

CLIFTON TO TANGOIO COASTAL HAZARDS STRATEGY 2120

MINUTES OF THE NORTHERN CELL ASSESSMENT PANEL WORKSHOP 8 HELD AT THE NAPIER SAILING CLUB, 63 WEST QUAY, NAPIER, COMMENCING AT 9.00 AM TUESDAY 15 AUGUST 2017

PRESENT

Panel Members:

Craig Daly, Douglas Dickson, Garry Huata, Bruce Lochhead, Steve Loughlin, Sarah Owen, Mike Penrose, Dorothy Pilkington, Oliver Postings, Hoani Taurima, Shaun Thompson-Gray, Tim Tinker.

Facilitation Team:

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

Observers:

Paul Bailey, Mark Clews, Larry Dallimore, Craig Goodier, Graeme Hansen, Tania Huata, Trudy Kilkolly.

Technical Advisors:

Mike Allis (NIWA – from 12.15 p.m.), Jonathan Clarke (T & T), Judy Lawrence (from 9.40 a.m.), Paul Kench, Emma Ryan (Edge Research Team), Cerasela Stancu (Maven).

APOLOGIES

Simon Bendall, Jon Kingsford, Mark Levick, James Minehan, Martin Rockel, Ann Redstone, Michel de Vos.

Motion

That the apologies be accepted.

The motion was moved (Sarah Owen), seconded (Craig Daly) and confirmed.

WELCOME AND KARAKIA

The Chairman explained the emergency evacuation procedure for the Napier Sailing Club and other relevant housekeeping matters.

Aramanu Ropiha opened the meeting with a karakia.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Dorothy Pilkington raised a point in regard to the Minutes from Workshop 6, which were confirmed at Workshop 7, in her absence. The last paragraph under “Report on Social Impact Assessment/Social Return on Investment” on Pg 4 raised a query “*whether a member of the Tourism Board should be represented on the panel*”. This would have been more correctly stated as “*a member of a HB tourism organization*”. The point was that it could be beneficial to have information on people who like to surf as this could provide tourism opportunities for Hawke’s Bay.

Minutes of workshop 7 held on 10 July 2017 were pre-circulated.

Motion

That the Minutes of Workshop 7 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

The motion was moved (Sarah Owen), seconded (Steve Loughlin) and carried.

WORKSHOP OVERVIEW

1. Stephen Daysh outlined the process for scoring the pathways for each of the priority units. Information and agreed weightings from the last session were included in the report. Criteria 5 and 7 were discussed, being:
 - a. Socio-economic Impacts;
 - b. Natural Environments Impacts.
2. Relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions had been pre-scored, with the exception of the Westshore unit. Further information was required in regard to potential impacts on Pania Reef from any sediment/renourishment work carried out.
3. The panel discussed the various pathway options for the four coastal units. Aramanu Ropiha noted the scoring and comments as the meeting progressed.

SCORING OF CRITERIA

Ahuriri

1. Confirmed the pathways were being scored on the effects of the pathway over the 100-year period.
2. Jonathan Clarke advised a decision was made that a concrete sea wall and rock revetment would be scored differently in the scoring of the technical criteria and this had been done for the re-scoring of those criteria. A decision was taken to make most of the units in the northern cell rock revetments, rather than concrete walls. The difference between the two is that it is more difficult to maintain a beach in front of a concrete wall, as it erodes faster.
3. With the creation of a sea wall there could be impact on the environment as the effects could be transferred to another area.
4. Effects on reef at the eastern end. Jonathan said no sand would be added, which could possibly overwhelm the reef.
5. It was noted that rock revetments can become ecosystems in their own right.

The meeting broke for morning tea at 11.10 a.m. and resumed at 11.30 a.m.

Pandora

1. Potential for managed retreat could be seen as being beneficial if an area is likely to be inundated, i.e. it would not always be a negative thing.
2. From a Maori cultural perspective the area is seen as a “kai basket”.
3. Groundwater levels were queried and whether inundation could potentially occur when combined with tides. Jonathan confirmed groundwater levels are likely to be an issue in this area. Any stopbank would have to include sheet piling in the design in order to prevent groundwater flows under the stopbank.
4. In response to queries it was confirmed the floodgate would only need to be used during big events so most of the time there would be access under the road bridge. As these become more extreme it would be used more often.

