

**BEFORE THE CHRISTCHURCH REPLACEMENT
DISTRICT PLAN HEARINGS PANEL**

IN THE MATTER of the Resource
Management Act 1991
and the Canterbury
Earthquake
(Christchurch
Replacement District
Plan) Order 2014

AND

IN THE MATTER of the Natural Hazards
Stage 3 Proposal
(Part) and Coastal
Environment Stage 3
Proposal

**AFFIDAVIT OF MICHAEL RENIER ANTONIUS THEELEN IN SUPPORT OF
APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF THE TIMEFRAME FOR MAKING OF
SUBMISSIONS ON COASTAL HAZARDS MATTERS**

Sworn *2* September 2015

 **Simpson Grierson**
Barristers & Solicitors

Simpson Grierson
J G A Winchester / S J Scott
Telephone: +64-3-968 4018
Facsimile: +64-3-379 5023
Email: sarah.scott@simpsongrierson.com
PO Box 874
SOLICITORS
CHRISTCHURCH 8140

I, **MICHAEL RENIER ANTONIUS THEELEN**, Chief Planning Officer of Christchurch, swear:

1. I am the Chief Planning Officer at Christchurch City Council (**Council**). I have been in this role and equivalent positions at the Council for 9 years.
2. I am authorised to make this affidavit on behalf of the Council. I confirm that the content of this affidavit is based on my personal knowledge or inquiries I have personally made.
3. This affidavit is in response to the Panel's direction to file an affidavit in support of the Council's application for extension to the closing date for making submissions on the coastal hazards aspects of Proposals 5 and 19 and relevant planning maps, dated 31 August 2015 (**Application**). The Panel's direction seeks that this affidavit addresses:
 - 3.1 why the circumstances pertaining to the Coastal Hazard aspects of the Natural Hazards Proposal and the Coastal Environment Proposal differ from other Proposals, justifying an extension of time;
 - 3.2 the matters in clause 5(2)(a) to (c) of Schedule 3 of the Order in Council; and
 - 3.3 whether the consequences of granting the extension will see the Chairperson faced with similar applications.

Circumstances for coastal hazards

4. The primary difference between coastal hazards and the other stage 3 topics is that for Coastal Hazards, the proposed Replacement District Plan introduces a new set of provisions which seek to control activity rights based on predicted changes in the environment. The subject area relies on complex scientific information which underpins the proposed provisions. That material includes predictions of sea level rise and other corresponding effects from climate change, as well as the risk framework and the consequences of land movements caused by the earthquakes (some areas have subsided, exacerbating the risk). Further, the risk from coastal hazards is not as easy to identify and understand, when compared to the risk of rock fall, for example. This makes it more difficult to communicate the nature of the risk, its timeframes and consequences.

5. Due to the complexity of the information and the differing scientific opinions about these matters, for many submitters the material is likely to be difficult to understand and, because of that, I anticipate many submitters would benefit from further time to understand the material and to engage suitably qualified and experienced experts to help them prepare their submissions and evidence. Additional time provides the best chance of reducing uninformed concern and reaction from potential submitters.
6. The situation is compounded by the large number of affected properties and persons. The provisions which seek to address coastal hazards will affect many thousands of people and properties.
7. The other Stage 3 proposals do not affect as many people nor do they have the same need for scientific input. For example, the issues relevant to the Special Purpose Zone (Flat Land Recovery) are no more complex than the bulk of the provisions elsewhere in the proposed plan, and will not involve the same level of scientific input. Indeed, I consider that the issues for that Zone are largely of a planning nature as the zone has essentially been notified as a "holding zone" while the Council and Crown complete the necessary work to establish the future use of the red zone.
8. Further, accepting that other Stage 3 chapters also fall within this category, the coastal hazard provisions have not had the benefit of consultation. The Council did begin a separate consultation process in July 2015 on the broader topic of responding to coastal hazard, but this was not presented directly in the context of the Proposed District Plan, or the subsequent notified provisions. Consultation is relevant because of the highly technical nature of the provisions. The Stage 1 Natural Hazards proposal in contrast, had the benefit of consultation on the proposed provisions, which lasted six weeks, with a further two weeks of reporting back to Council ahead of the proposal being opened for formal submission. There has not been time for equivalent discretionary consultation for Stages 2 and 3 under the Order in Council timeframes, yet the information for coastal hazards is complex, and certainly is not less complex than the information around rockfall hazard, cliff collapse, and other land stability issues dealt with in Stage 1.

