



Meeting of the Clifton to Tangoio Coastal Hazards Strategy Joint Committee

Date: 14 June 2024
Time: 10.00am
Venue: Council Chamber
Hawke's Bay Regional Council
159 Dalton Street
NAPIER

Agenda

Item	Title	Page
1.	Welcome/Karakia/Housekeeping/Apologies	
2.	Conflict of Interest Declarations	
3.	Confirmation of Minutes of the Clifton to Tangoio Coastal Hazards Strategy Joint Committee meeting held on 17 May 2024	
4.	Te Awanga erosion issues and pathway considerations	3
5.	Project Manager's June 2024 update	7
6.	Communications and engagement update	27
7.	Current coastal projects update	31
8.	Update on follow-ups from previous meetings	33



Clifton to Tangoio Coastal Hazards Strategy Joint Committee

14 June 2024

Subject: Te Awanga erosion issues and pathway considerations

Reason for report

1. This report has been prepared to accompany a presentation from members of the Te Awanga community.

Background

2. Damage to the foreshore adjacent to the Te Awanga lagoon at Te Awanga was caused by floodwaters from Cyclone Gabrielle. This damage left some properties at risk from water intrusion from high seas.
3. A public meeting was held with the community on 26 April 2023 to discuss possible solutions and how they might be funded. Joint Committee and Technical Advisory Group (TAG) members and staff and councillors from Hastings District Council (HDC) were invited and in attendance.
4. Further erosion and sea water intrusion occurred on 10 July 2023 in the same area, with some metres of erosion to a 200m section of coast, impacting the beach access and parking area as well as causing power outages. Since then, there has been a replenishment of gravel to this area that has given some immediate respite to the problem but this needs ongoing monitoring.
5. Te Awanga representatives are keen to pursue a level of protection for the section of coast adjacent to the Te Awanga lagoon, with a preference for a revetment style intervention. The Te Awanga representatives, with support from HDC, are considering the Ecoreef solution for this section of coast and have obtained prices for a staged approach.
 - 5.1. Stage 1 involves protection of the immediate 200m section of coast under threat adjacent to the Te Awanga lagoon, estimated at \$730k for design, consent and construction.
 - 5.2. Stage 2 involves a further 450m of protection from the Maraetotara river mouth to the northern end of the Te Awanga domain, estimated at a further \$1.67m, giving a total project cost for all work as \$2.4m.
6. Funding for these works needs to go through a public consultation process to determine an agreed way forward, with consideration of a targeted rating scheme similar to the Waimarama Seawall, and determination of public and private good benefits.
7. HDC infrastructure assets, including water and stormwater, along with Unison assets in the Wellwood Terrace area, are under threat should the barrier beach fail opposite the Te Awanga lagoon and allow seawater to inundate the area. Te Awanga representatives are seeking consideration of pre-emptive work to protect these assets, funded by HDC assets, to maintain the lagoon area as the stormwater receiving and discharge area.
8. The 'do nothing' option poses a significant risk to this area, with replenishment gravels providing a very short-term level of intervention.

9. On 12 May 2024, Te Awanga representatives met with Joint Committee and TAG members and staff from HDC to further discuss their preferred solution. It was agreed that the information should be presented to the Joint Committee, recognising that the Strategy is intended to be released for public consultation in September 2024 and is based on a different proposed solution for Te Awanga.

Discussion

10. The Strategy is a long-term approach for responding to coastal hazards in a coordinated way along a large stretch of coastline. Time is needed to consult with all communities along the coast and those living inland, confirm the Strategy, raise funds, secure resource consents, and commence works. This means that in practical terms, any solution for Te Awanga delivered under the Strategy is likely to be at least 3 to 4 years away.
11. The Strategy is based on recommendations developed by the Community Panels through a robust and extensive process in 2017-2018. For Te Awanga, after considering a range of possible solutions including sea walls, offshore reefs, retreat and others, the approach recommended by the Community Panels to respond to coastal erosion and coastal inundation risks is groynes and gravel nourishment, complemented with a raised beach crest.
12. In Stage 4 of the Strategy development process, concept designs have been prepared and costed based on that approach, with a coastal process model developed to test the optimal number and location of groynes and the height of the beach crest, and when the interventions may fail.
13. Acknowledging the Strategy is a long-term approach and has taken time to develop and confirm, the Councils have set up an Interim Response Plan that guides how urgent coastal hazards issues are to be managed until the Strategy is being implemented.
14. This plan confirms that until the Strategy is in place, coastal hazard mitigation projects should continue to be delivered where required and where they are not inconsistent with the overall direction of the Strategy. The plan confirms that the existing approach remains in place, where the relevant Territorial Authority (HDC or Napier City Council) leads the response, with HBRC acting in an advisory and regulatory capacity. This is how the Clifton, Cape View Corner and Rangatira revetments were delivered in recent years.
15. At this time, the Ecoreef proposal fits under the Interim Response Plan and the Te Awanga community continues to work with HDC to determine whether it can be progressed.
16. For completeness, it is noted that the Memorandum of Transition (MOT) establishes a process for transferring existing identified coastal hazard mitigation assets from the Territorial Authorities to HBRC following confirmation of the Strategy. The MOT requires that where a new coastal hazard asset is proposed by a Territorial Authority, it should consult with HBRC given that it may be subject to a future transfer of ownership.
17. An underlying tenant of the Strategy is that it needs to be flexible and adaptive to future uncertainty and changing circumstances. Adjusting the Strategy to accommodate alternative solutions will likely be necessary over time, however the process needs to be robust and transparent.
18. Careful consideration needs to be given to how or if the proposal being developed by the Te Awanga community fits within or alongside the Strategy. TAG is in the process of assessing this question.

Next steps

19. Following the presentation by the Te Awanga community, TAG will prepare a brief report for the Joint Committee to consider Strategy alignment questions and a proposed way forward. This will be presented at the next Joint Committee meeting, with a particular focus on how the Strategy consultation process in September should respond to the Ecoreef proposal.

20. HDC continues to function as the lead agency under the Interim Response Plan for any urgent coastal hazard mitigation works in Te Awanga.

Decision-making process

21. 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 *Te Awanga erosion issues and pathway considerations* staff report.

Authored by:

Simon Bendall
Coastal Hazards Strategy 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

14 June 2024

Subject: Project Manager's June 2024 update

Reason for report

1. This report provides an update on project-related matters including timeframes, budgets and tracking towards milestones.





Project dashboard

2. The project dashboard (Table 1) is provided to summarise current project status for budget, timeline and all eight Strategy Workstreams (WS). An assessment of each project element is made on a 'traffic light' basis, with a brief commentary provided to explain the rating given.
3. Where a rating has changed from the preceding report, the metric is shown in red underline with an arrow showing the change in status.

