



Meeting of the Clifton to Tangoio Coastal Hazards Strategy Joint Committee

Date: Tuesday 3 September 2019
Time: 10.00am
Venue: Council Chamber
Hawke's Bay Regional Council
159 Dalton Street
NAPIER

Agenda

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE
1.	Welcome/Notices/Apologies	
2.	Conflict of Interest Declarations	
3.	Confirmation of Minutes of the Clifton to Tangoio Coastal Hazards Strategy Joint Committee held on 31 May 2019	
4.	Actions from Previous Clifton to Tangoio Coastal Hazards Strategy Joint Committee	3
5.	Call for Items of Business Not on the Agenda	7
Information or Performance Monitoring		
6.	Assessment Panel Supplementary Recommendations	9
7.	Project Manager's Update	23
8.	Current Coastal Projects Update	27
9.	Discussion of Items Not on the Agenda	29



CLIFTON TO TANGOIO COASTAL HAZARDS STRATEGY JOINT COMMITTEE

Tuesday 3 September 2019

SUBJECT: ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS CLIFTON TO TANGOIO COASTAL HAZARDS STRATEGY JOINT COMMITTEE

Reason for Report

1. In order to track items raised at previous meetings that require action, a list of outstanding items is prepared for each meeting. All action items indicate who is responsible for each, when it is expected to be completed and a brief status comment.
2. Once the items have been completed and reported to the Committee they will be removed from the list.

Decision Making Process

3. Staff have assessed the requirements of the Local Government Act 2002 in relation to this item and have concluded that, as this report is for information only, the decision making provisions do not apply.

Recommendation

That the Clifton to Tangoio Coastal Hazards Strategy Joint Committee receives and notes the "*Actions from previous Clifton to Tangoio Coastal Hazards Strategy Joint Committee Meetings*" report.

Authored by:

Simon Bendall
PROJECT MANAGER

Approved by:

Chris Dolley
GROUP MANAGER ASSET
MANAGEMENT

Attachment/s

- [1](#) Agreed actions from 31 May 2019 Joint Committee meeting

Agreed actions from 31 May 2019 Joint Committee

Task	Meeting / Agenda Item	Actions	Resp.	Status/Comment
1.	Contributory Fund	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed to have a workshop by respective councils around how the fund would be operated, management and governed. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HBRC 31 July HDC 1 August NCC 2 August
2.	Project Manager's Update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stage Consultation approach: TAG to produce a revised project Plan 	Simon Bendall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In progress.
3.	Current Coastal Projects Update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jon Kingsford to update committee re Whakarire Ave Revetment Works (led by NCC) 	Jon Kingsford	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On-going update to be provided in the Current Coastal Projects Update.

Item 4

Agreed actions from 18 March 2019 Joint Committee

Task	Meeting / Agenda Item	Actions	Resp.	Status/Comment
4.	Actions from 18 March 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To distribute PDF version of the OECD case study to members once available. 	Simon Bendall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Purchased the report and circulated to the Joint Committee 8 August 2019.
5.	Project Manager's Update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed that TAG bring back a report in how to manage risks around LTP alignment. (Having a stand-alone consultation alongside the LTP's). Proposed to engage with Dave Cull at an earlier stage and to attend the presentation with James Shaw. 	TAG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completed – 31 May 2019 meeting. In progress – suggested he attends a meeting post-election, when the new councillors are on-board.
6.	Workshop actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the discussions, the TAG funding subgroup would further refine the funding model and have the model externally peer reviewed. Proposed to have an update/progress on Central Government funding. 	TAG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On hold. Pending receipt of refined costings for physical works programme. Completed – 31 May 2019 meeting.

Attachment 1

CLIFTON TO TANGOIO COASTAL HAZARDS STRATEGY JOINT COMMITTEE

Tuesday 3 September 2019

Subject: CALL FOR ITEMS OF BUSINESS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Reason for Report

1. Standing order 9.12 states:

“A meeting may deal with an item of business that is not on the agenda where the meeting resolves to deal with that item and the Chairperson provides the following information during the public part of the meeting:

- (a) the reason the item is not on the agenda; and*
- (b) the reason why the discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.*

Items not on the agenda may be brought before the meeting through a report from either the Chief Executive or the Chairperson.

