Cliff Collapse Management Areas 1 and 2, and the Rockfall Management Area 1 overlays that were addressed in my s42A report, I recommend the following existing overlays and associated mapping and provisions are included as QMs:
 - (a) Mass Movement Management Areas 1, 2 and 3;
 - (b) Rockfall Management Area 2; and
 - (c) Remainder of Port Hills and Banks Peninsula Slope Instability Management Area.
5. In addition, I recommend the existing underlying Plan zoning within the following overlays be retained given that the provisions in these overlays would mean intensification under MDRS is challenging or unrealistic:
 - (a) Cliff Collapse Management Areas 1 and 2;
 - (b) Rockfall Management Area 1; and

(c) Mass Movement Management Area 1.

INTRODUCTION

6. My full name is Brittany Olivia Ratka. I am employed as a policy planner in the City Planning Team of the Council.
7. My section 42A report addressed the topics of the Industrial Interface QM, the Significant and Other Trees QM, and the Natural Hazards QMs.
8. During the PC14 hearing, the Panel raised questions with respect to the slope instability QMs. As such I have prepared this supplementary evidence.
9. I am authorised to provide this evidence on behalf of the Council.

Qualifications and experience

10. My qualifications and experience are set out at paragraphs 2.1.2 and 2.1.3 of my section 42A report.

Code of conduct

11. While this is a Council hearing, I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses (contained in the 2023 Practice Note) and agree to comply with it. Except where I state I rely on the evidence of another person, I confirm that the issues addressed in this statement of evidence are within my area of expertise, and I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from my expressed opinions.

Scope of supplementary evidence

12. This supplementary evidence addresses the treatment of the existing slope instability overlays in the s32 and s42A reporting for PC14. It updates the s32 evaluation of the existing slope instability overlays as QMs, to confirm the Council's proposed approach to those overlays. In doing so, it also considers retaining the underlying zoning for the highest hazard areas where intensification is not realistic.

THE TREATMENT OF THE SLOPE INSTABILITY OVERLAYS IN THE S32 AND S42A REPORTING

Section 32 analysis

13. The Part 2 Qualifying Matters s32 report section 6.9 included a QM assessment for existing 'slope instability areas', while not explicitly listing each existing overlay, it could be considered to include all existing slope instability overlays in the Plan.
14. Appendix 3 to the Part 2 Qualifying Matters 32 report (Carry Over Qualifying Matters – Barker and Associates) includes all existing slope instability overlays. In one of the examples in this appendix it indicates that the Remainder of Port Hills and Banks Peninsula Slope Instability Management Area is not to be retained as a QM. Similarly, the housing capacity assessment and the notified mapping included all existing slope instability overlays (in one 'slope' overlay) except the Remainder of Port Hills and Banks Peninsula Slope Instability Management Area was excluded.
15. Appendix 2 to the Part 2 Qualifying Matters 32 report contains a list of existing and proposed provisions associated with QMs. Table 2 in this appendix lists '5.6.1 Slope Instability Management Area' as the provisions for the slope instability QM. This reference includes the provisions and assessment matters for all existing slope instability management areas.

Section 42A analysis

16. The s42A report is inconsistent with the original s32 report as it goes on to only specify the Cliff Collapse Management Areas 1 and 2, and the Rockfall Management Area 1 as QMs. The introduction (subchapter 5.1.) within the Natural Hazards Chapter of the Plan states that areas with these specific hazards are locations where the risk from natural hazards is considered to be unacceptable and such risks cannot practically be reduced to acceptable levels, and new activities in those areas are generally to be avoided. Whilst the s42A report does not include all existing slope instability areas, the response to submissions is not impeded by this.

UPDATED S32 ANALYSIS

17. Given this background, the uncertainty as to the intended treatment of the slope instability overlays (beyond those specifically addressed in the s42A report), I have updated the s32 evaluation to clarify the specific operative Plan slope instability overlays which are recommended as QMs. That exercise can be treated as a s32AA analysis to the extent necessary.

18. Appendix 1 contains the updated s32 evaluation. The updates are shown by way of tracked changes to section 6.9 of the original s32 analysis (in the overall Council s32 report).
19. It considers 6 options for progressing a slope instability QM and includes evaluation of all existing slope instability overlays, and additionally considers where it may be appropriate to retain the current Plan zoning for the highest hazard areas where development is unrealistic within the planning framework.
20. My evaluation recommends the following existing overlays and associated mapping and provisions are included as QMs:
- Overlays specifically recommended in s42A report*
- (a) Cliff Collapse Management Areas 1 and 2;
 - (b) Rockfall Management Areas 1;
- Additional overlays*
- (c) Rockfall Management Area 2;
 - (d) Mass Movement Management Areas 1, 2 and 3; and
 - (e) Remainder of Port Hills and Banks Peninsula Slope Instability Management Area.
21. In addition, I recommend the existing underlying Plan zoning within the following overlays be retained given that the provisions in these overlays would mean intensification under MDRS is challenging or unrealistic:
- (a) Cliff Collapse Management Areas 1 and 2;
 - (b) Rockfall Management Area 1; and
 - (c) Mass Movement Management Area 1.

Date: 29 November 2023

Brittany Ratka

APPENDIX 1 – SLOPE INSTABILITY QUALIFYING MATTER UPDATED S32 EVALUATION (ATTACHED AS SEPARATE PDF)