Table 1: Project Dashboard Report: June 2024

Status: On Track Under Stress Key Risk

Metric	Status			Commentary
Project Budget				2023/2024 budget underspent relative to forecast. Carryover unspent funds to 2024/2025.
Project Timeline				September 2024 target for notifying proposed Strategy on track to be achieved. However, 'Key Risk' status assigned to acknowledge continued delays that have occurred to date in progressing the Strategy and the challenges and uncertainty for communities experiencing ongoing effects from coastal hazards.
<u>WS1: Funding / Governance</u>				Funding model work progressing and on track for presenting to HBRC on 19 June. Status changed to reflect complex financial environment.
WS2: LGA Consultation				LGA Consultation requirements (Section 16 / LTP amendment) on track to be achieved.
WS3: Comms & Engagement				Comms and engagement plan for early engagement phase in implementation – activities commence July. September consultation phase activities scoped, external support sought to resource this effectively.
WS4: Design				Gravel nourishment feasibility assessment completed, confirming gravel is available to support beach nourishment activities although required volumes particularly for capital nourishment are high. CoastSnap on track for deployment during early engagement.

Metric	Status		Commentary
WS5: Mātauranga Māori			External contractor engaged to provide expertise and capacity. PSGEs have confirmed capacity constraints are limiting ability to engage in Strategy development at this time. Desktop work to develop draft cultural values frameworks based on existing information underway. Outcome to be provided to PSGE's in the first instance for review.
WS6: Coastal Ecology			Draft coastal ecology monitoring plan has been received and reviewed by HBRC science team. Mana Whenua engagement sought to expand / refine monitoring plan. Recommended monitoring is currently cost-prohibitive. TAG working on options to progress.
WS7: Regulatory			Discussion document on key regulatory matters for the Strategy to drive through local planning frameworks presented to Joint Committee. Outcome now reflected in Strategy drafting.
WS8: Signals and Triggers			Thresholds development process completed and outcome will be reflected as draft thresholds in Strategy document. TAG has assessed the development of signals and triggers and has determined to pause further work until the Strategy has been adopted with confirmed thresholds. Workstream currently on hold.

4. There is one status change to report for this period, related to the confirmation of the funding model. While the development process overall is on track, the lead role is now shifting to Hawke's Bay Regional Council to work the model through a Long Term Plan amendment process. The overall financial environment within which the funding model is being developed continues to be complex and challenging, prompting a higher risk rating to be applied in this reporting period.

Central Government: Climate Inquiry

5. As noted verbally in the May meeting, the Finance and Expenditure Committee's Inquiry into climate adaptation was announced on 10 May 2024. The approximately 150 public submissions made to the Environment Committee's previous inquiry into climate adaptation, including the submission made by this Joint Committee, will be considered by the new inquiry.
6. The new inquiry has the following terms of reference:
 - 6.1. The purpose of the inquiry is to develop and recommend high-level objectives and principles for the design of a climate change adaptation model for New Zealand, to support the development of policy and legislation to address climate adaptation.
 - 6.2. For this purpose, the committee must consider the following topics:
 - 6.2.1. the nature of the climate adaptation problem New Zealand faces
 - 6.2.2. frameworks for investment and cost-sharing
 - 6.2.3. roles and responsibilities
 - 6.2.4. climate risk and response information-sharing.
 - 6.3. The committee may, as it thinks fit, consider other matters relevant to the purpose of the inquiry.
 - 6.4. The committee must take account of submissions received by the Environment Committee on its recent inquiry into climate adaptation.

- 6.5. The committee must finally report on the inquiry by 5 September 2024.
7. The Finance and Expenditure Committee has invited any new submissions to consider the following questions:
 - 7.1. What would be a durable, affordable, and fair approach to adaptation for the existing built environment (i.e., where people live and work) in the future? How could that approach be phased in over time?
 - 7.2. What outcomes should such an approach to adaptation lead to? What are the highest priorities to achieve?
 - 7.3. What do you think the costs will be? How should these various costs be distributed (eg amongst property owners, widely across New Zealanders, ratepayers, now and in future)? Should this distribution change over time?
 - 7.4. What do you think is the critical information that will inform people and help them understand future risks, costs, and impacts?
 - 7.5. What are the particular issues facing Māori, especially sites, assets, and land vulnerable to climate-driven natural hazards?
 - 7.6. What are the problems with New Zealand's approach to managing climate-related natural hazards? What are the underlying drivers of these problems?
 - 7.7. What adaptation-related costs are you facing now? How are you planning on addressing these costs?
 - 7.8. What adaptation related risks are you facing now and how are you planning to address these risks?
8. The submissions period for the inquiry is open now, and closes 11:59pm, Sunday 16 June.
9. The Joint Committee's submission to the previous inquiry is provided as **Attachment 1** for reference. While this submission will be considered, the new inquiry has a different focus and approach. The Joint Committee and TAG have also continued to develop the Strategy since the last submission was lodged, particularly focusing on funding adaptation actions. With these factors in mind, TAG recommends that a new submission is prepared to reinforce previous messaging and comment on at least some of the questions posed above.
10. A draft submission is in preparation at time of writing this report to enable meeting the submissions deadline. With the Joint Committee's support, TAG will complete the submission and, with the Chair's endorsement, lodge it on the Joint Committee's behalf.

Central Government: Fast Track Approvals Bill

11. In April 2024 the Joint Committee entered a submission on the Fast Track Approvals Bill. The submission is provided as **Attachment 2**.
12. The three key points made by the submissions were:
 - 12.1. The risk of decision-making on fast-track approvals failing to consider local natural hazard risks and strategies, resulting in people, homes, businesses and infrastructure being located in areas where the risks from natural hazards are, or are likely to be, significant in the short, medium or longer term.
 - 12.2. The risk of projects being granted fast-track approvals that undermine collaborative approaches and excludes or minimises meaningful input from those that are directly affected by the decisions being made.
 - 12.3. The potential opportunity for projects and programmes of work proposed by the Strategy to be approved swiftly, but only once the Strategy itself has been widely endorsed through a public consultation process.
13. The Joint Committee confirmed a desire to speak in support of the submission.

14. On 29 May, the Environment Committee contacted TAG to offer a 10-minute speaking slot to make an oral submission. Limited options were available, and a response was required by 31 May. In consultation with the joint committee Chair, TAG requested a time between 9am and 1pm on Friday 14 June (during this Joint Committee meeting).
15. At the time of writing this report, TAG has not had a reply or confirmation of a speaking slot. Should this be confirmed, the Joint Committee will be updated by email. As it is only a 10-minute slot, it is suggested that the Chair, with support from TAG as required, makes some brief comments to highlight the three key aspects of our submission and then invites questions from the Environment Committee.

General updates

16. A Regulatory Workstream background paper (May 2024) was presented to the Joint Committee's 17 May meeting. As requested by the Joint Committee, that paper has since been circulated to policy planning leads at each of the five Hawke's Bay councils with a note drawing their attention to the report's recommendations and potential work to incorporate into councils' respective RMA plan development work programmes.
17. The next key milestone for the Strategy development process is the workshop with HBRC on 19 June 2024, where the funding model as developed by the Joint Committee will be presented by TAG.
18. The next Joint Committee meeting on 5 July 2024 will seek Joint Committee endorsement for the full proposed Strategy document to be recommended to HBRC.