Please note that nothing in this standing order removes the requirement to meet the provisions of Part 6, LGA 2002 with regard to consultation and decision making.”

2. In addition, standing order 9.13 allows “A meeting may discuss an item that is not on the agenda only if it is a minor matter relating to the general business of the meeting and the Chairperson explains at the beginning of the public part of the meeting that the item will be discussed. However, the meeting may not make a resolution, decision or recommendation about the item, except to refer it to a subsequent meeting for further discussion.”

Recommendations

1. That the Clifton to Tangoio Coastal Hazards Strategy Joint Committee accepts the following “Items of Business Not on the Agenda” for discussion as Item 9:

Item	Topic	Councillor / Staff
1.		
2.		
3.		

Annelie Roets
Governance Administration Assistant

James Palmer
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

CLIFTON TO TANGOIO COASTAL HAZARDS STRATEGY JOINT COMMITTEE

Tuesday 3 September 2019

Subject: ASSESSMENT PANEL SUPPLEMENTARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Reason for Report

1. This report seeks input from the Joint Committee on proposed responses to the supplementary recommendations made by Clifton to Tangoio Coastal Hazards Strategy Northern and Southern Cell Assessment Panels.

Background

2. In 2018, the Northern and Southern Cell Assessment Panels delivered their final report to the Joint Committee (full report available for download at <https://www.hbcoast.co.nz/panels/>)
3. The report outlines the Panel's process and presents their recommended 100-year adaptive pathways for 9 priority units along the Clifton to Tangoio coastline.
4. The report also presents a range of supplementary recommendations that were identified during the Panel's deliberations (refer to Sections 8.7 and 9.6 of the report). The supplementary recommendations generally relate to shorter term actions considered important by Panel members, or detailed matters associated with pathway implementation.
5. Following the adoption of the Panel's report by all Partner Councils for the purposes of commencing Stage 4 of the Strategy, developing the implementation detail associated with the Panel's recommended pathways has been the key task and focus of TAG and the Joint Committee.
6. TAG are mindful however that the Panel's supplementary recommendations have not yet had a formal response from Council's.
7. To progress these matters, the supplementary recommendations have been compiled in the **attached** table. For each recommendation, a proposed response has been identified by TAG. This is intended to assist with accountability and transparency in responding to the supplementary recommendations, so that they can be either closed or actioned as appropriate, and Panel Members advised accordingly.
8. In some cases, reporting back through the Joint Committee is recommended. In others, it is advised that a specific Council or Councils are contacted to seek that the matter is considered.
9. Feedback from the Joint Committee is sought on the proposed responses.
10. TAG will advance the matters as outlined in the attached table (with any modifications as may be requested by the Joint Committee) over the coming months and will provide progress updates to future Joint Committee meetings.

Recommendation

That the Clifton to Tangoio Coastal Hazards Strategy Joint Committee receives and notes the "*Assessment Panel Supplementary Recommendations*" report.

Item 6

Authored by:

**Simon Bendall
PROJECT MANAGER**

Approved by:

**Chris Dolley
GROUP MANAGER ASSET
MANAGEMENT**

Attachment/s

[!\[\]\(a870788d6ed9b8fd294b7654a8c8526b_img.jpg\)1](#) Proposed Response to Assessment Panel Supplementary Recommendations

