

**RE: COMMUNITY-LED COASTAL ADAPTATION PLANNING PROCESS
OPTIONS FOR ESTABLISHING COMMUNITY PANELS – “DISCUSSION DRAFT”**

Introduction

This paper provides advice, as part of the Co-Design process associated with the Council’s planning for establishing Community-Led Panels to advise on coastal adaptation issues, regarding options for the make-up and geographic extent of the Panel areas.

How the Hawke’s Bay Panels were Determined

In 2016 I advised the three Hawke’s Bay Councils on Panel set-up options associated with the Clifton to Tangoio Coastal Hazards Strategy. In that case Tonkin and Taylor had identified 16 specific coastal units in the project area and we assessed a range of Assessment Panel option configurations including:

- All Units Together (16 cells)
- Coastal Hazard Areas (5 cells)
- River Boundaries (4 cells)
- North / Central / South (3 cells)
- North / South (2 cells)
- Combined (1 cell)

The Hawke's Bay recommendation was for the North /South Option, where two panels were formed to cover the area from the Port of Napier through to Tangoio, and the Port of Napier south to Clifton. The reasons for this recommendation were:

- Grouped units with interrelated coastal processes;
- Ensured that each partner Council was jurisdictionally involved in both Panel areas; and
- Struck a good balance between administrative and process cost efficiency and community representation, too many panels would be difficult to operate, but with fewer panels the number of panel members required for representation purposes increases.

The two Hawke's Bay Panels were subsequently established, and their work and recommendations are reported in: *Clifton to Tangoio Coastal Hazards Strategy, Report of the Northern and Southern Cell Assessment Panels. Final Report, 14 February 2018.*

Kāpiti Background and Factors

In July 2014 the Kāpiti Coast District Council resolved to withdraw the coastal hazard provisions notified in the District Plan Review and also that:

- The Council endorse the formulation of a Coastal Advisory Group (CAG) with membership from key statutory agencies, neighbouring councils, submitters, coastal landowner and community representatives with an independent chair.
- That staff develop a draft terms of reference for the CAG and identify the skills / attributes of potential group members for Council consideration.

A draft terms of reference was developed for the CAG, but this was never finalised and implemented. This draft envisaged a single "Advisory Group" looking at all the coastal hazard issues up and down the coast within the KCDC boundaries (Paekākāriki to Ōtaki).

In the following period (2015 to 2019):

1. A number of court processes were initiated which have now been concluded. Agreements were entered into between:
 - the Council and North Ōtaki Beach Residents Group (NOBRG)
 - the Council and Coastal Ratepayers United (CRU).
2. These agreements included commitments that the Council keep NOBRG and CRU reasonably updated on developments affecting coastal hazards it is aware of (including its work engaging with Wellington Regional Council and central government). The agreements also include commitments around:

Engagement with the community

- the Council engaging with the community, including NOBRG and CRU, early in the process of addressing coastal hazards, including:
 - considering how to respond to central and regional government legislative and policy initiatives in relation to coastal hazard management;
 - considering the nature and extent of the coastal hazard science that may be required;
 - identifying the coastal hazards problem definition; and
 - commencing the policy development process, including the alternative responses to the identified coastal hazards problem(s).

Community consultation

- the Council consulting with the community:
 - in relation to proposed management responses to the coastal hazards problem(s) identified as part of the Schedule 1 RMA process and in accordance with the principles of consultation set out in section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002; and
 - prior to formally notifying a coastal hazards plan change under Schedule 1 of the RMA, KCDC will also release a draft for public consultation.

Evaluation of a range of options

- the Council evaluating an appropriate range of management options for coastal hazards management, including those summarised in ES.7 of Carley et al¹ and considering:
 - a range of possible responses (not restricted just to hazard lines) to manage levels of development in the coastal environment to manage risks of coastal hazards; and
 - the potential need to address separate areas of the Kapiti Coast differently, in the event that different risk profiles are identified in those areas.