Decision-making process

19. 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 *Project Manager's June 2024 update*.

Authored by:

Simon Bendall
Coastal Hazards Strategy Project Manager

Approved by:

Chris Dolley
Group Manager Asset Management

Attachment/s

- 1 [↓](#) Submission on Inquiry into Climate Adaptation by Clifton to Tangoio Coastal Hazards Strategy Joint Committee 1Nov2023
- 2 [↓](#) Fast Track Approvals Bill submission by Clifton to Tangoio Coastal Hazards Strategy Joint Committee 19 April 2024



1 November 2023

Environment Committee
Parliament Buildings
Wellington

Tēnā koutou katoa

Submission on the Inquiry into Climate Adaptation

1. Introduction

This submission is from Clifton to Tangoio Coastal Hazards Strategy Joint Committee (“Joint Committee”), formed by members appointed by the Hawke’s Bay Regional Council, Heretaunga Tamatea Settlement Trust, Hastings District Council, Mana Ahuriri Trust, Napier City Council and Maungaharuru-Tangitū Trust.

We wish to appear before the Committee to speak to our submission.

We wish to ensure that at least one representative from each organisation that forms our Joint Committee is given the opportunity to appear before the Environment Committee to discuss our submission.

We wish to make the following comments in relation to the inquiry.

2. Overview

Thank you for the opportunity to provide a submission on the Environment Committee’s inquiry into climate adaptation.

This is a timely, and important opportunity to engage with central government on this critical topic for our region and the rest of New Zealand. We look forward to discussing our submission with you and to sharing our substantial practical experience with climate adaptation and the challenges and opportunities ahead.

3. About us

The Joint Committee is formally constituted under the Local Government Act 2002, with members appointed by the Hawke's Bay Regional Council, Heretaunga Tamatea Settlement Trust, Hastings District Council, Mana Ahuriri Trust, Napier City Council and Maungaharuru-Tangitū Trust.

Our task is to develop a long-term adaptive plan for coastal hazards for the stretch of coastline between Tangoio in the North, and Clifton in the South. This is the most heavily populated coastal area in Hawke's Bay, encompassing the city of Napier and the coastal settlements of Clifton, Te Awanga, Haumoana, Clive, Awatoto, Bay View, Whirinaki and Tangoio.

These areas are predominantly low-lying and are exposed to risks from coastal erosion and coastal inundation. Sea level rise will increase these risks over time. Retreat is likely to be the only viable long-term solution for some communities.

Our project was the first in the country to follow the Dynamic Adaptive Pathways Planning (DAPP) approach recommended in the Ministry for the Environment document "*Coastal hazards and climate change: Guidance for local government*" released in December 2017 (MFE Guidance).

Our work has been profiled by Local Government New Zealand, Ministry for the Environment, Resilience to Nature's Challenges National Science Challenge, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and has been included as a case study in the National Adaptation Plan released in 2022.

Since we began this work in late 2014 we have:

- Commissioned detailed hazards and risk assessments and ground truthed these with affected communities.
- Developed decision-making processes for determining preferred options for responding to the risks identified.
- Completed cultural values, social impact, coastal ecology and economic assessments.
- Formed two community panels to work collaboratively on understanding risks, identifying and evaluating options, and recommending solutions to the Joint Committee.
- Determined and clarified the roles between the Hawke's Bay Regional Council and territorial authorities for implementing the Strategy.
- Developed draft adaptation thresholds for each community.
- Explored options for funding models and instruments, including a coastal contributory fund which would seek to build up funds overtime to offset the future cost of adaptation and more equitably spread costs across generations.

This process has taken longer than we expected; existing legislative settings have hindered our pace and progress.

The key remaining task that we are now focused on and developing is the funding model for implementation – that is, determining the relative contributions to Strategy implementation from rate payers and any other contributors.

Prior to Cyclone Gabrielle, the Strategy was planned for public notification and submissions in August 2023. That has now been delayed by 12 months given capacity and resource constraints within the Councils and our communities.

Through our work we believe that we are in the almost unique position of being able to share direct practical experience of every phase of the adaptation planning cycle outlined in the MfE Guidance. We believe we can assist the Committee with reflections on how this work sits within and interacts with the existing legislative frameworks and policies, and offer perspectives on what we believe is needed from central government to better enable effective adaptation planning and action for communities in New Zealand.

4. Submission Development

As a Joint Committee we meet approximately every 8 weeks to advance the work of our Strategy.

Unfortunately, the submissions period for this inquiry did not align with our meeting schedule, and capacity constraints have affected our ability to come together for a special meeting. We have years of experiences to share; compiling all of this experience and summarising it for the Committee has not been possible in the time available.

Instead, staff from the three Councils that have members on our Joint Committee (Hawke's Bay Regional Council, Napier City Council and Hastings District Council) held a joint workshop to consider and debate content for a submission. Over 22 staff attended from multiple areas of each council, demonstrating the importance of this issue to our region.

We provide on the following pages the outcome of that workshop as captured by staff.

We endorse these comments, and seek the opportunity to expand on these and our experiences by appearing in front of the Environment Committee at the appropriate time.

Given the collective approach taken by the Councils, it is likely that similar comments will be received by the Environment Committee from the other individual Councils involved in this workshop. We trust that the Environment Committee will understand that pooling resources is the most effective way for us to engage in this process given our constraints, and that any duplication reflects our aligned positions.

5. Staff Workshop on Issues and Options Paper

The following sections provide a summary of discussion points under the specific questions posed in the Community-led retreat and adaptation funding issues and options paper published by the Ministry for the Environment in anticipation of the inquiry.

There was insufficient time to traverse all questions posed by the issues and options paper. We wish to stress that while not all questions have been responded to in the following summary, this reflects the partner Councils' capacity constraints and not our collective interest in and support for debate on the full suite of questions posed.

Chapter 4: Risk Assessments

How many stages do you think are needed for risk assessment and what scale is appropriate for each of those stages?

There needs to be more tools/frameworks available to support risk assessments to be carried out at various scales, whether that's regional scale, community scale or assessments for specific assets. We need to ensure effective risk-based decision making is carried out, but that flexibility and local input is enabled. In our experience, the assessment of risk has been largely a technical one (understanding the likelihood of various future coastal erosion and inundation scenarios and their respective consequences). This is distinct from what communities might consider tolerable or intolerable risks.

How frequently should a risk-assessment be reviewed?

This should be driven by location-specific factors in the first instance. A framework that indicates the appropriate timeframes to review risk assessments based on the type of hazard and its risk level for each project would reduce the need to review every hazard on a set schedule and help reduce costs and resource needs. Alternatively, the time period for reviewing a particular risk assessment could be left open and flexible based on events (trigger points are reached to prompt a review) and locality with a guideline of 3-5 years to tie in with council timeframes.