Northern Panel		
Panel Recommendation	TAG Comment	Recommended Council Action
General		
A. 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.	<p>Example given by Panel of suspected difference in approach to application of S71-74 of Building Act in Whirinaki (HDC) and Bayview (NCC). This should be reconciled if differences do exist.</p> <p>District Plan approach needs to be considered as part of the larger regulatory review required for Strategy implementation</p>	<p>1. Action: Letter from Joint Committee Chair to HDC and NCC CEOs requesting Council building departments undertake cross-council review of processes for issuing building consents at coast + request engagement with TAG.</p> <p>2. Action: Regulatory Workstream of TAG to investigate district plan alignment matters</p>
B. 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.	TAG to consider and recommend approach to Joint Committee	3. Action: TAG to develop paper for Joint Committee to recommend approach for Panel Member involvement in Stage 4, including through development of Triggers
Westshore (Unit D)		
A. The Biggest risk culturally from the preferred pathway (Pathway 3) is impacts on Te Pania and other reefs from sediment / turbidity caused by renourishment. Expect that controls are in place to ensure that only appropriate material is used i.e. fine to course sand, not silt. Expect that consent conditions are imposed requiring appropriate monitoring of any effects of renourishment on Pania / Rangatira Reefs and reefs to the north and that appropriate actions would be required in the event that an adverse effect is identified. Assume renourishment at medium and long term is with gravel, not sand.	<p>Regional Coastal Environment Plan regulates activities in CMA that may affect Pania Reef and other seabed disturbances</p> <p>Any application for resource consent for this activity will need to specifically address actual and potential environmental effects and include consultation Iwi</p>	4. Ongoing: TAG to maintain watching brief on future consent applications for renourishment activity at Westshore

Northern Panel		
Panel Recommendation	TAG Comment	Recommended Council Action
B. The Panel supports the ongoing monitoring of turbidity around Pania reef currently being undertaken by the Port of Napier.	Port of Napier to be advised	5. Action: Letter from Joint Committee Chair to Port of Napier communicating Panel's support for turbidity monitoring
C. The area between Westshore and Bay View is vulnerable to erosion and effects on lifeline assets e.g. State Highway, railway, gas pipeline, fibre optic and other utilities.	This area is covered by Units C (Bay View) and D (Westshore) – these matters need to be considered in detailed design phase which is underway	<i>No further action required. This matter will be addressed through detailed design</i>
D. From a recreational perspective, there is a considerable desire to restore and maintain amenity value by rebuilding the beach and nearshore area with sand which has been eroded over the past 20-30 years.	Napier City Council to be advised	6. Action: Letter from Joint Committee Chair to NCC CEO communicating Panel's desire for sand renourishment
E. There may be an opportunity to make use of the sand available through the port maintenance dredging and the proposed new port berth project to satisfy some or all of the required sand needed to replenish Westshore. Alternative sources of suitable sand may be required to be sourced to provide sand of suitable size or volume.	To be addressed through detailed design for implementing recommended pathway at Westshore - particularly in consideration of potential costs	<i>No further action required. This matter will be addressed through detailed design</i>

Northern Panel		
Panel Recommendation	TAG Comment	Recommended Council Action
Bay View (Unit C)		
A. The biggest risk culturally from the preferred pathway (Pathway 3) is impacts on reefs from sediment / turbidity caused by renourishment. Expect that controls are in place to ensure that only appropriate material is used. Expect that consent conditions are imposed requiring appropriate monitoring of any effects of renourishment on reefs and that appropriate actions would be required in the event that an adverse effect is identified.	<p>Regional Coastal Environment Plan regulates activities in CMA that may affect Pania Reef and other seabed disturbances</p> <p>Any application for resource consent for this activity will need to specifically address actual and potential environmental effects and include consultation Iwi</p>	7. Ongoing: TAG to maintain watching brief on future consent applications for renourishment activity at Westshore
Whirinaki (Unit B)		
A. Biggest risk culturally from the preferred pathway (Pathway 4) is impacts on reefs from sediment / turbidity caused by renourishment. Expect that controls are in place to ensure that only appropriate material is used. Expect that consent conditions are imposed requiring appropriate monitoring of any effects of renourishment on reefs and that appropriate actions would be required in the event that an adverse effect is identified.	<p>Regional Coastal Environment Plan regulates activities in CMA that may affect Pania Reef and other seabed disturbances</p> <p>Any application for resource consent for this activity will need to specifically address actual and potential environmental effects and include consultation Iwi</p>	8. Ongoing: TAG to maintain watching brief on future consent applications for renourishment activity at Westshore

