

CLIFTON TO TANGOIO COASTAL HAZARDS STRATEGY 2120

MINUTES OF THE SOUTHERN CELL ASSESSMENT PANEL WORKSHOP 5 HELD AT THE HB REGIONAL COUNCIL, DALTON ST, NAPIER, AT 5.00 P.M. ON WEDNESDAY 3 MAY 2017

PRESENT

Panel Members:

Martin Bates, Tom Evers-Swindell, Mike Harris, Te Kaha Hawaikirangi, Paul Hursthouse, Peter Kay, Brent McNamara, Bruce Meredith, Keith Newman, Sarah Owen, Aki Paipper, Jagwinder Pannu, Duncan Powell, Maurice Smith, Waylyn Tahuri-Whaipakanga, David Wells.

Facilitation Team:

Peter Beaven (Chair), Simon Bendall, Stephen Daysh, Jan Seaman (Minutes).

Observers:

Mark Clews, Gary Clode, Craig Goodier, Larry Dallimore, Graeme Hansen, Rod Heaps, Trudy Kilkolly, Bruce Lochhead, Dean Moriarty, Connie Norgate.

Technical Advisors:

Jonathan Clarke (T & T), Paul Kench, Judy Lawrence, Emma Ryan (Edge Research Team)

APOLOGIES

Mark Mahoney, Peter Paku, Jamie Thompson, Terry Wilson.

WELCOME

The Chairman advised Des Ratima had resigned from the panel due to other commitments. Aki Paipper opened the meeting with a karakia.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Motion

That the Minutes of the Workshop 3 Site Visit be confirmed as a true and correct record with the following amendments:

1. Haumoana heading: "The floodgate will not work if the Tukituki River is up - **add but water can be pumped out**".
2. Clive/East Clive heading change the word "*royalty*" in the last two sentences:
 - a. "Winstone's pay a **fee**....."
 - b. "If it related to rivers then the Regional Council could collect the "**RMA levies**".
3. Clifton heading: Second para, second sentence "The *lease* technically expires....." should read "The **consent** technically expires....."

The motion was moved (Maurice Smith), seconded (Tom Evers-Swindell) and carried.

Motion

That the Minutes of Workshop 4 be confirmed as a true and correct record.
The motion was moved (David Wells), seconded (Martin Bates) and carried.

OPTION DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

Simon Bendall went through the option development process. In Workshop 4, the Panel had split into Focus Groups to brainstorm potential options for each of the on priority areas. Following Workshop 4, TAG had written up and evaluated the options developed by the Panel with support from T&T. T&T were also asked to consider whether any additional options should be considered. Through this process, a total of 18 distinct options had been identified. TAG and T&T then considered which of those 18 options could work in each of the priority units. This resulted in a recommended “short list” of options for each priority unit. The Panels task today was to consider these recommendations, and ultimately agree which options should move on for further assessment in each priority unit.

To present this information, the following handouts were provided:

1. Options Overview Sheet – showing all options in brief detail
2. Option Shortlisting Recommendations – identifying options recommended for further consideration in each priority unit
3. Option Summary Sheets – a 1 page option summary providing more information and guidance on the recommended shortlisted options, including a high-level concept plan of how each option might be implemented in each priority unit

It was suggested that it would have been beneficial if the information had been available for consideration prior to the meeting. The Chairman explained that the report had just been finalized and time would be allowed for members to look into and consider the information provided between this workshop and Workshop 6. This information was in draft form and open to debate and challenge, with feedback welcomed. Council experts, the Edge team and two coastal engineers from Tonkin & Taylor were involved in the preparation of the recommendations and panel members could have confidence that the list was comprehensive. In accordance with the agreed process, no costs had been taken into account at this stage.

Panel members split into small groups for each of the four cells to consider the information provided and reported back to the meeting at 6.20 p.m.

REPORT-BACK FROM SMALL GROUPS SESSION

Clifton Group

Paul Hursthouse reported.

The group congratulated the TAG on the amount of work undertaken and agreed with the options supplied, along with the following comments.

- It was noted that each option was viewed as a single option and the group wondered whether a combination of options approach would have been preferable.
- Plantings as an option had been discarded, however, it was felt there could be some strategic plantings combined with engineering considered for the campground and Maraetotara areas.
- The possibility of the Maraetotara River area being viewed as a wetland/lagoon was raised.
- Consideration of a vertical permeable sill - the group advised they would like this included as an option. They acknowledged that the use of tyres and railway lines may not necessarily be the best construction method and new techniques may be available. The coastal engineers felt this did work to some extent, however, it was not considered suitable for beach environments experiencing waves over 1 metre high. The option was there but was not felt to be good enough.
- Questioned the sea wall option, which the option summary sheet had identified as having both major benefit and negative/adverse benefit. The use of positives and negatives in the summary sheet was intentional as there are some potential negatives to a positive option. In this case, there is the possibility of negative affects at the end of the walls, further along the coast. Some beach would be lost as a result of the wall but it was felt preferable to lose some beach rather than real estate. At the present time beach access is lost at high tide.
- Gravel renourishment could be beneficial if combined with another option, e.g. a sea wall, where renourishment could be adopted to possibly mitigate a negative affect.