What do you think makes a risk tolerable or intolerable (i.e. acceptable or unacceptable)?

The level of risk, which is subject to a number of multifaceted factors, including the community perception of what is important and what level of risk they would be willing to accept. Statistically the level of risk is based on: annual chance x lives lost x cost + people displaced + economic damage. It is also important to consider that tolerability will be fluid. The Joint Committee suggests that the tolerability of residual risk needs to be determined collaboratively, and through consultation including community, mana whenua, councils and central government. We acknowledge there is inherent bias to shorter-term thinking with a range of community interests, so this tends to place onus on councils to actively consider and plan for longer term future actions.

Do you think local risk assessments should be carried out or reviewed by a centralised agency or a local organisation? Why?

Assessments should be carried out locally using a national framework/methodology and reviewed centrally. It is imperative that local elements are included to determine what is relevant. Risk assessments carried out by local organisations to ensure local knowledge and community can be represented with audits by centralised agency to ensure consistency and quality of approach.

Should risk assessments be carried out only by technical experts or should other people also have a role? What role should other people and organisations have?

There needs to be a national framework which could be implemented locally and reviewed through a central government entity. Council suggests that there needs to have as broad a base as possible involved in regard to subject matter experts who each have a broad range of technical expertise. These will then be weighted accordingly.

Chapter 5: Local Adaptation Planning

Do you think there should be a requirement to undertake local adaptation planning? If so, should the trigger be based on the level of risk or something else?

If based on risk, this is appropriate. Adaptation planning is time and resource intensive and needs to be done in response to risk. The process needs to be assisted both through the provision of resources to achieve this in local government, as well as provisions or standards on how this should be undertaken. It is suggested that having a risk threshold or a matrix to help guide where / when adaptation planning is a requirement would be useful.

What direction should central government provide on the local adaptation planning process?

Central government should be around higher-level standard and framework setting. In this, there needs to be the development of clear, objective, scalable risk assessment processes outlined, clearly defined terms and thresholds. There also needs to be the development of legislation which is able to adequately define what level of risk should be taken into account for different planning scenarios and have mandatory requirements. There should be no "opt out" ability and this should be enforced by central government. We need investment in the planning process and into new technologies to encourage regional and local uptake of the framework.

Do you think there should be a requirement to plan for different scenarios, such as changes in the level of risk or what happens if there is a disaster? Why or why not?

There should be a requirement for the planning of different scenarios, this will allow the identification of different synergies across mitigations and encourage innovation. It is important however that any policy development is cognisant of resourcing and capacity requirements and ensures that there are appropriate mechanisms to fund the activities of local government.

How can we make sure that local adaptation planning is inclusive and draws on community views?

It is important to recognise and incorporate the fact that communities are not just geographical even in the natural hazards space; for example, Esk School is a community hub for multiple communities that were affected in different ways in the wake of Cyclone Gabrielle, but that felt connected as one community through their relationship with the school. We also need to engage with other "stakeholders" such as tourist organisations and businesses or institutions. There needs to be enough resourcing to be able to utilise community engagement teams in both local and central government to ensure wide community presence. It is also important to keep up with relevant research on best practices around how to engage with the community and be agile at changing our approach as best practice shifts.

Who do you think should make decisions about the adaptation pathway we choose and why? How should others be involved in the process?

It is essential that we include the community in these decisions and empower them to lead the process where appropriate. This will assist with the uptake of decisions through the

community and enables transparency on the risk if there was inaction. Strong trust-based relationships between Elected Members, their staff, and central government equivalents will be essential to ensure good, timely decision-making. Communities and individuals need to be brought along on the journey wherever possible to ensure as much buy-in as possible. Decision-making should not be left to technical experts with no holistic community-based lens applied. Decisions should be consistent regionally and linked to funding.

Chapter 6: Community-led Retreat

What do you think are the most important outcomes and principles for community-led retreat?

From Council's perspective the ultimate outcome should be the creation of resilient sustainable communities that are empowered and enabled to support themselves. We also consider the following outcomes from the consultation document to be essential:

- Increasing the physical and psychological safety of our people;
- Ensuring roles and responsibilities of all parties are clear;
- Giving effect to the principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi; and
- Ensuring equity between and within communities and generations.

When it comes to principles transparency, consideration of future generations, and a commitment to consensus and community empowerment are key. We need effective decision-making but the urgency of any retreat process should influence what approach is taken. We also considered the following principles from the consultation document to be key:

- Ensuring processes are fair, flexible, efficient, timely, and transparent;
- Ensuring decisions are evidence-based while accepting there will be some uncertainty;
- Involving communities in decisions that affect them; and
- Ensuring that iwi, hapū, and Māori are represented in governance and are empowered to partner with the Crown on retreat processes and outcomes for their people and whenua.

When it comes to making decisions about retreat, clear principles around what constitutes a mandate for retreat will be important. This will be necessary to ensure that a minority are not blocking retreat, while ensuring that communities are able to have a say in what happens, rather than being disempowered by processes that lack transparency and are imposed upon them.

Do you prefer option 1 (voluntary) or option 2 (a mix of voluntary and mandatory parts)? Are there any other options?

It is not realistic to expect a purely voluntary system to be effective when it comes to mass managed retreat. There will always be people who are not willing to leave and while forcing them to leave may not be appropriate, councils need to have the power to withdraw services when all other options have been exhausted, with a heavy focus on voluntary retreat whenever possible. Voluntary retreat is far more likely where communities are well educated on the issues, engaged with early, and empowered to be part of the decision-making process

and take ownership of decisions wherever possible. In some circumstances, situations may change suddenly to an intolerable risk and there may be no option when to employ a mandatory retreat process. However, even in those circumstances, the better informed and pre-prepared those communities are the less traumatic that process will be.

Do you agree that affected land should no longer be used at the end of a retreat process (with limited exceptions for things like ceremonial events, recreation, some agricultural or horticultural uses and mahinga kai gathering)? Why or why not?

This is heavily dependent on the specific retreat process and the type of risk – safety would need to be the paramount consideration, followed by the viability of the proposed land use.

We note the question actually carves out significant exceptions for post-retreat land use. We would add adaptation and biodiversity measures to the list (i.e. creating wetlands or nature reserves on the retreated land) to increase the resilience of the local environment and adjacent land. Whether and how Māori land should be used after retreat should be a conversation led by mana whenua. More broadly communities should be heavily involved in any decisions about future use of the land. It may be easier to build a mandate for retreat if communities know the land will be put to good use while it still can be.

We note example in Hawke's Bay where residential housing has retreated from the floor of Esk Valley because of the intolerable risk to life, the land however is perfectly suited to maintaining vineyards and crops so in this example the land should be able to be continued to be used for an activity which is consistent with the risk profile.