Southern Panel		
Panel Recommendation	TAG Comment	Recommended Council Action
All Units		
A. We need to be mindful of care of the environment and doing our best to leave a legacy of good guardianship. We should be concerned about not only human welfare but the welfare of all living things, respecting interconnectedness/cause and effect principles and that if we don't do this it will be to the detriment of all.	Design Workstream to incorporate ecological ethos as appropriate	1. Action: TAG Design Workstream to report to the Joint Committee on how this has been incorporated into detailed design
B. The pathways as recommended will result in hard engineering along virtually the whole of the southern cell. There is concern about the effects of this approach on the natural character of the beautiful coastline.	Design Workstream to incorporate softer elements as appropriate For LGA consultation purposes, need to consult on more than one option – TAG need to develop primary alternative options to defence (e.g. Managed Retreat) and include detail on estimated costs / impacts etc in consultation material	2. Action: TAG Design Workstream to report to the Joint Committee on how this has been incorporated into detailed design 3. Action: TAG to develop managed retreat concept for application in Hawke's Bay – where, how, who pays, etc. To be included in 2021 consultation document
C. Managed retreat has been in the 'too hard box'; we have not paid enough attention to it, it's costing and possible funding models.	For LGA consultation purposes, need to consult on more than one option – TAG need to develop primary alternative options to defence (e.g. Managed Retreat) and include detail on estimated costs / impacts etc in consultation material	<i>No further action required. This matter is addressed by Action 3 above</i>
D. Once signed and adopted, Councils should incorporate the Strategy into Regional and District Plans. Until such	TAG Regulatory Workstream are considering legal/planning issues as part of Stage 4.	4. Action: TAG Regulatory workstream to report on this issue to Joint Committee as work

Southern Panel		
Panel Recommendation	TAG Comment	Recommended Council Action
time as the planning framework has been changed to facilitate Strategy outcomes, if a consent application is consistent with the Strategy and urgency is identified within the Strategy, there should be an ability for Councils to give weight to the Strategy, and in doing so, hasten the consenting process.	<p>This work could result in RMA plan review/plan change processes and/or decision-making in context of applications for resource consents, building consents and other approvals.</p> <p>Note that until such time as regulatory regime has been changed, the Coastal Hazards Strategy is considered a non-statutory document and has limited weight; consent applications will be assessed on their merits against current regulatory framework.</p>	develops
Clifton (Unit L)		
A. Consider groyne-head at end of sea wall to build up beach and low tide access if this is adopted for Clifton.	Engineering report would be required on pros cons and business case. May require consent variation or new consent for any physical works .	5. Action: Letter from Joint Committee Chair to HDC CEO requesting consideration of Panel recommendation
B. There is a high degree of urgency for Clifton to respond to current erosion losses urgent action is required.	<p>Clifton Seawall construction complete. Project proceeded separate from Coast Hazards Strategy work.</p> <p>Consider balance of seawall in Pathway planning through design workstream.</p>	<i>No further action required.</i>
Te Awanga (Unit K2)		

Southern Panel		
Panel Recommendation	TAG Comment	Recommended Council Action
A. The Councils should look at the existing vertical railway irons - we feel this is a genuine short-term solution for this community whilst this Strategy is being developed and implemented. A functional, and preferably aesthetically improved option of this nature could be implemented and used as an experimental short-term measure, together with crest maintenance, and monitored for effectiveness.	Design team/TAG to consider and report back to Joint Committee on pros and cons of a properly designed and built pilot scheme. Consider seeking input / advice from Living at the Edge / Universities – potential for masters student project? Note: if this is led by HBRC Design team, then presents risk that the small design team's capacity will be distracted/stretched even thinner.	6. Action: TAG Design Workstream to consider and report back to Joint Committee on pros and cons of a properly designed and built pilot scheme. Including undertaking review of existing railway irons and how these should be managed in the period leading up to and following pathway implementation.
B. If any existing railway irons are removed (e.g. for health and safety reasons) then a suitable, alternative needs to be put in its place.	Determine agency responsibility per LGA/HSE/RMA. Assess health and safety over short and long term. Assess pros and cons of replacement.	<i>No further action required. Addressed through Action 6 above.</i>
C. Look at options to enhance the existing vertical railway irons with art / public works of art that acknowledge and reflect the cultural heritage of this coast.	Once agency responsibility determined as above, assess pros and cons and canvass local support through Cape Coast Community Plan.	<i>No further action required. Addressed through Action 6 above.</i>
D. Special consideration needs to be given to consulting with surfers / people with knowledge of the surf break where there are any artificial interventions that may affect the surf break.	Regional Coastal Environment Plan regulates activities in CMA + New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement also has particular protection for surf breaks. Any application for resource consent for this activity will need to specifically address these actual and potential environmental effects	7. Ongoing: TAG to maintain watching brief on future consent applications for coastal defence structures at Te Awanga.
Haumoana (Unit K1)		

