

Wellington City District Plan – Omnibus Plan Change			
Flood Hazard Mapping			
<p>Scope of Proposed Change</p> <p>To amend the Flood Hazard overlay mapping where updated flood modelling with respect to specific sites has changed the extent of modelled flooding.</p>			
<p>Background</p> <p><u>Flood Hazard Mapping</u></p> <p>Due to the timing of Wellington Water Limited’s (WWL) development of flood modelling and associated flood mapping that was included in the notified 2022 Proposed District Plan (PDP), there are isolated parts of the city where updates to the flood model that have occurred post submissions and decisions on the PDP have resulted in a change in the extent of flood hazard mapping.</p> <p>WWL investigate site specific queries on the flood mapping that reflects the WWL flood modelling as they receive them. Where a site specific assessment results in changes to the flood modelling, this updated position is available to support resource consent applications for proposed buildings or activities in areas identified in the Plan as within a Flood Hazard Overlay. WWL record these changes for inclusion in plan changes to update the flood hazard mapping in the 2024 District Plan.</p> <p>The Council’s Resource Consents Team, and customer queries received by WWL where the District Plan Flood Hazard Overlays differ from the WWL modelling, have identified that this places unnecessary costs and development constraints on landowners.</p> <p>Currently, the identified areas are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An area in Crofton Downs where recent approved development including bulk earthworks and local stormwater infrastructure has been undertaken; 2. 15 Chelmsford St, Ngaio (and adjacent properties); 3. 415 Horokiwi Rd (and adjacent properties); Belize Grove, Grenada Village; 4. Bell Street, Tawa (rectifying an error with flood mapping relating to an incorrect city boundary); and 5. Removal of stream corridor that no longer exists following completed bulk earthworks at 86 Rochdale Drive, and 112 Melksham Drive, Churton Park. <p>The result of this is that there have been resource consents required for activities proposed within the Flood Hazard Overlays, where the flood assessment undertaken by WWL has identified that there is no flood hazard risk based on updates to their flood model. While in many cases this is unavoidable as the lack of flood hazard is only identified following a more granular site assessment undertaken at the time of proposed development of a site, the District Plan maps should be periodically updated to reflect the updated WWL flood model.</p> <p>Strategic Direction</p> <p>The following objectives in the Strategic Direction chapter of the 2024 District Plan are relevant to this issue:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>SRCC-O2</td><td> <p>Risks from natural hazards are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identified and understood; ... </td></tr> </table>		SRCC-O2	<p>Risks from natural hazards are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identified and understood; ...
SRCC-O2	<p>Risks from natural hazards are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identified and understood; ... 		

Issue

That updates to the flood hazard modelling that informs the flood hazard mapping have identified undue constraints on identified sites and result in inefficient implementation of the District Plan.

Assessment of options

Cost/Benefit Assessment

The options are assessed below. The assessment is additional to information in the [Section 32 - Part 2 - Natural and Coastal Hazards](#), and is limited to the effect of the changes.

Flood Hazard Mapping

For the purposes of this evaluation, the following options have been considered:

- Option 1: Status Quo
- Option 2: Update the Flood hazard overlay mapping

Option 1: Status Quo - Retain existing flood hazard overlay mapping

Costs:

- Resource consent is required for activities in locations that the WWL flood model no longer identifies at risk of flooding in a 1:100 year event. This places additional costs and development constraints on the owners of these sites.

Benefits:

- Nil

Option 2: Update the Flood Hazard Overlay mapping

Benefits:

- Resource consent is not required for activities in locations that the WWL flood model no longer identifies at risk of flooding in a 1:100 year event.
- Alignment with strategic direction.

Costs:

- Costs to Council with respect to the resourcing needed for this aspect of the plan change.

Efficiency and effectiveness

Option 2 is clearly the most efficient and effective option as it ensures that the District Plan flood hazard overlays accurately reflect best available information on flood hazard.

Risk of acting/not acting

There are no significant risks associated with either option identified above.

Overall evaluation of the issue

The Flood Hazard Overlay mapping is directly informed by flood modelling undertaken by WWL. WWL often update the flood model on receipt and verification of site-specific information. WWL have provided updated mapping that reflects the updated flood model.

This update ensures that in these locations, the Flood Hazard Overlay mapping is accurate, and that the rules requiring resource consent do not unnecessarily apply to areas not at risk from flood flooding. The result is a more efficient and effective District Plan.

Recommendation

Option 2: Update the Flood Hazard Mapping is the recommended option.

Consultation

Pre-notification consultation with directly affected landowners was undertaken prior to public notification of the plan change. There was general support from those landowners that provided feedback.

The Ministry of Education provided support for the mapping amendments as they relate to Ngaio Playcentre.

Recommended changes to mapping

Mapping updates prepared and provided by WWL.

Consequential amendments

No consequential amendments are necessary.