Do you agree that these powers are needed to ensure land is no longer used once a decision has been made to retreat? What powers do you consider are needed?

It will be important to ensure there are adequate but tightly controlled powers to ensure land is not inappropriately used after retreat and in particular to ensure environmental outcomes are achieved. There will need to be a clear, efficient, and timely process in legislation for the removal of existing use rights, e.g. land rezoning and other associated decisions. This will need to include clear powers around ownership and control of the land once it is retreated from, including what the land can be used for. What it can be used for post-retreat should be agreed with the community as part of the retreat process. The current RMA processes associated with rezoning and rules are highly litigious and costly, time-consuming legal action will stand in the way of good retreat processes. Individual interests still need to be protected but clear mechanisms that allow timely decisions will be essential.

What do you think the threshold or trigger should be for withdrawing services once a decision has been made to retreat?

Decisions around thresholds for withdrawing services should ideally be made in collaboration with affected communities. In situations where mandatory retreat becomes necessary this is likely to be the trigger for the withdrawal of services. It is unlikely there will be many situations where the entire community agrees to a voluntary retreat process, but services should not be withdrawn until the risk becomes intolerable and a mandatory retreat process is put in place.

In what circumstances, if any, do you think decision-makers should be protected from liability? What are your views on option A, option B, or any other possible option?

Clear rules will need to be established about when decision-makers will and will not be liable for decisions. Where a robust risk assessment and adaptation process has been followed, there should not be any liability. Such an approach would recognise that decision-makers should not be burdened with significant and constant litigation in response to fair and appropriate decisions. However, given the significance of retreat-related decisions, including unwinding 'existing use rights', some well-focussed grounds for decision-makers' liability is valid to ensure decision-making remains robust, fair and commensurate with the decisions being made. It will also be important to consider whether liability for inaction is appropriate, ensuring that doing nothing is not preferable to risking liability when taking action.

Chapter 7: Funding and Financing Adaptation

Which parts of the current system work well and which do not? Are there any other issues with our current approach to adaptation funding?

The biggest issue with the current approach is that risk lies where it falls, and this often leads to perverse outcomes. Often people do not have any real choice about where they live and there are significant equity issues at play in the housing options available for communities and individuals with less access to resources. We also lack a clear collective understanding of affordability and whether this is tied to the land value or the inherent risk of living there.

Councils cannot artificially disincentivise people from living in particular locations and the current system is not able to take into account the nuances of affordability and risk tolerance or to consider the pathway that leads to the problem. Councils need to be empowered to develop/encourage solutions for resilience at the point of development, not after the fact and financial incentivisation is required for this. There are no incentives for long term funding options which makes it hard both politically and legally to fund them – it is much easier to get something with an immediate demonstrable benefit funded, but this can lead to maladaptation. At this stage, there is a lack of involvement of key parts of the private sector including lifelines, banks, and insurers who need to be a part of these conversations and solutions.

The targeted rates system under s101(3) is useful – allows councils to consider exacerbators, consider community wide impacts, and split out targeted rates for specific properties. However, our inability to rate central government assets (those excluded under the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002) creates an unhelpful power imbalance when it comes to who is paying for protections/improvements. There is no funding mechanism for retreat at any scale, anywhere, requiring central government to intervene to enable retreat each time. The current rating system is based on growth and intensification with retreat being disincentivised.

The current system works well for transport with Waka Kotahi co-funding roading projects. In a similar manner, there needs to be adaptation funding and a clear process by which councils can access that funding.

What do you think are the most important outcomes and principles for funding and adaptation?

Outcomes:

We need to reduce our long-term costs by investing in addressing issues early and shifting the focus of investment from post-event to pre-event adaptation. We also need to ensure that Te Tiriti o Waitangi is given effect to.

Principles:

The key principle must be equity. As land becomes more marginal it becomes cheaper, drawing speculators and lower socio-economic groups to it. Lower socio-economic groups tend to lack financial resilience and have less support when things go wrong. We need to ensure that vulnerable groups are not perversely incentivised to move into high-risk areas as they become less tenable options. This is a likely outcome of allowing the market to drive change rather than government driving it. On top of this where significant natural disasters occur, for example Cyclone Gabrielle, the same communities who are generally more vulnerable are less able to cope with the impacts of that disaster. On a micro-level this is things like not having spare cash, or no food or petrol reserves. On a macro-level these communities have often had underinvestment in their infrastructure and lack insurance and alternate housing options.

In general, all people and groups who benefit from an adaptation action should pay, taking into account equity principles, including government agencies and utility providers. On the other side any group or organisation exacerbating issues, for example where there is encouragement to rebuild infrastructure and housing in disaster areas without appropriate adaptations, should be expected to financially contribute.

Finally, we need to shift behaviour and culture towards including adaptation in our thought processes and decision-making on both an individual and organisational scale and any funding framework should support the necessary work in adaptation planning.

In what circumstances (if any) do you think ratepayers and taxpayers should help people pay for the costs of adaptation?

Taxpayers and ratepayers are all vulnerable in some way and all need to contribute to the costs of adaptation. While there may be circumstances where property owners should be wholly responsible for the costs, these are likely to be limited given the lack of general awareness of risks to date and the social and economic consequences both locally and nationally of communities being displaced and financially devastated. The first question must be one of equity when considering who should pay for what. Ensuring that the benefits and support go to those who need it most is important.

In what circumstances should central government help councils to meet adaptation costs?

While central government cannot be expected to pay for everything, central government funding should generally be available to support adaptation in the same way that it is available to support roading. There needs to be a clear framework created which allows people to make good decisions with certainty long-term. For councils, we need to know that

if we follow a good risk assessment and adaptation planning process, funding will be available to support these projects, particularly where that funding may not be needed for 50 or 100 years. Any new developments should be able to demonstrate they are able to mitigate hazard risks without creating more adaptation costs long-term.

Investment in resilience prior to events is orders of magnitude lower in costs than recovering after an event; there is a strong business case for government to support improved resilience as it will reduce costs of response overall.

What are the benefits and challenges of providing financial support to people needing to retreat?

The reality is that without financial support many people will be unable or unwilling to retreat, the consequences will get worse, and the sense of community will erode. It is not realistic to expect that an enforcement approach without any form of incentive will be effective. There will be better outcomes, with lower costs overall (particularly when viewed through a holistic lens), resulting from providing support to make good decisions early, getting communities onboard, and supporting retreat once it becomes necessary. Now is the time to set up a system that ensures that commensurate financial support gets to the people who need it most. The current ad hoc approach does not ensure equitable division and creates a perverse sense of safety encouraging further development in high-risk areas.

There is a significant challenge around when financial support should occur. If people are willing to leave earlier and the council, third party agent or government is able to recoup some money through renting out those properties while they are still safe to occupy (this is probably more relevant to coastal retreat), it may be that a larger buy out is appropriate, compared with those who chose to wait until the last minute. Equally, it should be carefully considered whether persons who knowingly buy into properties within at-risk-areas should be treated differently from land holders who have had long-standing property interests and new information has revealed those properties are at-risk. However, we acknowledge providing no financial support at all where people choose to stay is likely to create significant hardship and challenges for a successful large-scale retreat strategy.