Southern Panel		
Panel Recommendation	TAG Comment	Recommended Council Action
A. Area down by the Domain / Grange Road is at risk now from inundation /flooding through failure to maintain the crest – this needs urgent attention.	Comment to presented to Hastings DC for consideration – note HDC have sought consent for beach scraping to relocate gravel on breach onto crest	8. Action: Letter from Joint Committee Chair to HDC CEO requesting consideration of Panel request
B. Vehicle access to / through and behind the beach crest needs to be managed. Acknowledging that there are strong community values associated with this access, viable access to the beach needs to be maintained but the beach crest needs to be off limits; it needs to made clear what you can and can't do and why. The beach crest must be built up.	Comment to be presented to Hastings DC for consideration	9. Action: Letter from Joint Committee Chair to HDC CEO requesting consideration of Panel request
C. Vehicles turning around at the groyne end of the beach are causing significant erosion / losses. This also needs to be addressed.	Comment to be presented to Hastings DC for consideration	10. Action: Letter from Joint Committee Chair to HDC CEO requesting consideration of Panel request
D. Groyne saddle needs to be filled so that the beach can build back up.	Matter has been considered by HDC and resolved.	<i>No further action required.</i>
E. Support the Reserve Management Plan prepared by Hastings District Council which includes works to maintain / enhance the beach crest and manage vehicle access.	Submission lodged on behalf of the Panel. Management Plan process now complete and Plan finalised/Approved. No further response required.	<i>No further action required.</i>
F. Noting an impending threat at Clifton, efforts have	Process underway:	11. Action: TAG to report back to Joint Committee

Southern Panel		
Panel Recommendation	TAG Comment	Recommended Council Action
<p>been made to bring in a revetment to respond and this is commended. However, an imminent threat also exists at Cape View Corner. Urge that rocks are placed here and beach crest maintenance carried out to give a temporary respite while long term solution is developed. There is a duty of care to protect power, water and road at Cape View Corner which supplies the entire Cape Coast area.</p>	<p>21 August 2019 meeting held between Peter Beaven (HBRC Councillor), Anne Redgrave (HDC Councillor), Keith Newman (Community), Brian (Community), Jose Beya (HBRC), Chris Dolley (HBRC), Craig Thew (HDC)</p> <p>Recent storm damage was inspected, Recent sale of Bridgeman properties to new owners was noted</p> <p>Funding is currently available from HDC for shingle placement to (partially) offset environmental losses</p> <p>Hasting DC to investigate options for short term protection of cape corner with assistance of HBRC</p> <p>Noted that public utilities risks should be assessed independently from any H21 discussion due to risks in mixing the discussions and delays</p>	<p>on progress with HDC-led project to consider risk mitigation options at Cape View Corner / H21</p>

