

**Proposed Change 1 to the Wellington Regional Policy Statement  
Hearing Stream 3 – Climate Change**

**Speaking Notes – Kat Viskovic on behalf of Porirua City Council**

2pm, Wednesday 30<sup>th</sup> August 2023

1. Porirua City Council’s submission points and position on the provisions allocated to HS3 continue the theme of the issues raised in hearing streams 1 and 2. Essentially the issues raised by PCC in its submission derive from:
  - (a) A need for the RPS to provide clear direction, which in turn will enable PCC to give effect to the objectives and policies as intended through its district plan;
  - (b) Concern that some of the provisions seek to require action by PCC that sits outside of its statutory functions; and
  - (c) The requirement for the RPS to give effect to national policy direction, in particular the National Policy Statement for Urban Development.
  
2. PCC has filed four statements of expert planning evidence in support of its submission:
  - (i) **Mr Michael Rachlin** – Climate Change – General, and Climate Resilience and Nature-Based Solutions;<sup>1</sup>
  - (ii) **Mr Rory Smeaton** – Energy Waste and Industry, and Transport; and
  - (iii) **Mr Torrey McDonnell** – Natural Hazards.
  
3. A consolidated version of PCC’s proposed amendments to the HS3 provisions is attached to my submissions as **Attachment A**. Having reviewed the rebuttal evidence filed by GWRC PCC continues to support those amendments.
  
4. In addition to the above, I just wish comment on the legal submissions filed by Kāinga Ora in relation Natural Hazard Overlays (discussed at section 2). I agree with the Kāinga Ora’s assessment that there are two approaches that can be taken to the identification of flood hazards in District plans, that is either to map the hazard within the plan, or to rely on a definition and non-statutory mapping.
  
5. PCC’s proposed District Plan maps the flood hazard overlay within the plan. However, from a legal perspective I note that including hazard mapping within the plan itself:
  - (a) ensures that a consistent approach is taken to the application of hazard provisions at the consenting stage; and
  - (b) avoids creating issues relating to natural justice that could arise if hazard mapping is dynamic, as the activity status of an activity could change without

---

1 Two separate statements.

the knowledge of the landowner. Furthermore, hazard mapping that changes over time may mean that potential submitters may not have been involved during the Schedule 1 process, and would not necessarily be given the opportunity to challenge the mapping or hazard identification at a later time.

6. Mr McDonnell is available to answer any specific questions the Panel may have about the approach that was taken to flood hazard mapping as he was the PCC reporting officer during the PDP hearings.