

CLIFTON TO TANGOIO COASTAL HAZARDS STRATEGY 2120

MINUTES OF THE SOUTHERN CELL ASSESSMENT PANEL WORKSHOP 8 HELD AT THE HB REGIONAL COUNCIL, DALTON ST, NAPIER, AT 12.00 NOON ON THURSDAY 6 JULY 2017

PRESENT

Panel Members:

Martin Bates, Tom Evers-Swindell, Mike Harris, Te Kaha Hawaikirangi, Paul Hursthouse, Peter Kay, Brent McNamara, Mark Mahoney, Bruce Meredith, Keith Newman, Connie Norgate, Aki Paipper, Jagwinder Pannu, Duncan Powell, Maurice Smith, Waylyn Tahuri-Whaipakanga, Jamie Thompson (from 5.30 pm).

Facilitation Team:

Peter Beaven (Chair), Simon Bendall, Stephen Daysh, Jan Seaman (Minutes), Aramanu Ropiha (Kaitiaki o te Roopu)

Observers:

Tom Belford (part meeting), Mark Clews, Larry Dallimore, Graeme Hansen, Rod Heaps, Trudy Kilkolly, Bruce Lochhead, Dean Moriarity, Ann Redstone (part meeting), Tania Huata.

Technical Advisors:

Jonathan Clarke (T & T), Rob Bell, Judy Lawrence, Emma Ryan (Edge Research Team), Cerasela Stancu (Maven).

APOLOGY

Dave Wells.

Motion: That the apology be accepted.

The motion was moved (Tom Evers-Swindell), seconded (Peter Kay) and carried.

WELCOME AND KARAKIA

The Chairman welcomed those present and thanked the members who attended the Cultural Values Wananga on Saturday 1 July. Around thirty-five people attended.

Aramanu Ropiha opened the meeting with a karakia.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Minutes of the last meeting have not yet been finalised and will be confirmed at the next meeting.

SCORING FOR TECHNICAL CRITERIA – 5, 6, 7.

1. Simon Bendall went through the plan for the day. Information provided as handouts and/or pre-circulated to panel members included the confirmed criteria, agreed criteria weightings from the last session, and the outcome of the technical scoring criteria workshop held on Tuesday 4 July.
2. Stephen Daysh confirmed that the final scoring of options is the job of the panel. However, there is value in the observers having the opportunity to contribute to the overall discussion and debate around the scoring of the options using their experience and knowledge but the final scoring numbers and the reasons for the scoring must come just from the panel members.

3. Simon Bendall outlined the pathways that had been developed by Tonkin & Taylor with input from Edge.
4. He discussed use of the term “beach control structures” in the pathways. Previously, there was a range of options included under this general heading; namely groynes, offshore reef and offshore breakwater, as they all sought to achieve the same outcome, i.e. to build up the beach, and grouping them in categories was a way to reduce to total number of pathways for scoring through MCDA. However, at the technical scoring criteria workshop held on 4 July it was felt that in order to effectively score the pathways through MCDA, the term “beach control structures” would need to refer to a specific structure. To that end, the technical scoring criteria team considered each unit, and which of the beach control structures made the most practical sense in each case. It was considered that the recommended beach control structure for all southern cell units was groynes because:
 - a. Groynes are known and well understood, with existing examples along this stretch of coastline
 - b. In comparison, breakwaters are not a current feature on this coast, are more complex in design considerations, and more likely to generate unintended or undesirable effects (such as currents and hazards for recreational users)
 - c. Breakwaters are significantly more complex to build.
 - d. It is easier to monitor the structural integrity of groynes, and repairs and enhancements can be carried out quickly with land based equipment, as opposed to the marine equipment and surveys required to monitor/repair/enhance breakwaters.
5. The panel accepted this recommendation.
6. Simon then raised use of the term “sea wall”, which, similar to breach control structures, had been used in the pathways to refer to either a concrete wall or rock revetment. In a similar way, it was felt that the pathways needed to be specific. Noting that it is possible for some areas to have flexibility of design and employ a combination of concrete and rock, the recommended sea wall structure for all southern cell units was rock revetment because:
 - a. Rock revetments are easier to build
 - b. Concrete walls are less ‘natural’, and more prone to design and construction failures
 - c. It is easier to extend, raise, strengthen and repair rock revetments, making them more adaptable to changing risks over time.
 - d. Rock revetments have less of an impact on the beach, compared to vertical concrete walls that can exacerbate erosion and scour at the structure.
7. Economic analysis of the pathways was discussed – the Panel will consider how the scoring ends up after this meeting and in the next workshop economic analysis will refine and help identify the preferred pathways in each priority unit.
8. There were questions regarding whether the impact of managed retreat had been considered, i.e. how it could affect productive land. It was confirmed this level of detail would not be evaluated as part of the economic analysis but future consideration would be required if this option were to be pursued.
9. There were questions regarding whether some relatively urgent issues could be prioritised, and whether the panel could make recommendations to HBRC. It was confirmed that if the panel agreed, they could make interim recommendations for priority actions. Urgent maintenance at Haumoana Domain was noted (saddle in the groyne). It was suggested and agreed that from a process integrity point, scoring should be done first and then other recommendations would be looked at and recorded for each priority unit.
10. The panel discussed the various pathway options for the four coastal units. Simon Bendall noted scoring and comments as the meeting progressed. Criteria 5, 6, and 7 were discussed and scored for the pathways, being:

- a) Socio-economic Impacts;
- b) Relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites waahi tapu and other Taonga;
- c) Natural Environments Impacts.

Clifton Coastal Unit

1. The panel discussed this unit, in the three steps as outlined above.

Socio-economic Impacts

1. Discussion around “renourishment - short term”. The technical team felt given the dynamics of the coastline renourishment could possibly be washed away in heavy seas so would not be a viable solution.
2. Managed Retreat – a question was raised about where houses would go in this event. Boat ramp also questioned and whether access to Cape Kidnappers would be compromised. Relocation of the boat ramp had been looked at but costs would be very high.
3. Groynes in this location would need to protect the beach so that recreational use and access could continue. Access on the actual foreshore could be restricted and it would not be possible to go around the ends of the groynes, although there could be access over the top at the landward end of the groyne.
4. The difference between (long term) managed retreat and renourishment control structures was queried. In pathway 2, it would be necessary to retreat in the long term; with pathway 3 the commitment would be to hold the beach in place for 100 years. To continue this for the long term a lot more work would be required and there would be a big economic component in committing to the long time frame. Groynes would be designed to last a certain length of time, or work would continue to repair and extend as necessary. Ultimately there would be less dislocation of the community and its values for options that protect in the long term.
5. In regard to safety, there would be some residual risk with the groynes as people would continue to live within hazard areas, where managed retreat would provide more community safety as people would relocate outside of hazard areas.
6. A sea wall would result in less movement of gravels up the coast and it could be designed for the future, however, it is likely there would be less beach.
7. The social impact on the Te Awanga community was raised as it related to large amounts of material for renourishment being brought into the Clifton area on trucks. (Noted this would apply across all areas.) There is less renourishment required when it is associated with a groyne, however, in the long term it could be necessary to nourish more frequently.
8. Type of beach questioned where a sea wall is used. Noted the water level would get deeper as the material eroded, however, there would be some sediments at the base of the wall, Stop banks or something similar would be required at the ends of the structure to prevent storm surge inundation getting around the ends of the wall. Life of a sea wall would be designed according to the pathway.
9. Groynes with renourishment would provide usable beach – 10 m beach berm then a sloping area to the beach, which could impact on the use of tractors. Noted if there was sea level rise the access to Cape Kidnappers would most likely be lost regardless.
10. Sea wall versus groynes and renourishment and the effects of material moving northwards was questioned. Confirmed groynes with renourishment would eventually see material moving up the coast. There would be some movement with a sea wall, however, it would reduce sediment transfer overall.

11. Confirmed revetments and walls were both good at dissipating wave energy. For Clifton the sea wall would be a rock revetment, with concrete being a last resort.
12. A question was raised about whether there would be a groyne head at the end of a sea wall. This would be looked at in the detailed design phase and would help prevent edge effects. Agreed to look at this as a recommendation.
13. With a sea wall only, there would need to be a deep foundation from the start, and a bigger foundation for a long term sea wall, however, there would still be a risk to the community of the sea over-topping the wall. There would also be consequences if a sea wall failed. A large sea wall could bring down the amenity value of the camping ground and views would be lost.
14. An adaptive management process will be built into everything, giving flexibility to shift. Monitoring will take place and over time pathways will be reviewed and triggers identified, with pathways changing due to certain factors.