Southern Panel		
Panel Recommendation	TAG Comment	Recommended Council Action
Haumoana (Unit K1) – “H21” Properties		
<p><i>The Panel wishes to acknowledge the unique circumstances that apply to the properties from 1 to 41 (odd numbers only) Clifton Road, Haumoana (“the H21”), and the importance of Cape View Corner, which maintains access to Te Awanga and includes important infrastructure, including the Clifton Road Reserve and properties to the south. The Panel further recognises that the long-term pathways recommended for Unit K (Haumoana and Te Awanga) have been designed at a high level for the broader Unit K, and not specifically for the H21 properties. As such, once implemented the Unit K pathways will provide some benefit for the H21 but this may not happen quick enough, and it will not translate to a high standard of protection. Having met with the owners of the H21 at a dedicated workshop on 30 January 2018, and considered these special circumstances, the Panel has identified further actions under the Strategy to complement the recommended pathway for the broader Unit K. These are: [specific actions below]</i></p>		
A. As a matter of urgency, small groyne(s) + renourishment, and where necessary rock revetments, at Cape View Corner are constructed that precede but complement the Unit K pathways.	HDC to investigate as part of work to be undertaken following 21 August 2019 meeting (See Action 11 and comments above)	<i>No further action required. Addressed by Action 11 above</i>
B. Landowners need to be provided with an ability (through changes to Resource Management Act planning documents) to install their own individual protections /improvements on private land where consistent with the Strategy and complementary to the Unit K pathways, so that the regulatory bar is not set too high for appropriate private action;	TAG Regulatory Workstream will explore existing planning framework for strengths, gaps and weaknesses it may have for implementing the Coastal Hazards Strategy. In the meantime, each consent needs to be considered on its merits and in accordance with existing framework. An outcome of the 21 August 2019 meeting with WOW is that HBRC will shortly be completing a significant modelling project for coastal processes within Strategy area – this provides a resource for considering the effects of applications and could assist to reduce consenting costs and timeframes.	<i>No further action required. To be considered through existing TAG Regulatory Workstream</i>

Southern Panel		
Panel Recommendation	TAG Comment	Recommended Council Action
<p>C. That a working group of Panel Members, supported by TAG and technical advisors, is appointed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Consider modelling outputs of various design options for Cape View Corner and costing information to confirm final design; ii. Ensure the design does not cause downstream effects on the northern side of the groynes (for example, the houses on Beach Road); iii. Ensure that access to and along the beach is not compromised; and iv. Ensure that the design is sustainable and does not create further issues that would then need to be addressed with further interventions. 	<p>For consideration as part of Stage 4 in conjunction with HBRC design team and report to JC.</p> <p>For consideration alongside any interim works per the H21 and Cape View Corner and report to JC.</p>	<p>12. Action: TAG to develop paper for Joint Committee to recommend approach for Panel Member involvement in Stage 4, including in any response to be developed for H21 / Cape View Corner (also see aligned Action 3 in Northern Panel Supplementary Recommendations)</p>
Clive / East Clive (Unit J)		
<p>A. Beach scraping, crest management and planting is required as short-term measure as an enhancement to the status quo.</p>	<p>HBRC to investigate and report to JC on outcome and any action proposed.</p>	<p>13. Action: TAG Design Workstream to report back to Joint Committee following consideration of any short-term soft engineering requirements at Clive</p>

Southern Panel		
Panel Recommendation	TAG Comment	Recommended Council Action
Awatoto (Unit I)		
<p>A. Awatoto (Unit I) has not been considered in this iteration of the Strategy (note Recommendation One in Section 9.1) but the section of Awatoto that extends from the Waitangi Reserve to the northern end of Waitangi Road is at equal risk of inundation as Units J through L.</p> <p>With the implementation of protection measures for Units J through L, what is yet unknown is any unforeseen impacts these measures may have on Awatoto, including impacts on the Waitangi Reserve.</p> <p>The unknown impacts (positive/negative) of the cessation of the gravel extraction at the Winstone, Awatoto site are also noted, including the previous continuous build-up of the sea wall by Winstone heavy machinery.</p> <p>If negative impacts do occur, and the risks for Awatoto increase, the Strategy may need to be reviewed earlier than the suggested 10-year period.</p>	<p>HBRC Asset Group to monitor barrier heights and inundation events and report to JC as appropriate.</p> <p>Note emergency works scan required every 12 months as part of Stage 4 Project plan</p>	<p>14. Ongoing: TAG to maintain watching brief on coastal monitoring outcomes and report to Joint Committee through emergency works reporting.</p>

CLIFTON TO TANGOIO COASTAL HAZARDS STRATEGY JOINT COMMITTEE

Tuesday 3 September 2019

Subject: PROJECT MANAGER'S UPDATE

Reason for Report

1. The Project Manager's report is usually given as a verbal update, to provide opportunity for questions and discussion with the Committee on general project-related matters. In this case, a written report is provided to update the Joint Committee on progress made in each of the 5 workstreams of Stage 4 of the Clifton to Tangoio Coastal Hazards Strategy.

