

10 May 2013

Hon Gerry Brownlee
Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery
Parliament Buildings
WELLINGTON

Dear Minister Brownlee

In response to your queries following our meeting on Thursday 2 May 2013, please find attached:

- The minutes for the Port Hills Zoning Review Advisory Group meeting held on Friday 10 May 2013,
- A table outlining responses to your queries, raised in the meeting that I had with you on Thursday 2 May 2013.

The majority of queries raised were answered in the tables prepared in response to your letter of 12 March 2013. A small amount of additional information to provide clarity on issues raised at our meeting is provided in the final column of the table.

A further matter that the Advisory Group would like to clarify is in relation to the Group's approach to Crown and Council owned land. At its meeting the Group clarified its position and this is included in the minutes.

I would be happy to meet with you to brief you further on our response, if you think this would be helpful.

Yours sincerely



Keith Turner
CHAIR
PORT HILLS ZONING REVIEW ADVISORY GROUP

Released by the Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery

Released by the Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery

Minutes

Meeting Friday 10 May 2013

Port Hills Zoning Review Advisory Group

Meeting	Participants
Friday 10 May 2013, 7.45am – 8.45am CERA offices, Christchurch Conference phone meeting Withheld under section 9(2)(a)	Advisory Group: - Dr Keith Turner – Independent Chair (phone) - Diane Turner – Deputy Chief Executive, Recovery Strategy, Planning and Policy, CERA - Kevin Locke – General Manager, Capital Programme, CCC (phone) - David Jennings – Independent Geotechnical Engineer (phone) - Patricia Noble – Senior Legal Advisor, CERA Attendees: - CERA - David Corlett – CERA
Introduction	The Chair opened the meeting and noted the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The additional information requested following his meeting with Minister Brownlee • Further explanation around the Group's approach to Crown and Council owned properties • The feedback from a Group member on the Gondola property on Bridle Path Road.
Additional information requested	A table was supplied prior to the meeting with draft answers to the queries. The Group worked through the table and agreed on the content, subject to discussed changes to be made by the secretariat. The Group agreed that there were no changes to its recommendations as a result of the queries.
Crown / Council owned properties	Prior to the meeting an explanation of the Group's approach to Crown and Council owned properties was circulated. The Group agreed that the general approach is as set out below: Unlike the flat land, for which an area wide approach was adopted, zoning decisions for properties in the Port Hills were made on an individual basis with the key consideration being life safety risk. The Port Hills area considered by the Advisory Group encompasses a number of Crown and Christchurch City Council owned properties interspersed among those in private ownership. The Group adopted as one of its guiding considerations the position that Crown and Council land should generally be recommended for green zoning. This is because most of those properties are non-residential (typically unoccupied land such as recreation reserves and infrastructure sites); whereas the GNS modeled life safety risk areas assume residential use. The guiding consideration referred to above is consistent with the Cabinet minute of 14 November 2011 [CAB Min (11) 41/10 refers] which "noted that

Minutes



Meeting Friday 10 May 2013

Port Hills Zoning Review Advisory Group

	<p>white (unzoned) non-residential properties in greater Christchurch, including... non-residential properties in the Port Hills and Lyttelton... can be zoned green to enable normal insurance and consenting processes to be used to determine where rebuilding and/or repairs can occur.”</p> <p>In almost all cases, therefore, the Group has applied the guiding consideration and recommended that Crown and Council owned properties are zoned green. This is because the Council and Crown owned properties in the Port Hills are not residentially owned.</p> <p>For a few Crown and Council owned properties, the Group made a deliberate exception because it considered the level of life safety risk was more akin to that for privately-owned residential dwellings than for other (i.e. non-residential) Crown and Council owned properties. An example of this is the retirement village at 2 Truro Street: although the property is Council owned, the Group has recommended that it be zoned red. For this property the Group applied the Cabinet-agreed criterion that a rock roll affected property zoned for residential use would typically be recommended for red zoning if the dwelling was entirely within or substantially intersected by the 1 in 10,000 2016 Annual Individual Fatality Risk line as defined by GNS Science.</p> <p>The Group did not carry out the review on the basis of ownership, and has not carried out an exhaustive search to identify all Crown and Council owned properties, and has no plans to do so. As a result, there may be other properties where the Group was unaware a red-zoned property is Crown or Council owned.</p>
<p>The Gondola at 10 Bridle Path Road</p>	<p>The Group noted that on 5 April they supplied information that the property on which the Gondola is located was owned by Christchurch City Council. Group member Patricia Noble brought to the Group's attention that this information was incorrect.</p> <p>There are two property addresses (one commercial and one residential) on the land, which is comprised in one certificate of title. The Group confirmed the green zoning. The residential dwelling located at this site is not affected by the 1 in 10,000 at 2016 risk line, and the Group noted the Gondola itself has had treatment works (including the installation of rock roll protection structures) and reopened.</p> <p>The Group agreed that Appendix A should read as follows:</p> <p><i>Linkage to criteria:</i> The annual individual fatality risk associated with the residential dwelling is less than 1 in 10,000 at 2016 risk levels as per the GNS Model</p> <p><i>Guiding Consideration:</i> Not applicable – see criterion”</p> <p><i>Additional information:</i> “The dwelling on this property is outside the life safety risk line”.</p>