General observation was that there could be a multi-approach to the cell as a whole, as to assume the whole area is eroding would not be valid.

Te Awanga Group

Martin Bates reported.

The group felt there was interdependence between things along the coastline. One of the negatives identified was that whatever action was taken it could have an impact north or south. What stood out was the renourishment, which would have to be carried out in conjunction with other work, e.g. groynes. The Group felt that the immediate short-term solution was to start with renourishment.

Not all recommendations were rated, but rather short term (0 – 20 yrs), medium term (20 – 50 yrs) and long term (50 plus yrs). The top three options for each of the terms were considered to be:

1. short-term: renourishment;
2. medium-term: groynes;
3. long-term: breakwater.

The following points were noted.

- Beach scraping and how this would be beneficial for Te Awanga was questioned. It was advised that this is a simple, low-cost option which uses material lower down the beach to build up the crest and could be carried out immediately after a storm. There were limitations, e.g. available material and would be a short-term solution. Agreed to leave beach scraping in as an option.
- The group felt Option 8 – wetland and lagoon – should be included for the mid to long term in association with elements of managed retreat. If the 41 houses on Clifton Road had to be relocated in a managed retreat scenario it would open up space for a wetland area.

Haumoana Group

Keith Newman reported.

The group accepted all the options listed for MCDA scoring on the hand-out sheet and noted that a 'hybrid' or mix of options (e.g. planting, renourishment and beach scraping if material was available) rather than single options would be more effective in a pathway of adaptive management. The group did not prioritize options at this time.

Most of the group's time was spent considering 'Options recommended to be discarded+ rationale':

- Wetlands and lagoon creation – would like this to be included, with further work being carried out on this option to consider consequences and practicality. Suggested these areas could extend to East Clive and further south.
- Vertical permeable sill – open to this.
- Offshore reef – excellent idea warranting further study but the area may be too deep for this option.
- Sea wall along the whole of Haumoana – would be costly / impractical if it went more than the length of H21. If H21 sea wall built there would a need to mitigate impacts so a groyne field downstream would be best.
- Crest maintenance high on the list and it was felt this is a key option.
- Stop banks – Would like this included. Stop banks are already in place in parts of Haumoana. While it may not practical to consider the whole area (this requires further thought and investigation) there could be considerable merit in a network of stop banks (Tukituki to East Road corner), remodelled and extended in combination with flood gates at 3 main inundation risk portals (entrance under cycle bridge to wetland arm of the Tukituki estuary, head of the small lagoon just south of Grange Road South and the head of the larger lagoon on Beach Road). Adding plantings to stop banks for stability could be beneficial.
- Flood gates should be included and considered in combination with e.g. enhancing the shingle crest and with stop banks (as mentioned above) as there are waterways that allow storm surge to come up and cause inundation.

Would like to leave all the options on the table so that when the public meeting is held they can be shown as having been considered. Options can be prioritized after that time.

Clive/East Clive Group

Brent McNamara reported.

- Happy to maintain the status quo as long as maintenance is continued.
- Retreat the line - shingle banks have been moved back in the past and it may be practicable to do so again. This option should be added back in.
- Inundation after 2065 – look at a combination of wetlands/lagoon along with other options, as well as the possibility of a floodgate.

MCDA OBJECTIVE AND CRITERIA DEVELOPMENT AND CONFIRMATION

An overhead presentation was given by Stephen Daysh. The next step in the Panel process will involve the application of the multi criteria decision analysis (MCDA). This requires a clear objective and agreed criteria, and in this session the draft criteria and objective will be considered. This is an evolution of material already provided to the Panels in the report by Mitchell Daysh in their folders.

- Suggested decision criteria include cultural – confirmed this is a given for inclusion in relation to NZ.
- Questioned how the scoring would be approached for combinations - advised this is one of the methodology issues that will be looked at, along with further work to design option combinations. The advisory group had spent a lot of time on this issue but further work was required.
- Retreat and managed retreat - will need to discuss what the trigger points will be when pathways are developed and whether they will be socially or physically defined.
- Road testing queried, replied that the process needed to make sense when it came back to the panel for further discussion at the next workshop. Decisions would be going to Council so needed to be robust and have integrity.
- The NZ Coastal Policy Statement was highlighted as a foundation for the MCDA objectives. This would need to be borne in mind, along with the vision for the Clifton to Tangoio Coastal Hazards Strategy - *That coastal communities, businesses and critical infrastructure from Tangoio to Clifton are resilient to the effects of coastal hazards.*
- Questioned whether Councils would restrict or prevent new building along the coast where at risk from Coastal Hazards. . Government has directed councils to look at this in the NZCPS and new developments should be out of risk areas. There is an existing Coastal Hazard Zone in place along the HB coast in the Regional Coastal Plan and Napier City District Plan, however, the panels could make some recommendations if they felt change was necessary. .
- The buildings being built that were questioned at an earlier meeting were part of the completion of an existing subdivision . Owners/developers would have acknowledged risk and take liability. New areas will not be opened up in hazard zones. Councils are developing future growth options for both Napier and Hastings and all hazards will be considered for new urban growth areas.

