

CLIFTON TO TANGOIO COASTAL HAZARDS STRATEGY 2120

MINUTES OF THE SOUTHERN CELL ASSESSMENT PANEL WORKSHOP 11A – HAUMOANA 21 HELD AT THE HB REGIONAL COUNCIL, DALTON ST, NAPIER, AT 5.00 P.M. ON TUESDAY 30 JANUARY 2018

PRESENT

Panel Members:

Martin Bates, Brent McNamara, Keith Newman, Aki Paipper, Maurice Smith, Tom Evers-Swindell, Paul Hursthouse, Bruce Meredith, Dave Wells, Peter Kay, Jamie Thompson, Te Kaha Hawaikirangi.

Haumoana 21 Landowners:

Andy Coltart, Mark Lawrence, Chris Sherratt, Edwin Derricutt, Grant Hockings (telephone), Polly Hunt, Ash Zachan.

Invited but not in attendance:

John Bridgeman, Diane Demanser, John Emmerson, William Osborne.

Facilitation Team:

Peter Beaven (Chair), Stephen Daysh, Simon Bendall, Monique Thomsen (Minutes), Aramanu Ropiha (Kaitiaki o te Roopu).

Observers:

Mark Clews, Larry Dallimore, Graeme Hansen, Rod Heaps, Tania Huata, Ann Redstone, Dean Moriarty, Trudy Kilkolly, Craig Goodier, Gary Clode, Jose Beya.

Technical Advisors:

Emma Ryan, Judy Lawrence and Mike Allis (Edge Research Team), Jon Clarke (Tonkin & Taylor).

WELCOME AND KARAKIA

The Chairman welcomed those present to the meeting. Aramanu Ropiha opened the meeting with a karakia.

APOLOGIES

Mike Harris, Duncan Powell, Connie Norgate, Jagwinder Pannu, Mark Mahoney, Waylyn Tahuri-Whaipakanga

Motion: That the apologies be accepted.

The motion was moved (Keith Newman), seconded (Tom Evers-Swindell) and carried.

Hard copies of the presentations were made available and handed out.

PRESENTATION 1: CLIFTON TO TANGOIO COASTAL HAZARDS STRATEGY OVERVIEW AND UPDATE ON CURRENT STATUS

1. Simon provided an overview of the Strategy, principally for the benefit of the 'H21' landowners, outlining the work the Panels have done to date in Stage 3 of the Strategy.
2. The Southern Panel had developed pathways for Units K1: Haumoana and K2: Te Awanga but recognised the 'H21' properties were facing immediate issues therefore requested to hold a

workshop with the landowners to discuss the current and future risks from coastal erosion and inundation and how the different options may interact with the preferred pathways.

3. The objective for the discussion with the landowners was for the Panel to develop recommendations on if and/or how the 'H21' should be considered by the Strategy and whether to include any recommendation(s) into the final Panel Report.

PRESENTATION 2: COASTAL HAZARDS RESPONSE OPTIONS OVERVIEW

1. Jon Clarke gave an overview of the panel's recommended pathways for Unit K1: Haumoana and Unit K2: Te Awanga over the three nominal timeframes of 0-20, 20-50, 50-100 years, and discussed the implications and the potential future options for the 'H21' area.
2. Peter provided an update on the key topic of funding, advising that each Partner Council had identified in their draft Long Term Plans an allocation of \$100,000 each per year for the duration of each Long Term Plan 2018 – 2028 to commence Stage 4 of the Strategy, including the following activities: implementation planning to establish timing and order of works programmes in each priority unit; technical studies and detailed design work for prioritised physical works programmes; consenting costs for prioritised physical works programmes; policy and planning framework review and possible changes; and the continued operation and support of the Joint Committee.
3. There were discussions on the recommended option of renourishment and groynes (for Unit K) and the standard of protection required in urgency to get underway, especially for the Cape View corner and the 'H21' area and into the future. Jon confirmed that the Unit K groynes would provide some benefit for the 'H21', but not a high standard of protection and should not be considered a 'solution' for the 'H21'. He also noted that there were no problems with the design engineering of the groynes to be effective for the 50 years and that the design would protect Cape View Corner, but would not provide a high degree of protection for properties on the seaward side of the road. Rock revetment could be combined with the groynes which can be built up to help mitigate sea level rise. Panels did raise the cost of trucking in the material, the effects of halting shingle extraction, the effects downstream. Council can review the pathways every 10 years and if required can change the pathway option to best suit the Unit.
4. Managed Retreat was noted as a realistic option in the future, and Jon outlined the options as it is addressed differently worldwide – there is currently no legal obligation to compensate. There was the presumption that council would not let the property slide into the sea or leave abandoned and minimum intervention could include; demolition of building and disposal of materials, the excavation of foundations and sub-surface structures, the removal and capping of utilities, cesspits etc. and import appropriate fill to make good the site as well as planting and landscaping.
5. The landowners expressed their expectations and felt the groyne field would be beneficial to the area, the community and wider Hawke's Bay would be able to use the area and landowners would have more certainty that their properties would be protected and confidence for future investments.

PRESENTATION BY DR JUDY LAWRENCE

1. Dr Judy Lawrence provided a powerpoint presentation on the Revised Coastal Hazards and Climate Change Guidance for Local Government 2017 Preparing for Coastal Change, prepared by MfE.
2. Judy spoke on the guiding principles, sea level rise – the uncertainty and certainty, adaptive pathways and triggers and noted the guidance is being rolled out around the country. As a co-chair of a technical working group, she advised they had reported on adaptation to the Minister.
3. Panel members queried if the process undertaken by the Strategy to date was in line with the guidance or if they were required to revisit anything going forward; Judy acknowledged the process undertaken was on track and broadly consistent with the guidance. She was delighted the process had happened, and noted that it was courageous, and that there were good learning experiences to come from it, noting it would need to happen in other areas too but also that it was not completed as there was still decisions to be made and implemented.

- There was also a query in regards to the guidance and if it would make councils more cautious in regards to the decisions made for protection and nourishment, Judy advised that councils are required by law to take an approach and that if anything it gives the councils more confidence working with the community.

The meeting broke at 6.58 p.m. and resumed at 7.10 p.m. Note: Polly Hunt and Ash Zachan left the meeting.

DISCUSSION SESSION 1: PROPERTY OWNERS DISCUSSION WITH THE PANEL

- Simon invited the 'H21' landowners to respond to the information presented and share their experiences, future aspirations and what they would like to see in 20, 50 and 100 years time.
- The landowners each responded to the information presented which they found was positive and spoke of their aspirations to protect their homes. They agreed the option of groynes for the broader Unit K was acceptable and there was agreement in the approach to protect the area.
- Landowners expressed the Cape View Corner area is beneficial to Hawke's Bay and a real asset in the community that they would like to see protected.
- It was noted that the landowners have attended many meetings over the years and it always seemed that no progress was made, but were encouraged that this time it was different, in that the three councils are working together on the Strategy.

DISCUSSION SESSION 2: OPTION DEVELOPMENT

- Simon spoke of the challenge to form a recommendation(s) on if and/or how the H21 could be considered in the Strategy. The options presented by Tonkin & Taylor were listed in a table on screen, the panel and landowners worked through identifying and noting down each of the options the pros, cons and other important comments. The table as developed on-screen is provided below

Option for H21 to compliment Unit K	Pros	Cons	Comments
Small groyne(s) + renourishment combined with revetments (where necessary) at Cape View Corner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fits in with the rest of the coastal strategy Reduces risk to Cape View corner which maintains access to TA and all infrastructure including the Clifton Road Reserve and property south of Cape View corner 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to ensure there is no downstream effect on the northern side of the groyne e.g. houses on Beach Rd Risk of constantly needing to address issues by adding groynes / chasing our tail Risk of blocking access; possible to drop back end of groyne to allow access but may cause some issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appoint working group to come up with detailed design aspects + modelling Need to highlight urgency – this requires urgent action within the short-term response period Provide landowners with the ability to install their own individual protections to compliment protection offered by Unit K groynes – e.g. plan changes to enable

Option for H21 to compliment Unit K	Pros	Cons	Comments
			– Recognise the juncture between public and private – the bar set for private action is too high, provide an ability to enable works where consistent with Strategy
Offshore Reef Breakwater	/ Not a practical solution as per recommendations for other Southern Units		
Rock Revetment	Would block access to the beach – see rationale for Unit K recommendations		
Concrete Seawall	Not consistent with broader strategy re environmental effects / natural character		
Managed Retreat	Ref pathways – still in play as the long-term Strategy		
No further actions under Strategy	Not considered appropriate		

2. There was a discussion on the Cape View Corner and the urgency to do something to protect the infrastructure, it was recommended that the Strategy commence with the 'H21' area. Keith Newman suggested a working group was established to work alongside council and the Technical Advisory Team.
3. Simon proposed to draft up an addition to the Draft Panel Report (as an additional supplementary recommendation from the Southern Panel) for panel members to review as part of the process to finalise the draft report with any other feedback received. Panel members agreed with this approach.

EDGE EVALUATION SHEET

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

CLOSURE

1. Peter thanked everyone for attending the meeting and for their contribution.
2. Aramanu Ropiha closed the meeting with a karakia.

The meeting closed at 8.15 p.m.