A short break was held at 2.05 p.m., with the meeting resuming at 2.15 p.m.

15. Suggested that relativity between scoring needed to be assessed as part of the scoring process.

Relationship with Maori – Culture

1. Mana whenua of both panels had held a Cultural Criteria Workshop on Tuesday 4 July and felt there would be value in producing a report with recommended scores. The report was tabled for consideration. Relevance of cultural values is reflected in attitudes towards the oceans, rivers and land, and whether or how nature should be worked with, rather than controlled.
2. It was asked whether the areas identified as having cultural value in the coastal strip were to be protected or not. In relation to burial mounds it was felt those sites were placed there for a reason, in part being that in time the sea would reclaim the remains. This would be seen as a natural process and at the appropriate time any koiwi could be lifted and re-interred. The most important thing would be to preserve the memory of the sites with signage or something similar.
 - a. The Pathway 5 rating was questioned due to the number of people using the boat ramp facility as the boat ramp would be lost. It is used regularly in the gathering of kai moana (e.g. for tangis). It was felt long-term access would be preferable, however, when weighed up against a sea wall for the future it was felt preferable to have the area return to a more natural state.
 - b. It was confirmed that if a sea wall was built for the long term it would need to be a big structure. Maintaining the beach was felt to be important and there is an historical cultural value. In the past whale boats and canoes were launched from the beach. In general sea walls were not favoured by mana whenua.

Natural Environmental Impacts

1. A vote (show of hands) was held for scoring against natural environments impacts of Clifton Pathway 6, the outcome being a small majority for “3” over “4” due to the NZ Coastal Policy Submission preference for natural coastal ecological systems.

The meeting broke at 3.45 p.m. and resumed at 4.00 p.m.

2. The group considered Clifton Pathway 5 a viable option, which represented the proposal currently being prepared by the Hastings District Council (HDC) for a rock revetment at Clifton. It was suggested that the panel support the HDC’s application to the HBRC. Agreed a recommendation could be made and the panel would come back to consider this action after the seven criteria had been reviewed. The Chairman advised he would be happy to draft a letter as a supporting document and send it to the council as a result of the panel’s discussions.

Action: *Chairman to draft a letter to HDC supporting HDCs application to HBRC for a rock revetment wall at Clifton.*

Te Awanga Coastal Unit

1. Panel members considered that railway irons would be included in options 1 and 5. Under the groyne options the iron and tyres would not be removed without an alternative solution being put in place, however, the Panel consider them to be a genuine solution and could be used in the interim, maintained and their effectiveness monitored.
2. It was suggested if there are more aesthetically-pleasing alternatives to the railway irons and tyres, they should be explored and implemented without delay in the shorter term, e.g. before groyne fields are installed as they would offer immediate protection of the coast. Consideration could be given to making these into art-works.
3. The crest also needs to be maintained.
4. It was noted that the division between Te Awanga and Haumoana (Unit K1 and K2) is at Elephant Hill Winery.
5. Questioned whether groynes would be dismantled to create a sea wall where a pathway involves a change from groynes to sea wall in the long term. It was felt groynes would still have some effect if left in place, however for practical reasons in many cases rock is re-purposed.
6. Suggested from a health and safety point of view if any tyres/railway irons are removed they be replaced with something more suitable.
7. It may be necessary to consult with surfers if there are any hard engineering options/artificial structures put in the area that will affect the surf break.
8. Agreed a recommendation go to the council in regard to maintenance and beach protection, which could be carried out in a more aesthetically pleasing manner. Noted council may want to consult with the community before any changes are made.

The meeting broke at 5.00 p.m. and resumed at 5.30 p.m.