Released under the Official Information Act 1982 for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery

Table 1: Port Hills Zoning Review Advisory Group: Supplementary Information Requested At Meeting 2 May 2013

Address	Mla P	Area	Recommended zoning	Reasons as per Minutes supplied 5 April	Query	Linkage to criteria	Guiding consideration	Additional information supplied 5 April	Supplementary information provided post 2 May
1	2 View Terrace	Centaurus Road	Remain Green		What is the number of property, as it is unclear on the map?	<i>Not relevant to this query.</i>	<i>Not relevant to this query.</i>	<i>Not relevant to this query.</i>	The property that has asked for a review is 2 View Terrace.
2	4A, 4B and 6 Avoca Valley Road	Avoca Valley	Rec: Green > Red	Following a close examination of the GNS Science rock roll model it was determined that the dwellings at 4A, 4B and 6 Avoca Valley Road are exposed to an Annual Individual Fatality Risk of 1 in 10,000 or greater in 2016. Due to inconsistency in the GNS Science model for this location, and the Group's mandate to ensure that boundary lines are drawn sensibly, 2 Avoca Valley Road and 275 Port Hills Road met the criteria to be zoned red.	Noted that risk line understated around properties: 6, 4A, 4B, 2, and 275. Need to make sure minutes are clear on this point.	The annual individual fatality risk associated with the residential dwelling is less than 1 in 10,000 at 2016 levels as per the GNS model.	<i>Not applicable – see criterion.</i>	GNS has advised that the rock roll model understates the life safety risk to this property and the property is in an elevated life risk area. Following ground truthing and a close examination of the model, it was determined that the dwellings at 4A, 4B and 6 Avoca Valley Road are exposed to an Annual Individual Fatality Risk of 1 in 10,000 or greater in 2016.	The detail provided in the Minutes and Appendices A and B on 5 April 2013 fully explains the Group's recommendation in relation to these properties.

Released by the Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery

Table 1: Port Hills Zoning Review Advisory Group: Supplementary Information Requested At Meeting 2 May 2013

Address	Map	Area	Recommended zoning	Reasons as per Minutes supplied 5 April	Query	Linkage to criteria	Guiding consideration	Additional information supplied 5 April	Supplementary information provided post 2 May
2 Avoca Valley Road and 275 Port Hills Road	6	Avoca Valley	Rec: Green > Red	Following a close examination of the GNS Science rock roll model it was determined that the dwellings at 4A, 4B and 6 Avoca Valley Road are exposed to an Annual Individual Fatality Risk of 1 in 10,000 or greater in 2016. Due to inconsistency in the GNS Science model for this location, and the Group's mandate to ensure that boundary lines are drawn sensibly, 2 Avoca Valley Road and 275 Port Hills Road met the criteria to be zoned red.		The zoning of this property is an anomaly because the boundary lines have not been drawn sensibly.	<i>Not applicable - see criterion.</i>	This property has been recommended for red zoning, consistent with the Group's mandate to ensure that zoning boundaries are drawn sensibly.	The detail provided in the Minutes and Appendices A and B on 5 April 2013 fully explains the Group's recommendation in relation to these properties.