Are there any other approaches for providing support to people needing to retreat that we should consider?

Most important is taking into account that while financial support is important, it is not the only driver for decisions for individuals and communities and any support system must be willing to take a holistic view. Psychological support will be particularly important as people come to terms with significant change. Education also helps people to feel empowered, as well as allowing people and communities to be part of the process and given them genuine choices where there is the ability to do so, even if they are limited.

There should be funding available early in the process to ensure that good risk assessments and adaptation planning are carried out, rather than funding only being available for adaptation or retreat. Where retreat is required, funding should be available to make the best use of the land that has been retreated from.

What are the benefits and challenges of providing financial support to businesses needing to retreat?

A far more nuanced approach will be needed in this space. For a start smaller businesses and individual farms are likely to have less resilience and require more support to adapt. In the primary sector it is unlikely those businesses will be able to move, and their viability is essential for our economy so providing support makes sense. In other sectors the need for support may be less relevant as businesses will leave when they cannot get insurance. Working with the insurance sector to ensure that those businesses are retained within the wider community will be essential. Where a business provides for an essential community need there may be a better case for financial support. Further, it may not be appropriate to provide financial support to businesses which are adding to our emissions or choosing not to invest in adapting themselves.

What should be central government's initial funding priorities be and why? Which priorities are the most important and why?

Central government should prioritise invest in:

- Good quality holistic risk assessments to identify the greatest risk to life or intolerable risk and the lowest ability to pay. This can then drive a targeted and effective adaptation planning programme.
- Adaptation skills, training, and capability development in local governments who are at the coal face, which will help to ensure good adaptation is undertaken.
- Advancing the Climate Change Adaptation Bill to, among other matters, bring clarity of roles as between central government, regional councils and territorial authorities and others and set clear accountabilities and funding mechanisms. Too often risk assessments are undertaken at the local scale and then tangible actions to actually increase resilience are not completed due these aspects not being clearly defined.

6. Recommendations

Climate adaptation is one of our greatest challenges. In the Joint Committee's view, we need to move faster, and more efficiently. We owe it to our communities to lift the standard and increase resilience. We cannot sit back and wait for the more catastrophic events like Cyclone Gabrielle to drive change.

There are a wide range of legislative and practical barriers that are holding us back from effective local adaptation planning and action. The Joint Committee has had first-hand experiences with a number of those and some of those experiences have been documented in recent case studies. As such, we welcome this Inquiry, and urge the Environment Committee to seek in-depth engagement with this Committee and others who have attempted this journey and have real and practical experiences to share.

We look forward to future engagement on this critical issue.



19 April 2024

Environment Committee
Parliament Buildings
Wellington

via email to: en@parliament.govt.nz

Submission on Fast-track Approvals Bill 2024

1. Introduction

2. This submission is from Clifton to Tangoio Coastal Hazards Strategy Joint Committee ('Joint Committee'), formed by members appointed by the Hawke's Bay Regional Council, Tamatea Pokai Whenua, Hastings District Council, Mana Ahuriri Trust, Napier City Council and Maungaharuru-Tangitū Trust. Refer to Appendix 1 for more about the Joint Committee.

3. We do wish to appear before the Committee to speak to our submission.

4. Our work

5. The Joint Committee is formally constituted under the Local Government Act 2002. Our task is to develop a long-term adaptive plan for coastal hazards for the stretch of coastline between Tangoio in the north, and Clifton in the south.

6. The Joint Committee has extensive experience working with existing communities who are exposed to natural hazards risks. We know firsthand how challenging and complex these problems are. As an indication of these complexities, just some of the questions we have attempted to find answers to include:

- What is tolerable risk and how do we define that?
- How does risk tolerance change over time and how do we track that?
- Whose risk tolerance do we take into account or prioritise?
- How do we balance risk mitigation, affordability, and environmental considerations?
- What happens to people, communities and the environment if we do nothing about the increasing risks from natural hazards?
- What happens to our natural environment if we start changing it to increase resilience?
- How do we fairly apportion the costs for risk mitigation projects?
- Through taking action to increase resilience, how do we avoid creating perverse incentives for increased investment and development in at risk locations?
- How do we plan for, fund and implement retreat at a community scale?

7. What does our work mean in the context of the Bill proposing a new system for fast-tracking approvals?

8. There are three key themes to our submission:

- a. decision-making on fast-track approvals that undermine our coastal hazard planning
- b. projects being granted fast-track approvals that undermine our coastal hazard planning
- c. the Bill as an opportunity for our projects and programmes of work to be approved swiftly.

Fast-track approval decision-making failing to consider local natural hazard strategies and works

9. The challenges we are grappling with as a Joint Committee have been created by past decisions to approve and/or enable development in locations that are now exposed to high risks from natural hazards. Without proper safeguards, the Bill could compound those challenges whereby approvals are granted for national and regionally significant projects, but have local impacts and consequences now and into the future.
10. Over the past twelve months or so in Hawke's Bay, we have acutely experienced the consequences of past decisions. By way of an example, following Cyclone Gabrielle, the Future of Severely Affected Land (FOSAL) risk categorisation framework will mean that costs from those past decisions to approve development will be borne by ratepayers and taxpayers.
11. While past decisions were not made with the benefit of the hazards information available to us today, we are concerned that decisions, (including those to be made under fast-track approval legislation) will continue to be made that will perpetuate this problem for future generations. We are concerned that the Bill's relatively 'lightweight' requirements for decision-makers to actively consider natural hazard risks will compound those problems – not only now, but also for the foreseeable future. It is imperative that considerations of climate change impacts and natural hazards risks are strengthened before the Bill is passed.
12. We take the view that as a region, and country, we cannot continue to make decisions that will place people, homes, businesses and infrastructure in areas where the risks from natural hazards are, or are likely to be, significant in the short, medium or longer term. This is particularly crucial for those projects that are supposedly being advanced for fast-tracked approvals on the basis that they have significant regional and national benefits.
13. We submit that the Bill needs to be amended to ensure decisions are made with an increased awareness of natural hazards, risks (current and future), and local adaptation strategies (where they exist). This could be achieved by amending:
 - a. Clause 14(3)(v) (or similar) to ensure the applicant and application provide a thorough evaluation of natural hazard impacts on the project as well as how the project may be affected by climate change and natural hazards.
 - b. Clause 17(3)(j) to read (or similar) "is consistent with local or regional planning documents, including spatial strategies, **Future Development Strategies and any council-approved strategy relating to management of natural hazards or climate change.**"
14. We further consider that national direction and the provision through legislation of more effective regulatory tools for local government are required to support effective decision-making in this regard.