Haumoana Coastal Unit

1. The technical panel discussed how to deal with H21 / Cape View Corner. Suggested for the purposes of this assessment that focus should be on assets/infrastructure, with houses being dealt with later. Some of the pathways provide possible solutions for H21 but not all. Where an option does not provide a clear solution for the 21 houses it will be noted. It could be assumed that the 21 houses will retreat. The Panel agreed to this approach.
 - a. Stop banks. The assumption is that the coastal area would be protected by the groynes but river stop banks would need to be raised to address inundation risks. This would be combined with renourishing the crest and raising the beach crest at the Domain end i.e. the beach would be looked at as a whole. It would also depend on what happens at Te Awanga.
 - b. Structures could possibly be staged over time, however, when combined with renourishment it would be necessary to put them in reasonably quickly before material is lost.
 - c. It was confirmed groynes would protect and maintain a usable beach.
 - d. The difference between “Managed Retreat” and “Retreat the Line” queried. Managed retreat lets nature determine the line with no defenses being built, where retreat the lines picks a new line of defence.
 - e. There was a question whether it would be possible to create wetlands along the coast when thinking of managed retreat or retreat the line, however, it was advised in some areas there would not be enough space – if wetlands are created too close to the existing beach crest the crest is liable to roll landward and simply fill in the wetlands. There would be a possibility in the reserve land between Te Awanga and Haumoana, where there is more room.

Action: *Further investigation on wetland creation required.*

Action: *Information on managed retreat to be circulated to panel members.*

- f. It was noted if wetlands were to be created it would require mass managed retreat in order for broad areas of land to be cleared and converted into wetland, whereas the discussion was around incremental retreat which would make this more difficult.
- g. It was noted that Retreat the Line would be an incremental retreat. If some residents resisted moving then plans to create wetlands could be stalled.
- h. It was noted by Panel Members that groynes could be built to look more natural.
- i. HDC has a draft Reserve Management Plan currently out for submissions which includes a lot of work on crest replenishment and plantings. Suggested the panel should support that policy and put in a submission. Submissions close on 28 July.
Action: TAG to follow up with a draft submission for Panel Members to review.
- j. It was recommended that the crest be restored and vehicles be prevented from driving on top of the crest.

Clive Coastal Unit

1. Advised that Hohepa have signaled they propose to move from the area.
Action: Cerasela Stancu to follow-up.
2. After some discussion it was agreed that the technical team would need to have further discussions on the Clive pathways as presented, unit and the pathways were taken off the table. They will be developed further and will be discussed at the next meeting.
Action: TAG to discuss and develop the Clive/East Clive pathways further and bring to workshop 9.

The meeting broke at 7.15 p.m. and resumed at 7.30 p.m.

EDGE EVALUATION SHEET

1. Evaluation sheets were handed out, with a reminder that the survey was also available for on-line completion.

TECHNICAL CRITERIA SCORING

1. The meeting was asked to consider if there were any red flags associated with the recommended scores for the technical criteria that looked to be out of line, although it was acknowledged that not all Panel Members had the opportunity to review the recommendation ahead of the meeting given the short time frame since they had been circulated.
2. Due to time constraints it was felt that the panel would not be able give due consideration to the technical criteria in this workshop. From a process integrity point of view it was suggested further time be allowed for panel members to consider the document and revert with any comments/concerns - to the hbcoast email. Agreed there should be another workshop added to enable discussion and finalise the scoring of pathways as Workshop 9 will be very full.
Action: Requested that full text be inserted in the MCDA scoring sheet not "Same as Pathway 1".
Action: Sheets to be combined into one and emailed to members. If there is difficulty in printing the sheet out members should advise and a copy will be printed and posted out. Printed copies will also be available for collection at the HBRC office.
Action: Doodle poll with options to be circulated, with a view to holding an additional Workshop meeting (from 5.00 p.m. – 8.00 p.m. between now and late August, to complete the Clive Coastal Unit and confirm technical criteria scoring for all pathways.

The panel expressed thanks to the TAG team for their work and effort in preparing the reports.

Aramanu Ropiha closed the meeting with a karakia.

The meeting closed at 8.00 p.m.