Released by the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery

Table 1: Port Hills Zoning Review Advisory Group: Supplementary Information Requested At Meeting 2 May 2013

Address	Map	Area	Recommended zoning	Reasons as per Minutes supplied 5 April	Query	Linkage to criteria	Guiding consideration	Additional information supplied 5 April	Supplementary information provided post 2 May
26 and 26A Bridle Path Road	9	Bridle Path Road 1	Remain Green		Why are 26 and 26A recommended to remain green when surrounding properties are red?	The annual individual fatality risk associated with the residential dwelling is less than 1 in 10,000 at 2016 levels as per the GNS model.	<i>Not applicable</i> – see <i>criteria</i>	26: None requested or supplied 26A: The dwelling on this property is outside the life safety risk line	The property at 26 is entirely outside the risk line. The property at 26A is impacted by the risk line, but the dwelling is not. The titles of 24 and 28 Bridle Path Road include access ways which border 26 and 26A, but are well outside the risk boundary. The Minutes say the dwelling at 24 Bridle Path Road is clipped by the 1 in 10,000 2016 AIFR line as defined by GNS science risk modelling. The Group accepted the expert advice that the model is slightly anomalous in this instance, and the risk to occupants may be higher. Expert advice provided to the group indicated that this is not the case for 26 and 26A Bridle Path Road. The dwellings at 28 and 28A Bridle Path Road are impacted by the risk lines.
27 Morgans Valley	10	Morgans Valley	Rec: Red > Green	This property is owned by CCC.	Why is rezoning from red to green recommended?	See <i>Guiding Consideration</i> .	All Crown and CCC land be recommended for green zoning.	None requested or supplied.	Crown and CCC land is generally recommended for green zoning. This property is not residential. This property provides access to 70A Morgans Valley (which is also owned by CCC).

Released by the Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery

Table 1: Port Hills Zoning Review Advisory Group: Supplementary Information Requested At Meeting 2 May 2013

Address	Map	Area	Recommended zoning	Reasons as per Minutes supplied 5 April	Query	Linkage to criteria	Guiding consideration	Additional information supplied 5 April	Supplementary information provided post 2 May
6 54 Morgans Valley <i>*note this property is also in table 2 below.</i>	10	Morgans Valley	Rec: Red > Green	This property is owned by CCC.	54 is recommended to be rezoned from red to green. Need to explain the information the Advisory Group took into account.	See Guiding Consideration.	All Crown and CCC land be recommended for green zoning.	None requested or supplied.	Crown and CCC land is generally recommended for green zoning. This property is not residential. This property provides access to 70A Morgans Valley (which is also owned by CCC). Expert advice provided to the Group indicated that the GNS model overstates the risk to this property as it doesn't sufficiently reflect variation in the local topography. This property partially sits on higher ground than the adjacent red-zoned property at 56 Morgans Valley.
7 2/51A and 51C St Andrews Hill Road <i>Released by the Minister</i>	13	Mt Pleasant	Rec: Green > Red	Further consideration and expert advice indicated that this property is exposed to the potential for immediate land damage with an associated risk to life as a result of the earthquakes. Accordingly, it was considered that this recommendation is consistent with the intent of the red zoning criteria agreed to by Cabinet.	Why is rezoning from green to red recommended? Is it due to mass land movement and the absence of a defined geotechnical model, and hence a real life safety risk if further failure occurs?	The Group determined that the intent of the following criterion had been met: <i>There is the potential for immediate cliff collapse as assessed by GNS caused or accentuated by the Canterbury earthquakes with associated risk to life.</i>	Where properties did not strictly meet the red zoning criteria, but the intent of the criteria was met, the Group has recommended that these properties be zoned red.	Expert advice provided to the Group indicated that this property is exposed to the potential for immediate land damage with an associated risk to life as a result of the earthquakes. A loess (soil) cliff affects this property which has significant land cracks. In addition to earthquake induced land damage a significant rainstorm could cause collapse. GNS did not include this area in their models because it was not assessed as being a former coastal cliff (a key criterion for inclusion). ¹	This property sits at the top of a cliff and is exposed to the risk of cliff recession (cliff top collapse). The cliff was not included in the GNS cliff collapse model and is exhibiting significant instability. 2/51A and 51C are cross-leased properties.

¹ Note this property was incorrectly referred to in Appendix B supplied on 5 April as 2/51 St Andrews Hill Road (an address point which does not exist).

Table 1: Port Hills Zoning Review Advisory Group: Supplementary Information Requested At Meeting 2 May 2013

