

# Media Release

## Government postpones Port Hills announcement

Release Date: 28 August 2013

Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Minister Gerry Brownlee says the Government has now received all the geotechnical information it requires in order to announce the results of the long-awaited Port Hills land-zoning review.

"I had intended to make that announcement on behalf of the Government tomorrow.

"However, in light of the 'Quake Outcasts' High Court decision released on Monday 26 August, the Government now feels that it is unable to make that announcement.

"The High Court decision raises issues which must be given proper consideration and issues which the Government intends to appeal.

"Until those issues are clarified by the Court of Appeal or further legal advice, it would be unfair on Port Hills homeowners to make any announcement as I would be unable to give them the certainty those announcements intend.

"I understand that some Port Hills homeowners have been waiting for the results of the land-zoning review since last December, and expected an announcement this month.

"This is one of the reasons we are now seeking an urgent appeal of the decision in the Court of Appeal.

"The notice of appeal will be filed as soon as possible, along with a request for an urgent determination of the appeal so these issues can be resolved as soon as possible.

"In the meantime I offer my deepest apologies to those Port Hills property owners whose lives have been put on hold for so long and whose hopes were high for final decisions on their land," Mr Brownlee says.

Progressively over 2011 and 2012 the Government announced the results of land zoning in the Port Hills. Over 19,400 properties were zoned green, while 511 properties were assessed as having an unacceptable risk associated with either cliff collapse or rock roll risk, and were therefore zoned red.

On 9 October 2012 the Government announced a review process for all Port Hills properties, and 142 property owners specifically asked for their zoning to be reviewed, as they believed the original decision should have been different.