- 3. On 5 August 2019 the Greater Wellington Regional Council released a report prepared by Mitchell Daysh entitled “*Preparing Coastal Communities for Climate Change: Assessing Coastal Vulnerability to Climate Change, Sea Level Rise and Natural Hazards*”. This report identified Thirty-four separate coastal units across the Wellington region (with the exception of Wellington City). These units were grouped together because they were geographically linked.

- 4. This meant that each unit would be similar in its geomorphic characteristics and subsequently have a similar level of hazard. The coastal units were established by Dr Iain Dawe (Greater Wellington), with input from the Reference Group and the WRCCWG sub-group, and generally follow the logical identified coastal communities and distinct areas of the coastline of the region. A vulnerability heat map was outlined in the report which assessed the relative vulnerability of coastal communities to the effects of a modelled sea level rise/storm event scenario in order to inform future decision-making.

¹ Carley et al “Coastal Erosion Hazard Assessment for the Kapiti Coast: Review of the Science Assessments Undertaken for the Proposed and Considered Kapiti Coast District Plan” – June 2014.

Identified Coastal Units in the GWRC Study

Of the thirty-four coastal units, the report identified eight specific coastal units sit within the Kapiti District, as set out below:

No.	Coastal Unit	Territorial Authority	Features of this Unit
1	Ōtaki	Kāpiti Coast District Council	<p>The northern point of the unit is the edge of the boundary with Horowhenua District (before Waikawa Beach).</p> <p>Unit includes the beachfront area of Ōtaki Beach, Ōtaki River mouth and floodplain, and the Waitohu Stream.</p> <p>In total this area includes 7.74km of coastline and encompasses the natural beach environment of Ōtaki River mouth and beach.</p>
2	Te Horo	Kāpiti Coast District Council	<p>Northern extent is from south of the Ōtaki River mouth.</p> <p>The southern point is area north of Peka Peka and encompasses 4.65km of coastline. This coastal area includes the rocky beach at the northern end of Te Horo and extends to the sandy beach which has been subject to an era of accretion along the coast towards Peka Peka.</p>
3	Peka Peka	Kāpiti Coast District Council	<p>This unit extends from north of Peka Peka towards Waikanae Beach.</p> <p>5.47km of coastline.</p>

No.	Coastal Unit	Territorial Authority	Features of this Unit
4	Waikanae	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Northern point is an area north of Waikanae Beach through to the southern bank of the Waikanae River area before Paraparaumu Beach. Unit includes Waikanae River and estuary, and the Waimeha stream. 4.36km of coastline.
5	Paraparaumu	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Northern point is an area south of the Waikanae River. Southern point is area north of Raumati Beach. Unit includes a bend in the coastline. 4.69km of coastline.
6	Raumati	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Northern point is area north of Raumati Beach. Southern point is area north of Queen Elizabeth Park. Unit includes Wharemauku Stream. 4.63km of coastline.
7	Queen Elizabeth Park	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Greater Wellington boundaries of Queen Elizabeth Park. 3.48km of coastline.
8	Paekākāriki	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Northern point is area where Queen Elizabeth Park turns into Paekākāriki. Southern point is area before Centennial Highway (where jurisdiction changes from Kāpiti Coast District Council to Porirua City Council). 4.03km of coastline.

The Vulnerability heat map for these eight Coastal Units from the GWRC report is included in Appendix A of this letter.

There are a range of Options which might be considered for the establishment of Community-Led Coastal Adaptation Panels ranging from a single Panel that covers the whole District through to eight separate Panels, with a range of configurations in between. For the purpose of this advice I have prepared a table showing possible options and potential advantages/disadvantages.