Westshore

1. Managed retreat – questioned where people would be relocated. Half of the land area would be lost in 100 years and it is assumed that some motels/houses would be past their economic life at that time. There will be a portion of the seafront not usable, however it was noted that some of the land at Westshore is 6 m above sea level.

2. In terms of inundation near Airport, there are stopbanks in place on the Ahuriri outfall, preventing inundation.
3. Groundwater effects – it was noted that while this was still under study by GNS it was felt there would not be a big effect, but it was noted that as sea levels rose there would be more pressure on pumping at the airport.
4. There will be loss of material along the beachfront and the profile would fluctuate. There is potential for significant erosion and in 150 years the whole spit may have eroded, depending on the actual levels of sea level rise that occurs.
5. Noted that there was more at stake than the beach, e.g. the cycleway, green picnic areas and connections with other assets.

The meeting broke for lunch at 1.00 p.m. and resumed at 1.30 p.m.

6. Confirmed that “Natural Environment Criteria” does include protection of significant habitats of plants and animals, along with maintaining the natural character of the coastal environment, as per the scoring guide.

Bay View

1. Potential for erosion in this unit, however, it is predicted to happen later than some of the other units.
2. An area was identified (between the Airport and Turfrey Road) as being at risk but was not included in either the Westshore or Bay View Units. Noted that this would be dealt with as a specific issue (Lifelines).
3. The beach has amenity value, however, less than Westshore as it is used mainly by the local community.
4. Confirmed the sea wall would be around 1 m higher than the beach crest.
5. The panel was split on the scoring in relation to Socio-economic impacts for Pathway 6. A vote (show of hands) was held, the outcome being a majority for a score of “4” over “3”. (7 against 5.)
6. Natural Environment Impacts. Note that in the short to medium term the first three pathways were identical for the first 50 years. The remaining three pathways have a sea wall.

Whirinaki

1. It was noted that the six pathways for Bay View and Whirinaki were almost identical. Scores would differ as there was not the same amount of land available for Managed Retreat in the area, although the population was lower than in Bay View and some people would choose not to retreat to the same locale.
2. Confirmed the state highway would be safe for the foreseeable future but a sea wall may need to be built around the bluff north of Whirinaki at some stage.
3. Noted in Pathway 6 the Status Quo was actually to do nothing.
4. Natural Environment Impacts. Sea wall questioned in that the ends would be the weakest points, and whether it would be desirable to continue the sea wall all the way along. Agreed there could be an erosion hole at the ends but this could be mitigated by plantings.

The meeting broke for afternoon tea at 3.10 p.m. and resumed at 3.30 p.m.

Cultural Values

1. Questions were raised in relation to Westshore and the impact of renourishment on Pania Reef. Craig Goodier noted the following could impact on the reef:
 - a. uptake dredging;

- b. propeller wash;
 - c. Ahuriri lagoon sediment;
 - d. Ngaruroro River sediment.
2. It was felt that while there could be an effect from renourishment it would be very small, especially when compared to the effects from other sources.
 3. The area receiving sand renourishment at Westshore was shown on the map. It was possible for suspended sediments to be carried back towards the port from Westshore, but any potential impact on Pania Reef was considered minor, not dissimilar to conditions in recent years, and would be monitored by the Port.
 4. Currently the Port's resource consent is for two inshore disposal zones, which are utilized differently depending on the type of material. The outer area could possibly have an impact on Pania Reef, however, there are plans to move that zone past the Port to the eastern side (an offshore disposal area). The risk to Pania Reef would be reduced if finer material was to go to the proposed new dumping site.
 5. It was suggested that if sand was to be placed closer in at Westshore, it may have to be brought in from elsewhere as only some of the material from maintenance dredging would be suitable.
 6. A question was raised whether divers at Pania reef had noticed changes occurring. Garry Huata confirmed diving was good in terms of kai, however, with Pania Reef being a special protected site it required ongoing monitoring.
 7. Agreed the group scoring cultural values would meet again to consider the scoring for Westshore.
Action: *Once the additional cultural values scoring is completed information to be circulated.*

Other Recommendations

1. Additional recommendations from the panel were discussed and agreed and these are outlined below:
 - a. The area between Westshore and Bayview is vulnerable to erosion and effects on lifeline assets eg state highway, railway, gas pipeline, fibre optic and other utilities.
 - b. Disparities between Napier City and Hastings District Councils. The panel would like there to be more commonality between HDC and NCC in the interpretation of the building code and the provisions of the district plans.
 - c. The panel would see value in remaining as a reference group while the implementation plan is developed including considering the trigger points between steps within the pathways (Edge is working on the trigger points).
 - d. The panel supports the ongoing monitoring of sediment around Pania reef currently being undertaken by the Port of Napier.
2. The Port of Napier has implemented some monitoring on either side of Pania reef, with the intention that it will be maintained going forward.