Address	Map	Area	Recommended zoning	Reasons as per Minutes supplied 5 April	Query	Linkage to criteria	Guiding consideration	Additional information supplied 5 April	Supplementary information provided post 2 May
10 Quarry Road	13	Mt Pleasant	Rec: Green > Red	Further consideration and expert advice indicated that this property is exposed to the potential for immediate land damage with an associated risk to life as a result of the earthquakes. Accordingly, it was considered that this recommendation is consistent with the intent of the red zoning criteria agreed to by Cabinet.	Why is rezoning from green to red recommended? Is it due to mass land movement and the absence of a defined geotechnical model, and hence a real life safety risk if further failure occurs?	The Group determined that the intent of the following criterion had been met: There is the potential for immediate cliff collapse or land slip as assessed by GNS caused or accentuated by the Canterbury earthquakes with associated risk to life.	Where properties did not strictly meet the red zoning criteria, but the intent of the criteria was met, the Group has recommended that these properties be zoned red.	Expert advice provided to the Group indicated that this property is exposed to the potential for immediate land damage with an associated risk to life as a result of the earthquakes. A loess (soil) cliff affects this property which has significant land cracks. In addition to earthquake induced land damage a significant rainstorm could cause collapse. GNS did not include this are in their models because it was not assessed as being a former coastal cliff (a key criterion for inclusion).	This property sits below a cliff and is exposed to the risk of debris inundation from above. The cliff was not included in the GNS cliff collapse model and is exhibiting significant instability.
1/20 and 120A McCormacks Bay Road	13	Mt Pleasant and Redcliffs-1	1/20 Remain green 120A Rec: Green > Red	Not applicable.	Check numbering on maps do we have two numbered 120 McCormacks Bay Road?	Not relevant to this query.	Not relevant to this query.	Not relevant to this query.	The maps are correct. These are different properties. 1/20 McCormacks Bay Road is on map 13, 120A McCormacks Bay Road is on map 16.

Table 1: Port Hills Zoning Review Advisory Group: Supplementary Information Requested At Meeting 2 May 2013

Address	Map	Area	Recommended zoning	Reasons as per Minutes supplied 5 April	Query	Linkage to criteria	Guiding consideration	Additional information supplied 5 April	Supplementary information provided post 2 May
76 McCormacks Bay Road	14	Maffey's Road	Rec: Green > Red	Further consideration and expert advice indicated that the property is exposed to the potential for immediate land damage with an associated risk to life as a result of the earthquakes. Accordingly, it was considered that this recommendation is consistent with the intent of the red zoning criteria agreed to by Cabinet.	Need to make sure that minutes make clear why 76 McCormacks Rd is recommended to be zoned red	The Group determined that the intent of the following criterion had been met: <i>There is the potential for immediate cliff collapse or land slip as assessed by GNS caused or accentuated by the Canterbury earthquakes with associated risk to life.</i>	Where properties did not strictly meet the red zoning criteria, but the intent of the criteria was met, the Group has recommended that these properties be zoned red.	Expert advice provided to the Group indicated that the property is exposed to the potential for immediate land damage with an associated risk to life as a result of the earthquakes. The sub-vertical loess slope immediately upslope of this property shows signs of ongoing distress (as evidenced by ground cracking), suggestive of ongoing ground movement. There is a high possibility of collapse which is considered to pose a direct life safety risk to occupants. Ground damage is earthquake exacerbated, though not necessarily earthquake caused, and mitigation options are unclear. ²	The detail provided in the Minutes and Appendices A and B on 5 April 2013 fully explains the Group's recommendation in relation to these properties.

Released by the Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery

² Note that in the information supplied on 5 April referred to the "grass bank". This has been modified to be "sub-vertical loess slope".

Table 1: Port Hills Zoning Review Advisory Group: Supplementary Information Requested At Meeting 2 May 2013

Address	Map	Area	Recommended zoning	Reasons as per Minutes supplied 5 April	Query	Linkage to criteria	Guiding consideration	Additional information supplied 5 April	Supplementary information provided post 2 May
4 and 8 Moncks Spur	17	Redcliffs 2	Rec: Green > Red	Further consideration and expert advice indicated that these properties are exposed to the potential for immediate land damage with an associated risk to life as a result of the earthquakes. Accordingly, it was considered that this recommendation is consistent with the intent of the red zoning criteria agreed to by Cabinet.	Not clear why these properties are being recommended to be rezoned red.	The Group determined that the intent of the following criterion had been met: <i>There is the potential for immediate cliff collapse or land slip as assessed by GNS caused or accentuated by the Canterbury earthquakes with associated risk to life.</i>	Where properties did not strictly meet the red zoning criteria, but the intent of the criteria was met, the Group has recommended that these properties be zoned red.	The eight metre near vertical loess cliff adjacent to the properties at 4 and 8 Moncks Spur Lane was not included in the GNS model as it generally included sea-cut rock cliffs only. Expert advice provided to the Group indicated that these properties are exposed to the potential for immediate land damage with an associated risk to life as a result of the earthquakes. The advice indicated that the loess cliff presented an immediate life safety hazard, caused or accentuated by the earthquakes. In several areas the cliff failed and impacted the dwellings at 4 and 8 Moncks Spur. Remediation of the cliff would require both buildings to be demolished. On balance, the Group agreed that while the properties did not meet the red zoning criteria, they did meet the intent of the criteria and the risk to life is such that the panel recommended they be rezoned from green to red.	The properties in question are 4 and 8 Moncks Spur Road. The '4' is missing off the map.
69A Bay View Road	18	Moncks Bay	Rec: Red > Green	The Group agreed that the GNS Science rock roll model has overestimated the risk for this property. Thus, it is judged that the dwelling on this property is exposed to an Annual Individual Fatality Risk of less than 1 in 10,000 in 2016 due to rock roll.	Why is rezoning from red to green recommended?	The annual individual fatality risk associated with the residential dwelling is less than 1 in 10,000 at 2016 risk levels as per the GNS model.	Not applicable - see criterion.	Expert advice provided to the Group indicated that the GNS model overstates the life safety risk to this property because it does not take into account the completed treatment of the rockfall source at number 9 Red Rock Lane and the southeastern gully behind number 67A Bay View Road.	The rockfall sources identified by the GNS Science model as posing a risk to this property have been modified and treated.