Assessment Panel Options	Pros	Cons
<p>1. Separate Units (Eight Panels)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with areas used in GWRC Vulnerability assessment • Would enable a very fine grain assessment of issues in each specific unit • High resolution means greater say for each community of interest in what happens for their particular part of the coast 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eight Decision making processes would be inefficient, time-consuming and very costly • Administratively highly complex and highly resource intensive • High risk of inconsistent decision making • Logical communities of interest across different units would not be able to be able to be easily communicated and considered • Difficulties establishing high numbers of representative groups • Process will take a long time • High risk of failing to recognise coastal processes and the impacts of decisions made on one part of the coast affecting another part • This number of panels would be difficult for the community to engage with

Assessment Panel Options	Pros	Cons
<p>2. Community Board Areas (Four Panels)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses established Community Board areas which would provide a good logical Council focus for the Panel (but see associated con regarding the alignment of the community Board areas not being exact) • Good ability to have local representatives looking at specific local issues and easier to keep the numbers on each of the Panels to the ideal number of between 10 and 15 individuals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four Community Board areas do not exactly align with the eight coastal units identified in the GWRC Study. • Facilitating four Panels would be a costly and administratively time-consuming process for the Council to coordinate. • May not take full account of interrelated coastal processes in decision making (e.g. potential linkages associated with the Paraparaumu and Waikanae coastal units)
<p>3. Priority Areas Only (Ōtaki Unit as one Panel and Waikanae / Paraparaumu /Raumati Units together as a second Panel (Two Panels)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This takes a focused approach by concentrating on the two areas within Kāpiti District that were identified as higher priorities in the GWRC Vulnerability Report. • Two Panels strikes a good balance between administrative and process cost efficiency of the assessment process and the ability to involve a range of people representing relevant communities of interest in the two Assessment Panels, without having the Panels too large which would be an issue if only one Panel was established. • The Te Horo unit could be added to Ōtaki Panel area if that was deemed appropriate? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not address other areas which do have specific coastal hazards issues – e.g. Paekākāriki • Council would need to ensure areas not covered by the Panels were involved and fully consulted when preparing for the wider coastal District Plan variation exercise through a separate and well-coordinated process.
<p>4. Split at Waikanae River. One Panel North and one Panel South of the Waikanae River (Two Panels)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Takes an inclusive approach by assessing the whole of the Districts coastline. • Two Panels strikes a good balance between administrative and process cost efficiency of the assessment process and the ability to involve a range of people representing relevant communities of interest in the two Assessment Panels, without having the Panels too large, which would be an issue if only one Panel was established. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does include some areas where low vulnerability was assessed in the GWRC report i.e. Pekapeka

Assessment Panel Options	Pros	Cons
5. Whole of District (One Panel)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administratively simpler – one group, one process • Takes account of all interrelated coastal processes • Looks at the District comprehensively in terms of Coastal Hazards which will be required for the upcoming coastal District Plan variation process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very large area means a large representative group to cover all interests – difficult to manage as part of a multi-criteria assessment process, where between 10 to 15 participants is an ideal number. This could create concern about under-representation of some groups, or otherwise the need to establish a very large Panel which is less participatory. • Would be more difficult to facilitate a focus on particular communities of interest and their specific issues.

Need for Co-ordination the Whole of District / One Panel Option is Not Chosen

If the Council does ultimately to work with two or more Panels, consideration should be given to how best to coordinate between the panels to ensure the best use of resources and to avoid repetition.

Ways of achieving this include:

1. Establishing an overall Coastal Hazards co-ordinating / steering group with representation from each Panel along with Council, Iwi, GWRC and DoC.
2. Utilising joint sessions from time to time, for example the early establishment meetings that will explain and develop the assessment process and for sharing key areas of knowledge and science.

Draft Letter Prepared as a basis for Discussion at 11 November

This draft has been provided as a “Discussion Draft” to prompt thinking and add to as part of the upcoming Coastal Adaptation Co-Design Workshop planned for 11 November 2019.

Yours sincerely,

Stephen Daysh
Mitchell Daysh Ltd

Email address

DRAFT