WRAP UP AND NEXT STEPS

1. Technical scores. The next task will be for the panel to go through each of the technical scores (Criteria 1 to 4) as pre-scored by the technical team for each pathway and review the scores. Any queries on any particular technical score will be discussed at the next workshop. It was suggested panel members should study the information and comment on the scores they do not understand.
2. Judy Lawrence said as part of the Living at the Edge work there was interest in understanding what the triggers might be for moving between pathways. She suggested a workshop including both panels be held to work through what might be a trigger for change. This would assist in the design of the pathways approach which will be used in other parts of NZ. When the process has

been completed an implementation plan will be developed.

Action: *Arrange a workshop for the panels on triggers.*

3. Workshop 9, scheduled for 5 September, will be to go through the balance of the technical and cultural evaluation scores, and to review and agree final numbers.
4. Workshop 10 would be economic analysis and re-ordering. Options will need to be costed at a high level, with some indication of who will be paying - local community, general rate or the larger community and what the split may look like. The Joint Committee will need to carry out this work before it can be brought to the panel. It was suggested Workshop 10 be postponed (from 20 September) until after the Joint Committee meeting so that principles that the costings are based on can be agreed between the councils.
5. The final meeting will also need to be delayed, along with the next round of consultation.
Action: *Confirmation email including options for the final meeting date to be circulated.*

EDGE EVALUATION SHEET

1. Evaluation sheets were handed out for completion at the meeting, or online. As the first two questions related to cultural criteria they were to be ignored.

NEXT MEETING

1. The next meeting will be on Tuesday 5 September commencing at 5.00 p.m.
2. Aramanu Ropiha closed the meeting with a karakia.

The meeting closed at 4.05 p.m.

AGREED ACTIONS:

Task	Meeting / Agenda Item	Actions	Resp.	Status/Comment
1.	Workshop 6, DE-BRIEF AND FEEDBACK FROM 6 JUNE COMMUNITY MEETING	Peter to circulate the presentation by the Port of Napier to the panel.	Peter Beaven	Port of Napier Consent Application not yet submitted. This should be done within 3 – 4 weeks.
2.	Workshop 7, T&T AND EDGE PRESENTATION	Jonathan Clarke to put together some examples where an offshore reef has been successful, with information being circulated to the panel.	Jon Clarke	Offshore reef information. Jonathan updated the panel and advised there were very few examples to be found, especially for the size of the area to be covered. In some places they have proven not to be successful and therefore are not as common as offshore breakwaters, which do work. The preference would be to consider these instead. Suggested if a submerged artificial reef was a preferred option it could be revisited. No decision was made to remove it and it was agreed to leave this option until scoring was completed and decide if it was relevant.
3.	Workshop 7, T&T AND EDGE PRESENTATION	Recommendation be drawn up to highlight the issue and propose that as part of the HBRC Coastal Plan review process there be more consistency of approach between councils.	TAG	Recommendation to be added to Assessment Panel report.
4.	Workshop 8, SCORING OF CRITERIA – Cultural Values	Schedule a further workshop to score the cultural criteria for Westshore.	Monique	Completed.
5.	Workshop 8, SCORING OF CRITERIA	Circulate the scoring sheet to the panels once the Westshore cultural criteria has been completed.	Monique	Completed.
6.	Workshop 8, WRAP UP AND NEXT STEPS	Confirmation email including options for the final meeting date to be circulated to the panel.	Monique	Completed
7.	Workshop 8, WRAP UP AND NEXT STEPS	Schedule a workshop for both Northern and Southern panels on triggers.	TAG / Judy	Workshop for both panels on triggers – Jonathan doing work in this area, which will be important when the pathways have been chosen. This will form part of the implementation stage (Stage 4), however, feedback from panel members would be helpful. Agreed to leave as an Action point for TAG to come back at the next workshop with information on how to best address this issue.