Released by the Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery

Table 1: Port Hills Zoning Review Advisory Group: Supplementary Information Requested At Meeting 2 May 2013

Address	Map	Area	Recommended zoning	Reasons as per Minutes supplied 5 April	Query	Linkage to criteria	Guiding consideration	Additional information supplied 5 April	Supplementary information provided post 2 May
13 6 Red Rock Lane	18	Moncks Bay	Remain Green		Not clear why 6 is recommended not to change.	See Guiding Consideration	See comment under Additional Information	Expert advice provided to the Group indicated that the rockfall source impacting this property is fully contained on the property.	The detail provided in the Minutes and Appendices A and B on 5 April 2013 fully explains the Group's recommendation in relation to this property.
14 106, 108 and 112 Wakefield Avenue	22	Wakefield 2	Remain Green		Why is the property recommended to stay green when it is intersected by the risk line?	The annual individual fatality risk associated with the residential dwelling is less than 1 in 10,000 at 2016 risk levels as per the GNS model.	Not applicable - see criterion.	The dwelling on this property is outside the life safety risk line.	The detail provided in the Minutes and Appendices A and B on 5 April 2013 fully explains the Group's recommendation in relation to these properties.
15 1/6 and 8 Firmsarby Place	22	Wakefield 2	Remain Green		Why is the property recommended to stay green when it is intersected by the risk line?	The annual individual fatality risk associated with the residential dwelling is less than 1 in 10,000 at 2016 risk levels as per the GNS model.	Not applicable - see criterion.	Expert advice provided to the group indicates that the GNS model overstates the life safety risk to this property due to the presence of the road. (In most circumstances the presence of a flat area such as a road carriageway or building platform tends to reduce the rockfall risk for properties located below the flat area.)	The detail provided in the Minutes and Appendices A and B on 5 April 2013 fully explains the Group's recommendation in relation to these properties.
16 1 Firmsarby Place	22	Wakefield 2	Remain Green		Why is the property recommended to stay green when it is intersected by the risk line?	The annual individual fatality risk associated with the residential dwelling is less than 1 in 10,000 at 2016 risk levels as per the GNS model.	Not applicable - see criterion.	The dwelling on this property is outside the life safety risk line.	The detail provided in the Minutes and Appendices A and B on 5 April 2013 fully explains the Group's recommendation in relation to this property.

Released by the Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery

Table 1: Port Hills Zoning Review Advisory Group: Supplementary Information Requested At Meeting 2 May 2013