Stage 4 Overview

2. As previously reported to the Joint Committee, Stage 4 of the Strategy is being developed in 3 phases:
 - 2.1 Phase 1: Pathway Concept Development, Testing and Planning;
 - 2.2 Phase 2: Community Consultation and Approvals; and
 - 2.3 Phase 3: Pathway Implementation Projects (multiple).
3. TAG are currently working on Phase 1, which seeks to refine, test and develop to a next level of detail the recommended pathways developed by the Northern and Southern Cell Assessment Panels.
4. TAG have established 5 interrelated workstreams to complete the work required in Phase 1, with each workstream lead by a member of TAG:
 - 4.1 Design;
 - 4.2 Triggers;
 - 4.3 Funding;
 - 4.4 Governance; and
 - 4.5 Regulatory.
5. Each of these workstreams will result in content and recommendations for Joint Committee review and Partner Council consideration.
6. Once Phase 1 outcomes are accepted by Partner Councils, the significance of this work requires that community consultation under the Local Government Act occurs.
7. The following sections provide an update on progress made in each of the 5 workstreams noted above.

Design Workstream Update

8. Lead by in-house expertise from the Hawke's Bay Regional Council, the Design Workstream has three primary outputs:
 - 8.1. Detailed concept plans for the recommended pathway in each priority unit and updated capital construction and maintenance costs;
 - 8.2. A works programme detailing the order, timing and duration of the physical works programmes that form the first step of the recommended pathways in each priority unit; and

- 8.3. A high-level assessment of the recommended pathway in each priority unit to assist the regulatory workstream to consider consenting risks.
9. Over the past 12 months, a significant body of work has been undertaken by HBRC to produce a coastal processes model for the northern and southern cell. This model is required to allow the development of design details for each of the recommended responses, and for the effects of those structures on coastal processes to be tested.
10. With the exception of revised costings for the proposed Pandora stopbank, the Design Workstream are on track to complete their Phase 1 work by October 2019 as required by the Project Plan.

Triggers Workstream Update

11. The pathways in this Strategy have been developed based on the Dynamic Adaptive Pathways Planning (DAPP) approach recommended by the Ministry for the Environment's Coastal Hazards and Climate Change Guidance for Local Government. This means that the pathways are flexible and able to adapt to changing circumstances; this is particularly important in the context of highly uncertain future climate-change effects.
12. In order for the pathways to be adaptive, signals and triggers are required. These will provide both the early warning signals, and the ultimate trigger point when a decision is required to action a shift to the next step in the pathway, or potentially shift to an entirely new action if necessary. Thresholds will also need to be defined; that is, the circumstances or effects that communities wish to avoid; pathway actions will need to be implemented before threshold conditions are reached.
13. The Triggers Workstream, being led by Napier City Council, will develop signals, triggers and thresholds for each priority unit of the coast.
14. One of the challenges for this workstream is that signals and triggers have not been developed for coastal hazards pathways anywhere else in New Zealand; there is no defined process for doing this or other examples to learn from.
15. Usefully, in October 2019 TAG are expecting the release of a report from the Deep South National Science Challenge, which presents learnings from a series of workshops held (including with TAG and the Northern and Southern Cell Assessment Panels) on signal and trigger development. While it won't be a how-to guide, TAG understand that it will provide useful reference material and outline matters that will need to be considered in the trigger development process.
16. TAG have also contacted the Living at the Edge research team. While research funding is limited, there has been an initial agreement to work together in the early phase of process design and the sharing of information and material.
17. TAG envisions that once the trigger development process has been designed, collaborative workshops with Assessment Panel and community members will be held, likely in late 2019 or early 2020. This is a work in progress.

Funding Workstream Update

18. The Funding Workstream is tasked with:
 - 18.1. Developing a funding model to support the implementation of the Strategy, including the detail of a proposed contributory fund; and
 - 18.2. Providing an analysis sufficient to satisfy the requirements of s.101(3) of the Local Government Act to implement the pathways in each priority unit.
19. Much of the focus of the past 12 months has been on working with the Joint Committee and each Partner Council directly to seek agreement on funding matters, particularly on questions of responsibility and accountability.
20. Most recently, on 22 July, 31 July, 1 August and 2 August, workshops were held with Council Chief Executives and each Partner Council to explore ideas on the contributory fund concept.

