

SUBMISSION # 949 Proposed District Plan regarding Chapter 5 Natural Hazards.

PROPERTY: 23K Walkers Road,
Lyttelton,
CHRISTCHURCH 8082.

CONTACT: Julia Oakley
021 1345593
Email:julia.oakley@clear.net.nz

Pearse Smyth
Cameron & Co.
03 337 0218
Email:pms@cameronco.co.nz

To: Christchurch City Council
District Plan submissions
PO Box 73001
Christchurch 8154

Name of submitter: Julia Margaret Oakley
23K Walkers Road
Lyttelton
Christchurch 8082

18.12.2014.

I am writing to seek further relief regarding my initial submission # 949 on the proposed Natural Hazards chapter of the Christchurch District Plan Review, proposed by the Christchurch the Christchurch City Council.

I have now joined as a supporter of Pearse Smyth's(Cameron & Co) group in submission # FS1243 & # FS 1268 so that I will be legally represented by Pearse Smyth and expert Geotechnical engineer David Bell.

The current Port Hills zoning review map extends the hazard zones across the majority of the rural part of my property at 23k Walkers Road and the northwest tip of the residential part of the property. This has resulted in my receiving a letter from Christchurch City Council stating that my property is shown as Rockfall Hazard Management Areas 1 and 2 in the draft district plan.

This submission seeks a change to the boundaries of the Rockfall Hazard Management Areas(RHMA) 1 & 2 to exclude my property from these areas.

The specific provisions of the chapter this submission relates to are:

5.2-General Natural hazards Policies.

5.5-Policies for slope instability areas.

5.10-Port Hills and Banks Peninsula slope instability rules.

Planning map 52

REASON FOR SUBMISSION:

1-My property is located within the'Green Zone' but with the introduction of the chapter relating to slope instability it would become subject to RHMA controls.

2-The Council has not taken into account available information when locating the boundary lines for the hazard areas on my property. PHGG Assessment of GNS model accompanies this submission (Appendix 1).

2.1-Port Hills Geotechnical Group(PHGG) Assessment of GNS model applicability for 23K Walkers Road concludes that the individual site risk is less than the GNS suburb-scale value.

2.2-PHGG description of suburb average rockfall source as major continuous outcrop does not apply to my property which is commented on as 'diminished source-discontinuous outcrop.'

3-Geotechnical Engineer David Bell will provide a detailed report on the site specific risk to my property and his expert report will be submitted at a later date to support this submission at hearings.

3.2-Site specific Geotechnical investigations by David Bell(Appendix 2)and Coffey Geotech. engineer Adam Broadbent(Appendix 3)confirm that no rockfall runout entered 23K Walkers Road from 22 Feb. 2011 earthquake or subsequent EQs and support the removal of my property from RHMA 1 & 2.

DECISION :

I seek a change in the hazard lines so that my property is not within the RHMA 1 or 2.

Yours sincerely,

Julia Oakley

SUBMISSION #949 Proposed District Plan

APPENDIX 1

PHGG GNS MODEL Site specific to 23K Walkers road, Lyttelton.

Port Hills Geotechnical Group Assessment of GNS Model Applicability for Individual Site

Sector: 6 Address: 23 K Walkers Rd Current S124 Notice? ☐ yes ☒ no
(Section)

GNS Risk_{LOL} at Dwelling*: ☒ 10^{-2} to 10^{-3} ☒ 10^{-3} to 10^{-4} ☐ 10^{-4} to 10^{-5} ☐ Less than 10^{-5} (*Risk Model C)

Measured "F" angle at dwelling: 23° or ☐ Not measurable

Measured "S" angle at dwelling: ~21° or ☐ Not measurable GNS Map "S" angle at dwelling: 23°

Profile of slope above dwelling: ☒ sloping run-out ☐ localised cliff with flat base ☐ slope, flat run-out

Description of suburb average rockfall source: continuous outcrop, major

Did boulder(s) pass or land within 10 m of house

☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, ☐ House hit ☐ Landed ☐ Passed

Previously mapped? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Is "F" angle at dwelling less than GNS shadow angle?

☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Not measurable

Does the rockfall source vary significantly from the suburb average?

☒ Yes ☐ No If Yes, describe in Comments

If Yes, how does this affect risk to dwelling?

☐ Increases risk ☒ Decreases risk

Is there a significant topographic feature that influences risk to dwelling?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, ☐ Ridge ☐ Gully ☐ Flat surface

How does this affect risk to dwelling?

☐ Increases risk ☐ Decreases risk

Are there any other known mass movement issues that could increase risk to dwelling?

☐ Yes ☒ No

☐ Debris flow ☐ Landslide ☐ Cliff collapse

Based on observations of the site, is it possible to assess whether the site risk is same, greater or less than the GNS suburb-scale value?

☒ Yes

☐ No

RISK IS
same / less / greater than
GNS SUBURB-SCALE VALUE
(circle as appropriate)

SITE REQUIRES
MORE DETAILED
EVALUATION

Is an S124 Notice Required?

☐ Yes ☒ No

☐ Cannot make this assessment from available information

Comments:

diminished source - discontinuous minor outcrop

Assessed for CCC/Port Hills
Geotechnical Group by:

Kelly Walker

Rori Green

Date: 20 / 04 / 2012

1220