Address	Map	Area	Recommended zoning	Reasons as per Minutes supplied 5 April	Query	Linkage to criteria	Guiding consideration	Additional information supplied 5 April	Supplementary information provided post 2 May
17 1/104, 2/104 and 106 Sumnervale Drive	23	Sumnervale	Rec: Green > Red	Further consideration and expert advice indicated that the GNS Science rock roll model for this area may have underestimated the risk for these dwellings through suburb-wide averaging. The dwellings on these properties are exposed to an Annual Individual Fatality Risk of 1 in 10,000 in 2016 or greater due to rock roll.	Why is the property recommended to be rezoned from green to red?	The annual individual fatality risk associated with the residential dwelling is greater than 1 in 10,000 at 2016 risk levels as per the GNS model.	Not applicable - see criterion.	Expert advice provided to the Group indicated that the model significantly understates risk due to suburb wide averaging and different rockfall sources. The advice indicated that the road between this property and the cliff provides a bench, but the group is not convinced it provides sufficient protection. (In most circumstances the presence of a flat area such as a road carriageway or building platform tends to reduce the rockfall risk for properties located below the flat area but the Group does not consider this to be sufficient for this property.)	Despite the presence of the road, significant boulders were mapped beyond the risk line.
18 Taylor's Mistake Road	27	Taylor's Mistake Road			Is the name of the map accurate?				We think the name accurately reflects the area that the map covers.
19 -	28	Hobsons Bay			Is the name of the map accurate?				We think the name accurately reflects the area that the map covers.
20 37 Ross Terrace	33	Endeavour Place	Rec: Green > Red	This property is exposed to an annual individual fatality risk of 1 in 10,000 in 2016 due to rock roll as defined by GNS science risk modelling.	Why is rezoning from green to red recommended, when property to the north (18 Somes Road) is recommended to remain green??	See guiding consideration.	In applying the Port Hills zoning criteria to vacant residential lots the Group exercised judgement in relation to lots intersected by the life safety risk line and applied reasonableness test to achieve a sensible outcome.	None requested or supplied.	The property to the north (18 Somes Road) is Crown/CCC owned. It is a scenic reserve. Crown and CCC land is generally recommended for green zoning as it is not residential.
21 62 Hawkhurst Road	34	Hawkhurst Road	Remain Green		Clarification around recommendation	The annual individual fatality risk associated with the residential dwelling is less than 1 in 10,000 at 2016 risk levels as per the GNS model.	Not applicable - see criterion	The dwelling at this property is outside the life safety risk line.	The detail provided in the Minutes and Appendices A and B on 5 April 2013 fully explains the Group's recommendation in relation to this property.

Table 1: Port Hills Zoning Review Advisory Group: Supplementary Information Requested At Meeting 2 May 2013

Address	Map	Area	Recommended zoning	Reasons as per Minutes supplied 5 April	Query	Linkage to criteria	Guiding consideration	Additional information supplied 5 April	Supplementary information provided post 2 May
22 64 Hawkhurst Road	34	Hawkhurst Road	Remain Green		Clarification around recommendation	The annual individual fatality risk associated with the residential dwelling is less than 1 in 10,000 at 2016 risk levels as per the GNS model.	<i>Not applicable</i> - see <i>criteria</i>	The dwelling at this property is outside the life safety risk line.	The detail provided in the Minutes and Appendices A and B on 5 April 2013 fully explains the Group's recommendation in relation to this property.
23 66 Hawkhurst Road	34	Hawkhurst Road	Rec: Red > Green	This property is exposed to an Annual Individual Fatality Risk less than 1 in 10,000 in 2016 due to rock roll as defined by GNS Science risk modelling.	Why is rezoning from red to green recommended?	See <i>guiding consideration</i> . ³	In applying the Port Hills zoning criteria to vacant residential lots the Group exercised judgement in relation to lots intersected by the life safety risk line and applied reasonableness test to achieve a sensible outcome.	The dwelling at 64 Hawkhurst Road is built across the boundary and is outside the life safety risk zone. 66 Hawkhurst is a vacant section.	There is a garage on this property but not a dwelling.
24 73 Hawkhurst Road ⁴ <i>Please note: this property is not 73 Tunnel Road</i>	34	Hawkhurst Road	Part green and part red (no changes recommended)	The property located at 73 Hawkhurst Road (being the portion of Part RS 266 having the area of 0.4046 hectares more or less, contained in certificate of title CB2C/1236) is exposed to an Annual Individual Fatality Risk of 1 in 10,000 or greater in 2016 due to rock roll as defined by GNS Science risk modelling. A separation enables an offer to be made for the residential portion on this title.	The owner has requested rezoning from red to green - but the map indicates the property is already green. Why is this?	<i>Not applicable.</i>	<i>Not applicable.</i>	<i>None requested or supplied.</i>	This is a large property in one title comprising three lots - see attached title. The lot containing the dwelling is zoned red; the remaining lots are zoned green. The Group has recommended that the zonings remain unchanged, contingent on a separate certificate of title being issued for the green zoned lots.

³ Appendix A of the table supplied on 5 April erroneously referred to the criteria for residential dwellings in the information supplied for this property.

⁴ Note the owner of this property uses the address of 71 Hawkhurst Road (his neighbour at 71 Hawkhurst Road on the map uses the address 69 Hawkhurst Road).