Projects being granted fast-track approvals that undermine our extensive coastal hazard planning work

15. The Strategy has been a deliberately community-based project. We have worked extensively with, and been guided by, mana whenua and community members to get to this point. We describe our work as a "community-up" rather than "council-down" approach.
16. The Bill represents a significant departure from this philosophy. Yet we have found that meaningful collaboration has been the greatest strength of this project so far. We caution against a legislative process that excludes or minimises meaningful input from those that are directly affected by the decisions being made.

Opportunity for projects and programmes of work recommended in our Strategy being fast-tracked

17. Our work developing a long-term strategy for managing coastal hazards has identified a package of preferred adaptive measures over short, medium and long terms. Concept design work and cost estimates have been

prepared for those capital works featured in the preferred first adaptive 'step' (for example, gravel nourishment and the construction of coastal groynes to respond to immediate risks from erosion and inundation).

18. However, we are still working through complexities of funding future delivery of the strategy and this work has not been confirmed in any councils' Long Term Plan. So our projects are not yet 'application ready.' We do know that activities involved in many of the preferred works would require resource consents and probably a variety of approvals under other legislation.
19. If the Bill does pass into legislation, then we anticipate that the fast-track approvals process will offer an opportunity for us to progress those preferred works into the fast-track approvals process. Based on the extensive community input to date, we believe those preferred works would have significant regional benefits in terms of supporting our communities to adapt to the increasing impacts of a changing climate, particularly rising sea levels.
20. However, and noting our commentary above in relation to the collaborative approach we are taking, we consider that this would only be appropriate once the Strategy itself has been widely endorsed through the public consultation process we intend to undertake later in 2024. In this context, it may be that standard resource consent process represents a full re-litigation of matters already developed collaboratively and tested and confirmed through public consultation.
21. We raise this point to highlight for consideration that particularly in relation to our works proposed for climate change adaptation, the application of a fast track process may have some merit, providing there is a strong community developed mandate for the proposed actions and works.

22. Conclusions and Recommendations

23. Our mandate as a Joint Committee is to prepare a strategy for communities in Hawke's Bay already exposed to natural hazards risks.
24. The purpose of this submission is to provide an insight on some of the challenges of our extensive work; highlight the opportunity for the Bill to be used to deliver some of our strategy's projects providing a community mandate is confirmed, and also ask the Environment Committee to recommend amendments to the Bill for additional safeguards so that we can avoid further challenges, expense, and headaches in the future.
25. Thank you for the opportunity to make this submission on the Fast-track Approvals Bill.

Yours sincerely



Jerf van Beek
Chair, Clifton to Tangoio Coastal Hazards Strategy Joint Committee
Councillor, Hawke's Bay Regional Council

Address for service:

Hawke's Bay Regional Council
Private Bay 6006
Napier 4142
Attn: Gavin Ide, Principal Advisor Strategic Planning
e: gavin@hbrc.govt.nz | p: 06 835 9200

Appendix 1 – About the Clifton to Tangoio Coastal Hazards Strategy Joint Committee

The Joint Committee is formally constituted under the Local Government Act 2002, with members appointed by the Hawke’s Bay Regional Council, Tamatea Pokai Whenua (prev. Heretaunga Tamatea Settlement Trust), Hastings District Council, Mana Ahuriri Trust, Napier City Council and Maungaharuru-Tangitū Trust.

Our task is to develop a long-term adaptive plan for coastal hazards for the stretch of coastline between Tangoio in the North, and Clifton in the South. This is the most heavily populated coastal area in Hawke’s Bay, encompassing the city of Napier and the coastal settlements of Clifton, Te Awanga, Haumoana, Clive, Awatoto, Bay View, Whirinaki and Tangoio.

These areas are predominantly low-lying and are exposed to risks from coastal erosion and coastal inundation. Sea level rise will increase these risks over time. Retreat is likely to be the only viable long-term solution for some communities.

Our project was the first in the country to follow the Dynamic Adaptive Pathways Planning (DAPP) approach recommended in the Ministry for the Environment document “Coastal hazards and climate change: Guidance for local government” released in December 2017 (MfE Guidance).

Our work has been profiled by Local Government New Zealand, Ministry for the Environment, Resilience to Nature’s Challenges National Science Challenge, the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and has been included as a case study in the National Adaptation Plan released in 2022.

Since we began this work in late 2014 we have:

- Commissioned detailed hazards and risk assessments and ground truthed these with affected communities.
- Developed decision-making processes for determining preferred options for responding to the risks identified.
- Completed cultural values, social impact, coastal ecology and economic assessments.
- Formed two community panels to work collaboratively on understanding risks, identifying and evaluating options, and recommending solutions to the Joint Committee.
- Determined and clarified the roles between the Hawke’s Bay Regional Council and territorial authorities for implementing the Strategy.
- Developed draft adaptation thresholds for each community.
- Explored options for funding models and instruments, including a coastal contributory fund which would seek to build up funds overtime to offset the future cost of adaptation and more equitably spread costs across generations.

This process has taken longer than we expected; existing legislative settings have hindered our pace and progress.

The key remaining task that we are now focused on and developing is the funding model for implementation – that is, determining the relative contributions to Strategy implementation from rate payers and any other contributors.

Prior to Cyclone Gabrielle, the Strategy was planned for public notification and submissions in August 2023. That has now been delayed by approximately 12 months given capacity and resource constraints within the Councils and our communities.



**HERETAUNGA
HASTINGS**
DISTRICT COUNCIL



Clifton to Tangoio Coastal Hazards Strategy Joint Committee

14 June 2024

Subject: Communications and engagement update

Reason for report

1. This report updates the committee on communications and engagement since May 2024, and discusses the communications and engagement plan for the period July – September 2024.

Background

2. A communications and engagement strategy is guiding efforts to reconnect with the community over the next four months for pre-consultation engagement and formal consultation on the Strategy.
3. This plan aims to:
 - 3.1. maintain and increase community understanding of, interest in, and build buy-in to the coastal hazards mahi.
 - 3.2. enable and facilitate meaningful engagement with communities using effective and innovative approaches.
 - 3.3. align with and complement engagement activities occurring through the Mātauranga Māori Workstream.

Discussion

4. There has been a low level of engagement activity since the last Joint Committee meeting as the focus of the Strategy has been on funding model development and testing.
5. As brought to the last Joint Committee meeting in May, further communications and engagement will occur in two phases over the next four months.
6. In the lead up to HBRC's formal Strategy consultation in September, we will be engaging with the community over a three-week period in July (1-21) to provide information to assist understanding of the proposed Strategy.
7. TAG is in the process of confirming Joint Committee member availability to attend events and support with communications during this period.
8. Pre-consultation engagement will include:
 - 8.1. A three-part video series which will take the community through the coastal hazard risks, the development process of the Strategy, the proposed short-term solutions, the principles of the funding model, and the next steps of implementing the strategy. These videos will be fronted by a combination of Joint Committee and TAG members.
 - 8.2. A number of community events were proposed in the initial engagement plan shown to the Joint Committee in December 2023. Since then the number and types of events has been amended to fit within the wider Regional Council engagements for 2024. TAG have

agreed to facilitate three community pop-ups, which is where a stall is set up with TAG and Joint Committee members at an event or place where the community are. At the request of the Joint Committee Chair we will continue to plan for two community meetings. As the focus of this pre-consultation engagement is to inform the community on the mahi of the Strategy, and in particular communicate coastal hazard risks and show in detail the proposed solutions, we will also hold two coastal walks and talks with the engineering staff to walk the community through the proposed interventions along the coast at Westshore, Haumoana and Te Awanga.