The proposed MCDA objectives were presented for discussion:

To develop responses to coastal hazards risks that:

- Sensibly manage our communities' exposure to coastal hazards risks; and*
- Provide flexibility to respond to changing hazards risks over time.*

It was questioned whether (a) should be to “manage” or “mitigate”. Confirmed the NZ Coastal Policy Statement used the word “manage”. In some places the risks are low so mitigation is not required, rather management across the whole area. It would also include reducing risk as risk profiles will increase over time due to sea level rise and the increased intensity of storms. Also, mitigation in some circumstances may not be possible over time, for example where sea level rise increases such that

mitigation cannot be practically or cost effectively implemented. New information is always coming to hand, especially in regard to melting of the polar ice sheets.

Flexibility and the NZ Coastal Policy Statement queried, e.g. could the panel be confident that options put forward could be worked with. It was felt that as part of the process there may be some recommendations that would highlight the need to review/change policy and plans. These would be required to go through a public process.

The southern panel was in agreement with the objective as presented and was comfortable with this going forward. It will be put up at the public information session and also presented to the Northern Panel next week.

Draft decision criteria were presented:

Criteria	Description
Manages the risks of storm surge inundation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option reduces total exposure to risk from storm surge inundation • Option meets objectives over long timeframes • Option is proportionate to the scale and nature of risk
Manages the risks of coastal erosion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option reduces total exposure to risk from coastal erosion • Option meets objectives over long timeframes • Option is proportionate to the scale and nature of risk
Ability to respond to uncertainty over time / avoids inflexible outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option is able to readily respond to uncertain climate outcomes • Option includes measures to support future adjustments
Risk transfer to other locations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option does not exacerbate hazard risks in other areas • Option does not transfer risk to others
Socio-economic Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option does not cause social effects e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effects on community safety • Loss of amenity value • Decline in recreational values, community facilities • Option does not cause indirect economic / industry impacts (e.g. tourism, fishing)' • Option does not create equity issues
Relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option does not impact on cultural sites of significance • Option does not impact on access to, and carrying out of, customary activities
Natural Environments Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option does not impact on natural coastal ecosystems • Option does not impact on natural character of the coastal environment

The number of criteria (7) was considered about right from a methodology and practical point of view. These will be reviewed and circulated for further discussion, with a view to finalising at the next meeting.

Suggested members consider risk transfer issues from one location to the next for the various options and a pathway over time.

The use of the word “total” was queried in the first two criteria - “....Option reduced **total** exposure to risk.” Agreed to look at this and possibly add in the words “pathway” or “over time”. The third option covers the review and monitoring process, which would be in the implementation plan.

The last three criteria included socio-economic impacts, relationship of Maori, their culture and traditions and environmental impacts. A scoring guide will be added. Suggested the word “does not” be changed – this could be addressed through the scoring guide

Actions:

- a) *Use of the word “total” in the first two criteria to be reviewed;*
- b) *Use of “does not” - consider wording.*

COMMUNITY DISCUSSION MEETING

Date: 17 May at Haumoana Hall. The proposal was that this would be feedback from the panel members, carried out by way of an inter-active “drop in” session between 5.30 p.m. and 7.30 p.m. Stands with information will be set up, one for each cell, to be manned by panel members, with support from TAG and Edge members. Maps will be provided, as well as all options and draft MCDA objective and criteria. “Where to Next” will be a stand, as well as stand-alone computer stations for use on the night.

The northern panel will hold a similar meeting on 6 June, and these will be the first of two public meetings for each cell.

Suggested that members of the public be given a sticky note pad so that they can write down their comments and leave these on a board. This idea worked very well after the Christchurch earthquake.

Objectives for the meeting were to:

- a) communicate what is understood about the risks;
- b) test the idea of whether all the options were on the table and the suggested shortlist of options;
- c) get feedback on the objectives and criteria.

The meeting will be publicized by way of a broad advertising campaign - newspaper advertisements, emails, social media. Mail drop has not been considered as it is hoped to engage with all interested parties, not just those living in the coastal areas.

Action: Noted the Haumoana Hall is a bit “off the beaten track” and signage to highlight the meeting would be of benefit on the night.

Action: A member of the TAG to welcome visitors as they arrive.

Action: As panel members would be required to man the stands they were requested to RSVP to Monique regarding their attendance.

The format for the community discussion meeting as proposed was agreed.

EDGE EVALUATION SHEET

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

Te Kaha Hawaikirangi closed the meeting with a karakia.

The meeting closed at 8.25 p.m.