Table 1: Port Hills Zoning Review Advisory Group: Supplementary Information Requested At Meeting 2 May 2013

Address	Map	Area	Recommended zoning	Reasons as per Minutes supplied 5 April	Query	Linkage to criteria	Guiding consideration	Additional information supplied 5 April	Supplementary information provided post 2 May
25 Industrial properties along the foot of the cliff that runs out to the yacht club	37	Naval Point	Remain green	The Group noted that parts of Lyttelton Port area are exposed to the potential for immediate debris inundation from cliff collapse, and carry an associated risk to life. The Group did not make zoning recommendations for anything in the Port area.	These properties are zoned green and recommended to remain so. Is this because they are in the Port area and the risk line overstates the level of risk?	See comment under Guiding Considerations	The Group has considered the Port area (irrespective of the land ownership) as a separate item. See further explanation under 'Reasons as per Minutes supplied 5 April'.	None requested or supplied.	The Group considered the Port area (irrespective of the land ownership) as a separate item and did not consider zoning. The yacht club was considered as a special case as it is a community building with the potential for high occupancy. There was no evidence concerning the accuracy of the risk line discussed by the Group.
26 460 Governors Bay Road	40	Governors Bay Road	Remain green		Not clear why property is remaining green.	See Guiding Consideration	Properties that are zoned rural under CCC's City Plan and the Banks Peninsula District Plan are generally recommended for green zoning. Rural properties have been recommended for red zoning where they are included in the GNS Science rock roll or cliff collapse models, are part of the residential settlement pattern for the area, have met the red zoning criteria, and the Group has applied its guiding considerations in a consistent manner.	Not applicable	The detail provided in the Minutes and Appendices A and B on 5 April 2013 fully explains the Group's recommendation in relation to this property.
27 522 Governors Bay Road *note this property is also in table 2 below.	41	Maori Gardens	Remain green		Not clear why property is remaining green.	See Guiding Consideration	All Crown and CCC land be recommended for green zoning.	Not applicable	Crown and CCC land is generally recommended for green zoning. This property is not residential.

Released by the Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery

Table 1: Port Hills Zoning Review Advisory Group: Supplementary Information Requested At Meeting 2 May 2013

Address	Map	Area	Recommended zoning	Reasons as per Minutes supplied 5 April	Query	Linkage to criteria	Guiding consideration	Additional information supplied 5 April	Supplementary information provided post 2 May
28 58 Zephyr Terrace	42	Zephyr Terrace	Rec: Green > Red	The dwelling on this property is exposed to an Annual Individual Fatality Risk of 1 in 10,000 in 2016 due to rock roll as defined by GNS Science risk modelling.	Why is rezoning from green to red recommended when 42 and 42A Hays Rise and 571, 571A, 1051A and 1051B Dyers Pass Road are not recommended for change?	The annual individual fatality risk associated with the residential dwelling is greater than 1 in 10,000 at 2016 risk levels as per the GNS model.	Properties that are zoned rural under the CCC's City Plan and the Banks Peninsula District Plan are generally recommended for green zoning. Rural properties have been recommended for red zoning where they are included in the GNS Science rock roll or cliff collapse models, are part of the residential settlement pattern for the area, have met the red zoning criteria, and the Group has applied its guiding considerations in a consistent manner.	None requested or supplied.	The dwelling at 58 Zephyr Terrace is located approximately under the '58' annotated on the map. The dwelling is exposed to an annual individual fatality risk of 1 in 10,000 in 2016 and therefore meets the criteria for red zoning. 42 Hays Rise: The dwelling on this property is outside the life safety risk line. 42A Hays Rise: This property is a small parcel of land approximately 36m ² . 571 Dyers Pass Road: This is a large property and a significant portion is outside the life safety risk line. 571A Dyers Pass Road: This property is a small triangular lot of land (approximately 260m ²) outside the life safety risk line. 1051B Dyers Pass Road: This is a large property and a significant portion is outside the life safety risk line. 1051A Dyers Pass Road: The dwelling on this property is outside the life safety risk line.