- 8.3. Matahiwi Marae have reached out to the strategy team to seek some engagement. We will confirm details for this with the Joint Committee once it is confirmed.
 - 8.4. Two media releases and two opinion pieces will be shared with the community to highlight the overall ongoing work and the events and information available ahead of formal consultation. The opinion pieces will come from Joint Committee members.
 - 8.5. A social media campaign will sit alongside the video series and media collateral over the three-week period, covering in more detail the risks, proposed solutions, funding principles, address community concerns, and more. We will use partner channels to distribute the messaging appropriately, including tangata whenua.
 - 8.6. The website will be refined and updated with content to make it easier for the community to understand what is being proposed. As part of this, a short survey will be developed asking the community questions around the funding model principles including their willingness to pay to reduce exposure to natural hazard risks, implementation timeline, and the proposed solutions and their impact.
 - 8.7. A community newsletter will be sent out following this Joint Committee meeting, and cover the May Joint Committee meeting. It will be timed it to let the community know about pre-consultation engagement, including the events and information available. This will also be shared through partner channels, including tangata whenua.
 - 8.8. CoastSnap will be launched during pre-engagement, which will involve one of the media releases, website updates, social media, and a short video.
9. Formal consultation is proposed to occur through the month of September as a proposed amendment to HBRC's Long Term Plan. This will include a consultation document and submission form, media, social media, events, advertising, videos, and other initiatives.

Next steps

10. TAG will be commencing pre-consultation engagement in July.
11. Reporting at each Joint Committee meeting will be provided to update on engagement activities and outcomes.
12. In addition, Joint Committee members will be advised of key engagement activities by email, so they have the opportunity to participate. In some cases, TAG will be asking for Joint Committee members to attend / present at events and we will be seeking your availability for those events in due course.

Decision-making process

13. 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 *Communications and engagement update* staff report.

Authored by:

Simon Bendall
Coastal Hazards Strategy Project Manager

Rebecca Ashcroft
Consultant Frank Engagement

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

14 June 2024

Subject: Current coastal projects update

Reason for report

1. This report provides an opportunity for the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) to update the Joint Committee on various coastal projects that members have expressed an interest in keeping abreast of.

Westshore resource consent renewal

2. This work package is to secure a new consent for the renourishment of Westshore Beach that expires in 2027.
3. Discussions have been held with NCC regarding the alignment of the gravel bund and the option to extend the rock armouring of the Rangatira sea wall. Extension of the sea wall was not considered as an option thus far due to the high cost. We are considering an alternative solution. Extension of the bund to tie into seawall is the preferred short-term solution with while the alternative sea wall long term solution is confirmed and designed. Other options will be considered during the review of the renourishment programme.
4. Annual beach renourishment works for 2024 have been completed. Monitoring of the bund performance over autumn and winter is underway. The design for the 2025/26 renourishment will begin in July.
5. Consent costs will vary depending on what type of works will be considered in the future.
 - 5.1. Costs associated with the continuation of the beach renourishment option will be similar.
 - 5.2. For the construction of a structure on the foreshore (i.e. groynes or rock revetment) the consent requirements will increase due to additional engineering and environmental investigations so consultation will be required. For comparison, an initial cost estimate of \$1.4M has been received for the extension of the rock armouring (79m) to the Rangatira sea wall.
6. On completion of the beach renourishment works review, the consenting costs for the preferred option will be able to be better defined.

Haumoana shingle crest height

7. No further activity in this period.

Haumoana 18

8. No further activity in this period.

Maraetotara River at Te Awanga

9. The Te Awanga community reps have submitted to both Hastings District Council and Hawke's Bay Regional Council's LTP processes seeking direction on next steps and funding, as part of furthering this project.

Whirinaki

10. No further activity in this period.

Coastal Inundation Assessment Project update

11. Nothing further to report. Business as usual.

Hawke's Bay Climate Action

12. The next meeting of the Climate Action Joint Committee is scheduled on 5 August.
13. The Joint Committee will continue to progress a Climate Action Plan with a focus on emissions reduction and climate adaptation.
14. Of interest to the Joint Committee is an external advisor has been engaged to scope what a Climate Vulnerability Risk Assessment would entail and scan what is happening nationwide in this space. The early findings will be presented to the Climate Action Joint Committee in August.

Decision-making process

15. 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 the *Current coastal projects update*.

Authored by:

Simon Bendall
Coastal Hazards Strategy 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

14 June 2024

Subject: Update on follow-ups from previous meetings

Reason for report

1. This item tracks items raised at previous meetings that require action. A list of outstanding items is prepared for each meeting, including 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 *Update on follow-ups from previous meetings*.

Authored by:

Simon Bendall
Coastal Hazards Strategy Project Manager

Approved by:

Chris Dolley
Group Manager Asset Management

Attachment/s

- 1 [↓](#) Actions from previous Joint Committee meetings

Clifton to Tangoio Coastal Hazards Strategy Joint Committee

17 May 2024 Meeting

	Agenda Item	Actions	Responsible	Status/Comment
1	Project Manager's update	Invite Te Awanga community members involved in the Crest Armouring Proposal to present at the next meeting.	Governance/ Simon	Completed. Te Awanga community members will be in attendance at the 14 June meeting.
2	Project Manager's update	Develop an analysis of the proposal for the Te Awanga crest armouring and its implications for the Strategy.	TAG	Work in progress. Outcome to be informed by the 14 June presentation and presented to the 5 July Joint Committee meeting.
3	Project Manager's update	Provide updates on the Select Committee process for the Government inquiry into climate adaptation.	TAG	Complete. Refer to Project Manager's Report for update.
4	Mātauranga Māori workstream update	Supply Tamatea Pōkai Whenua with a compilation of records of engagement with mana whenua and key outcomes.	TAG	Work in progress.
5	Regulatory Workstream Update	Circulate and socialise the Regulatory Report with officers across relevant projects and with planning teams – particularly table 4.	TAG	Complete. Refer to Project Manager's Report for update.
6	Regulatory Workstream Update	Report back on Regional Policy Statement activity at the June Joint Committee meeting.	TAG	Work in progress. Key TAG members have been affected by illness. A verbal update will be provided on HBRC's Kotahi Plan project and update of the Regional Policy Statement review.