AGREED ACTIONS:

Task	Meeting / Agenda Item	Actions	Resp.	Status/Comment
1.	Workshop 6, CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES	Circulate a compiled list of questions and answers from the technical panel from the supplementary workshop.	Monique	Compiled list of questions with answers from the technical panel will be circulated once compiled.
2.	Workshop 6, REPORT ON CULTURAL VALUES ASSESSMENT	Arrange for hui-a-hapu at Matahiwi and Tangoio Maraes.	TAG	Arrange a hui-a-hapu – has been superseded.
3.	Workshop 6, REPORT ON CULTURAL VALUES ASSESSMENT	Schedule a wananga for panel members following further discussion with hapu	TAG	Completed
4.	Workshop 7, CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES	Emma to circulate a copy of the report on the survey to the panel once available.	Emma / Edge	Circulate a copy of report on survey – to the panel – will be forwarded within the next week.
5.	Workshop 7, PRESENTATION: T&T AND EDGE – OPTION SCREENING AND RECOMMENDED OPTIONS SHORT LIST & RECOMMENDED PATHWAYS FOR EACH PRIORITY UNIT	Jon/Keith to supply revision to T&T to cover options.	Jon / Keith	Completed.
6.	Workshop 7, PRESENTATION: T&T AND EDGE – OPTION SCREENING AND RECOMMENDED OPTIONS SHORT LIST & RECOMMENDED PATHWAYS FOR EACH PRIORITY UNIT	TAG to chase up the questions and answers from the EIT Supplementary session.	TAG	Compiled list of questions with answers from the technical panel will be circulated once compiled.
7.	Workshop 8, SCORING FOR TECHNICAL CRITERIA – 5, 6, 7. Natural Environment Impacts	Chairman to draft a letter to HDC supporting HDCs application to HBRC for a rock revetment wall at Clifton.	TAG	Chairman to draft a letter to HCE in support of application to HBRC for rock revetment wall at Clifton. Nothing to submit to at this stage but task will be completed at the appropriate time.
8.	Workshop 8, SCORING FOR TECHNICAL CRITERIA – 5, 6, 7. Haumoana Coastal Unit	Further investigation on wetland creation required, possibility in the reserve land between Te Awanga and Haumoana.	TAG	Further investigation on wetland creation – nothing to report (Jonathan currently overseas).
9.	Workshop 8, SCORING FOR TECHNICAL CRITERIA – 5, 6, 7. Haumoana Coastal Unit	Information on managed retreat to be circulated to panel members.	TAG	Circulate information on managed retreat – two papers circulated: one from Keith Newman and one from The Edge Research Team.

10.	Workshop 8, SCORING FOR TECHNICAL CRITERIA – 5, 6, 7. Haumoana Coastal Unit	TAG to follow up with a draft submission for Panel Members to review in regards to the HDC Reserves Management Plan.	TAG	TAG to follow up with a draft submission re HDC Reserves Management Plan – completed. Thanks extended to the panel for feedback and support. Mike Harris will be speaking to the submission and can speak in support of the panel.
11.	Workshop 8, SCORING FOR TECHNICAL CRITERIA – 5, 6, 7. Clive Coastal Unit	Cerasela Stancu to follow-up regarding Hohepa have signaled they propose to move from the area.	Cerasela	Simon Bendall to follow-up with Cerasela.
12.	Workshop 8, SCORING FOR TECHNICAL CRITERIA – 5, 6, 7. Clive Coastal Unit	TAG to discuss and develop the Clive/East Clive pathways further and bring to workshop 9.	TAG	Clive/East Clive pathways to be developed – information provided for this meeting.
13.	Workshop 8, TECHNICAL CRITERIA SCORING	Requested that full text be inserted in the MCDA scoring sheet not “Same as Pathway 1”.	TAG	Completed.
14.	Workshop 8, TECHNICAL CRITERIA SCORING	Sheets to be combined into one and emailed to members. If there is difficulty in printing the sheet out members should advise and a copy will be printed and posted out. Printed copies will also be available for collection at the HBRC office.	ALL	Completed.
15.	Workshop 8, TECHNICAL CRITERIA SCORING	Doodle poll with options to be circulated, with a view to holding an additional workshop meeting (from 5.00 p.m. – 8.00 p.m. between now and late August, to complete the Clive Coastal Unit and confirm technical scoring for all pathways.	TAG	Not yet done as workshop dates have been re-purposed. A date for the workshop to look at economic analysis will need to be finalized