Released by the Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery

Table 2: Crown / CCC owned land

Address	Map	Area	Recommended zoning	Reasons as per Minutes supplied 5 April	Query following meeting	Linkage to Criteria	Guiding Consideration	Additional information supplied 5 April	Supplementary Information provided post 2 May 2013
F 54 Morgans Valley Road	10	Morgans Valley	Rec: red > green	The properties at 27 and 54 Morgans Valley Road are CCC owned	The Advisory Group's approach to making recommendations for rezoning in relation to CCC and Crown land is unclear.	See Guiding Consideration	All Crown and CCC land be recommended for green zoning.	None requested or supplied	See item 6 on table 1. Crown and CCC land generally recommended for green zoning as it is not residential.
F 70A Morgans Valley Road	10	Morgans Valley	Remain green	Not applicable	The Advisory Group's approach to making recommendations for rezoning in relation to CCC and Crown land is unclear.	See Guiding Consideration	All Crown and CCC land be recommended for green zoning.	Not applicable	This property is owned by CCC and is a large area of undeveloped land. Crown and CCC land generally recommended for green zoning as it is not residential.
G 136 and 136A Main Road Note: is this 136C Main Road?	16	Redcliffs 1	Remain green	Not applicable	The Advisory Group's approach to making recommendations for rezoning in relation to CCC and Crown land is unclear.	See Guiding Consideration	All Crown and CCC land be recommended for green zoning.	Not applicable	These properties are part of Redcliffs School. The whole school is zoned green. Crown and CCC land generally recommended for green zoning as it is not residential.
H 24A Kinsey Terrace	19	Kinsey Terrace	Remain green	Not applicable	The Advisory Group's approach to making recommendations for rezoning in relation to CCC and Crown land is unclear.	See Guiding Consideration	All Crown and CCC land be recommended for green zoning.	24A Kinsey Terrace is a narrow strip of land owned by CCC outside of the event lines. (The small triangle of adjacent land is part of the title for 28 Kinsey Terrace.)	This property is CCC owned. It is used for infrastructure. Crown and CCC land generally recommended for green zoning as it is not residential.
A 42 Wakefield Ave	20	Richmond Hill Road	Remain red	Not applicable	The Advisory Group's approach to making recommendations for rezoning in relation to CCC and Crown land is unclear.			None requested or supplied	This property is the Summer Croquet Club. The land is owned by CCC (unsure about the buildings).
B 117E Wakefield Ave	21	Wakefield 1	Remain red	Not applicable	The Advisory Group's approach to making recommendations for rezoning in relation to CCC and Crown land is unclear.			None requested or supplied	This property is 7m ² and owned by CCC. There is likely an Orion power box (or similar) on the property.
D 3E Finnsarby Place	22	Wakefield 2	Remain red	Not applicable	The Advisory Group's approach to making recommendations for rezoning in relation to CCC and Crown land is unclear.			None requested or supplied	This property is 6m ² and owned by CCC. There is likely an Orion power box (or similar) on the property.

Table 2: Crown / CCC owned land

Address	Map	Area	Recommended zoning	Reasons as per Minutes supplied 5 April	Query following meeting	Linkage to Criteria	Guiding Consideration	Additional information supplied 5 April	Supplementary Information provided post 2 May 2013
C 38B Tuoro Street	24	Heberden 1	Remain green	Not applicable	The Advisory Group's approach to making rezoning in relation to CCC and Crown land is unclear.	See Guiding Consideration	All Crown and CCC land be recommended for green zoning.	Not applicable	This property is part of Van Asch School and is Crown owned. The whole school is zoned green Crown and CCC land generally recommended for green zoning as it is not residential.
E Taylors Mistake baches	28 and 29	Hobsons Bay and Taylors Mistake Bay	Rec: green > red	30, 31, 32 and 33 Taylors Mistake Bay: The geotechnical data shows that these structures are exposed to an Annual Individual Fatality Risk of 1 in 10,000 or greater in 2016 due to rock roll as defined by GNS Science risk modelling. 30 Taylors Mistake Bay is also exposed to the potential for immediate debris inundation from cliff collapse, and carries an immediate risk to life. // 28 Taylors Mistake Bay: The structure is located on a cliff top, and is exposed to the potential for immediate cliff collapse, and carries an immediate risk to life. // 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 67, 68 and 69 Taylors Mistake Bay: These structures are exposed to the potential for immediate debris inundation from cliff collapse, and carry an immediate risk to life.	Partial red zoning of the CCC land the baches are on. The Advisory Group's approach to making recommendations for rezoning in relation to CCC and Crown land is unclear.			None requested or supplied	Note that there are other baches treated the same on maps 30 and 41. Note the address points on the maps are used as identifying addresses for the baches and do not denote individual parcels of land.
I 522 Governors Bay Read	41	Maori Gardens	Remain green	Not applicable	The Advisory Group's approach to making recommendations for rezoning in relation to CCC and Crown land is unclear.	See Guiding Consideration	All Crown and CCC land be recommended for green zoning.	Not applicable	See item 27 on table 1. This property is owned by CCC. Crown and CCC land generally recommended for green zoning as it is not residential.

Released by the Ministry for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery