



16/2/11 Workshop on Managing Council & Community Risk from Natural Hazards – Participants' Conclusions for the day

- Risk to community structure vs risk to individual property
- What the hazards are for communities and how they manage short term and long term risks
- The window of opportunity provided by Canterbury quake is closing. If anything needs to change now is the moment



- Challenge of governance framework
- Intergenerational costs and benefits – what triggers decisions for the future
- Underlying governance decisions. There is a cost for keeping them the community out of harms way
- Social vulnerability
- Engaging communities early
- Level of acceptable risk needs to be realistic
- Benefits of mitigating risks



- Up-to-date good information and effective use of communications
- Prevention is the cheapest form of insurance
- Small investment can give huge returns
- Engaging with community and sharing best practice engagement/models (such as workshops like this)
- Seems like communities do not really understand the consequences of risk
- Governance/leadership – need more leadership at central government level with more National Policy Statements



- Learning from events. Need to implement them
- Decisions are made at various levels – it is important that we get all this information out together to our communities
- Councils do have the regulatory power to do something
- Need to engage with our electorates to inform of risks they face and not to just focus on “natural disasters” but “unsustainable behaviour”.



- Mitigation options
 - Managed retreat – set back
 - Trend from hard engineering to soft
- Responsibilities of councils for hazard identification lines/zones?
- Options for mitigation. Community will go for cheapest. Have we really got an understanding of the benefits?
- Are we building appropriately for our hazard environment?



- With all the information shared today, we now need to find ways to move forward. Leadership needs to be bold, creative and come from all levels including central government. Possible need for more national policy statements – who has this responsibility? We have also talked about capturing lessons learned. Must also implement these and also monitor the implementation of these.



- Government model should take account of politics (political cycle)
- assets should focus attention for development then that influences household behaviour
- look at long term management
- take a precautionary approach
- provision in the CDEM Act for reduction to feed into Long Term Planning



- misalignment in the planning timeframes between legislations 9 Building Act, RMA) and Long Term Planning
- take the learning from short term events into the long term
- Pegasus Bay decision - subdivision on liquefaction as is Kaiapoi but no lateral shift. Up front investment by developer required with good long term results.



- Disconnect between academic risk assessment and communities, with local government in the middle
- In many circumstances some level of protection i.e. 50 years, may be better than none if the ideal is considered unaffordable
- There is a danger with scientists trying to set 100, 200, 500 year standards of protection will perversely cause a reluctance to engage in any protection by poorer communities.