



16/2/11 Workshop on Managing Council & Community Risk from Natural Hazards - Participants' Summary of Session 1

- Natural hazards are increasing as humans increase the drivers of natural hazards and their own vulnerability to them
- People have difficulty judging their risk and balancing short term and long term concerns
- We need to create consensus with communities on the reality of their risks and the values they wish to adhere to



- In recovery – how do we learn from the lessons of an event to make long term change?
- Reaffirmed the importance of government and the implications of decision made and their impacts for the future
- Recognition that work is being undertaken – changes to land use are occurring, engaging more with community
- Difficult to make step change
- People distract themselves from risk they haven't experienced



- Inform communities about risk
- Assisting communities to decide level of risk they can live with
- Helping communities weigh risks and costs over short and long term
- Risk to “community infrastructure” is risk to individual property
- Noted the role of engineering /hard solutions in protecting us from decisions of past and role of land use planning in protecting future from our decisions



- What a huge difference between being prepared compared with not being prepared e.g. ChCh, Haiti
- Whole society paradigm shift required as historical approach only partially successful
- Avoid making decisions that put people in harms way
- Government/leaders spend less than 5% of their time on risk assessment and emergency management.
This is not good enough
- Significant risk registers should be kept
- Insure adequate risk management plans are in place



16/2/11 Workshop on Managing Council & Community Risk from Natural Hazards -

Participants' Summary of Session 2

- Council is obliged to mitigate harm, cannot absolve responsibility/pass to properties owner. No problem to do this for new development, but what action could be taken for existing development?
- Provide information, build defenses or extinguish land-use rights?
- Judicial review can reverse council decisions, but council must live with consequences e.g. Bexley in Christchurch



- Why can't an increasing risk e.g. sea-level rise be on a LIM?
- No such thing as property rights!
- Powers under RMA wide ranging
- Public interest trumps individual interests
- No legal requirement for council to provide compensation for changing land-use designation



- Public decisions on property can take risk based decision-making away from the property owner
- Useful to hear about the obligations of councils in terms of hazard risk management and most likely areas councils will be held liable in
- Connects well with the previous presentation on governance and the importance of decisions made at a local government level



- Drives home the importance for councils to have good record systems of recording up-to-date and accurate hazard information. Hopefully we can carry these issues forward. need for information to be consistent
- Which hazards are covered by which legislation?
- What is included in LIMs vs Plan Hazard areas or zones
- Most risks manageable so information is key to enable appropriate responses



- Apply certain responses for one hazard i.e. coastal erosion. should this apply to other hazards i.e. earthquakes, floods
- Amount and quality (precision) of hazard information
- How much is enough?
- Is there a difference between knowledge and information in the context of hazard risk?
- Make decisions based on keeping people out of harms way. S32 of the RMA means councils cant do nothing



- RMA sees integrated planning is more powerful than individual rights
- Trends identified include:
 - Managed retreat increasing
 - Moving away from hard engineering- to soft
 - Introduction of setbacks increasing
- Ensure zone limits are correct. Lines on maps carry over a risk based approach
- Councils/planners need to answer question “ what is acceptable risk?”



16/2/11 Workshop on Managing Council & Community Risk from Natural Hazards - Participants' Summary of Session 3

- Life safety building standards are not enough to prevent large insured losses. Look to include standards to prevent loss of amenity in building standards. As uncertainty around hazards reduces expect insurance cover to not be offered.
- Why does our main measure of success (GDP) improve when there is a natural disaster? Who is measuring the social cost of natural disasters?



- How do we define and measure the value of land i.e social and cultural as well as economic? Important when assessing options around dealing with sea level rise for example.
- Insurability of properties in known natural hazard areas (rising sea levels, landslip, flood, earthquake etc), and if so, at what cost (will rate payers have the ability to pay insurance premiums or take on more risk themselves?)
- It is important that the insurance industry become involved in the decision making process for future development of sub-divisions (insurer appetite to provide cover may not exist)
- Involve communities with local council findings and get feedback on local effects



- Christchurch/Canterbury earthquake repairs a logistical action. Building claims and admin all working well
- With 180,000 claimants, 60,000 jobs to do and up to 3.5 billion cost, this is NZ's largest building project. EQC may clear claims by March (at the latest)
- To much uncertainty in climate change modelling. Certainty is required with any coastal environment



- Best value for money will be key issue
- Start engagement early – councils wont have all the answers
- Natural hazards (disasters) are political issues.
- Will improved standards or planning for hazards be reflected in cost or ability to get insurance?
- Is there a level of risk that would result in broad areas being declined insurance? Or is it more on a individuals risk profile?



- Think more about what hazards are for our communities
- Identify how hazards managed for short term to long term risks
- Inform and advise communities about risk and options for steps to be taken going forward
- Recognition of building amenity value and the costs of business disruption caused by extensive non-structural damage



- Uncertainty in economic impacts calculations for Canterbury event
- Intergenerational costs and benefits of investment in mitigation. Challenge of thinking in long term
- Promote the value of losses avoided through risk reduction
- May be more useful to consider consequences (over likelihood) of hazard impacts in discussion with communities about what is “acceptable”



- The level of acceptable risk needs to be realistic for our communities
- Engaging the knowledge and thought of our communities early on
- Underlined the importance of governance decisions in avoiding decisions that put people in harms way
- Big picture of social vulnerability- balancing act with heightened awareness of recent world & NZ/Aussie events
- Risk – not just about emergency management but a whole of council, community, and sometimes Government interaction