21. The outcome of those workshops and discussion on next steps will occur in the workshop component of the 3 September meeting. Members of the TAG Funding Workstream will be in attendance to assist with this discussion.

Regulatory Workstream Update

22. The Regulatory Workstream has been tasked with considering 4 key questions:
 - 22.1. Does the existing planning and regulatory framework in Hawke's Bay require changes to improve consistency across jurisdictions?
 - 22.2. How supportive / restrictive is the existing framework in terms of Strategy implementation and what changes could be made to better facilitate implementation while appropriately managing adverse effects?
 - 22.3. How can the moral hazard risk associated with implementing coastal defence measures be managed? That is, the risk of inadvertently encouraging further development / investment in an area only temporarily protected by a coastal defence.
 - 22.4. In consideration of the existing planning and regulatory framework including the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement, and based on a high-level assessment of the actual and potential effects (including cumulative effects) of the proposed pathways, what are the challenges with gaining resource consents to implement the proposed pathways?
23. Each Partner Council is heavily engaged in various plan change and policy projects, and this has placed a strain on resources. It was originally intended that this workstream could be advanced with in-house Council expertise, however with resource limitations this has not been achieved. TAG are now considering options to advance this work with consultant support. This is not expected to affect overall project timeframes, but will have budgetary impacts that need to be worked through.

Governance Workstream Update

24. The Governance Workstream is tasked with confirming the role that each Partner Council and Iwi member of the Joint Committee will take in Strategy implementation.
25. With much of the focus on roles and responsibilities currently being debated within the Funding Workstream, the Governance Workstream is currently on hold.

Progress Summary and Budget Tracking

26. TAG have been busy working on the detailed assessments required in the first phase of Stage 4, and in broad terms the project is tracking in accordance with the overall project plan.
27. TAG are mindful that this phase of the project is highly internal and detail-oriented. This makes it difficult to demonstrate progress to communities and interested and affected persons.
28. Some key challenges at this stage of the project are:
 - 28.1. Funding: Securing alignment between the Partner Councils on funding matters;
 - 28.2. Regulatory: Resourcing workstreams with internal staff; and
 - 28.3. Triggers: Resourcing workstreams with internal staff, limited guidance or examples for how to advance work recommended by Ministry for the Environment's guidance.
29. TAG are actively working on solutions to the above challenges.
30. The project budget for the 2018-2019 financial year was approximately \$30,000 underspent.

Recommendation

That the Clifton to Tangoio Coastal Hazards Strategy Joint Committee receives the “*Project Manager’s Update*” report.

Authored by:

**Simon Bendall
PROJECT MANAGER**

Approved by:

**Chris Dolley
GROUP MANAGER ASSET
MANAGEMENT**

Attachment/s

There are no attachments for this report.



CLIFTON TO TANGOIO COASTAL HAZARDS STRATEGY JOINT COMMITTEE

Tuesday 3 September 2019

Subject: CURRENT COASTAL PROJECTS UPDATE

Reason for Report

1. This report provides an opportunity for the Technical Advisory Group (“TAG”) to provide an update on various coastal projects the Joint Committee have expressed an interest in keeping abreast of, namely:
 - 1.1. Whakarire Ave Revetment Works
 - 1.2. Port of Napier
 - 1.3. Extended consent area for sand deposition at Westshore
2. TAG members will provide a verbal update on each of these projects at the meeting.

Recommendation

That the Clifton to Tangoio Coastal Hazards Strategy Joint Committee receives the “*Current Coastal Project Update*” report.

Authored by:

Simon Bendall
PROJECT MANAGER

Approved by:

Chris Dolley
GROUP MANAGER ASSET
MANAGEMENT

Attachment/s

There are no attachments for this report.



CLIFTON TO TANGOIO COASTAL HAZARDS STRATEGY JOINT COMMITTEE

Tuesday 3 September 2019

Subject: DISCUSSION OF ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Reason for Report

1. This document has been prepared to assist Committee Members to note the Items of Business Not on the Agenda to be discussed as determined earlier in Agenda Item 5.

Item	Topic	Raised by
1.		
2.		
3.		