

**Minutes:**

**CAP Meeting – Northern Adaptation Area: Risk Assessments, Objectives, and Options**

**Date:** Wednesday 29 March 2023

**Time:** 1.30pm – 4.30 pm

**Location:** Nga Manu Nature Reserve  
(MS teams- link in invite)

**Attendees:**

Jim Bolger (Chair), Donald Day, Martin Manning, Susie Mills, John Barrett, Jeremiah Mateparae, Te Rangimārie Williams, Stephen Daysh, Kris Pervan, Elspeth McIntyre, Sandhira Naidoo, Ashlyn Gallagher, Yvonna Chrzanowska, Derek Todd, Kate MacDonald, Iain Dawe, Moira Poutama, Dr Aroha Spinks, Rhys Girvan, Andy McKay, Rachael Ashdown, and Abbey Morris

**Observers:** Cam Butler

**Apologies:** Jason Holland, Melanie McCormick, Deanna Rudd, Olivia Bird

Agenda Item	Comments
<b>Opening &amp; Introductions</b>	<b>Welcome</b> from Jim Bolger, CAP Chair <b>Opening Karakia</b> from John Barrett.
<b>Actions from previous meeting</b>	<b>Confirmation of the Minutes &amp; Tabling Seawall Update</b>  John motioned to move the minutes with minor edits.  Martin seconded the changes.
<b>Update: Council’s Work Regarding Dune Planting Work</b>	<b>Andy McKay and Rachael Ashdown, KCDC</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Andy and Rachel updated the CAP on Council’s work regarding dune planting with the aid of slides and walked the CAP through the ideal planting species and issues that the dunes are facing.</li> </ul> <b>Discussion:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chair questioned the percentage of planting which is provided compared to what is needed. Andy indicated it is less than 1%;</li> <li>• Stephen queried what the importance of driftwood is, Andy confirmed it is good for sheltering for birds and collecting sand;</li> <li>• Chair queried the effectiveness of planting and if Andy believes they are fixing the problem. Andy explains that they (KCDC and volunteer groups) are working on the edges of the issues. With the scale of the Kāpiti coastline, in some instances heavy machinery may need to be brought in to lessen slopes to allow for more effective planting; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Rachel explained there has been 25 years of work on the Waitohu Stream mouth with positive outcomes of the dunes growing due to native planting;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Chair queried if planting will be effective fast enough to protect the people living in the area in a short timeframe, or if managed retreat should be considered to make it safe for the houses.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Andy shared as an example there needs to be consideration for areas such as at the top of Manly Street where homes are 2-3 metres above sea level and only small areas of dunes exist as they are more vulnerable. Andy continued that there are not a lot of options in terms of soft solutions but that it is certainly something that needs to be focused on;</li> <li>○ Iain added that in his previous volunteer work with a low budget there was success in planting;</li> <li>● Te Rangimārie questioned if the Takutai Kāpiti work considers the planting mahi being shared by Andy and Rachel. Council staff confirmed this, and Andy added that their current work is centred round areas where there are active volunteer groups already not where areas are at the most risk and asked the CAP to consider that as a part of their work;</li> <li>● Chair added that the CAP will need to give consideration rate implications and the costs to perform these things;</li> <li>● Susie (CAP) and Rachel (KCDC) shared that they both attended a Coast Care conference in Auckland and noted that efforts other groups have made are huge and the learnings that children have made in that process. Both reminded the CAP that if managed retreat was proposed in a location, there would still be an issue where plants will be needed to be placed to build up dunes. Iain agreed and added that as dunes erode, they will look to stabilise and continue to move;</li> <li>● The Chair asked if ‘we’ need to defend the line now, and Jerry added that he believes that it depends on when and how it is done.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Presentation of Risk Assessments for Northern Adaptation Area</b> <i>(Facilitated information session with discussion)</i></p>	<p><b>Stephen Daysh, Mitchell Daysh &amp; Kate MacDonald, Jacobs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Kate presented the Risk Assessments with the help of slides. Kate and Stephen walked the room through a high-level look at the currently completed risk assessments for the Northern Adaptation Area, covering what they are and why they are needed;</li> <li>● Kate made an important point that the risk assessments cannot cover everything and instead they are targeted risk assessments, and are in alignment with what is set out (as a minimum) by Ministry for the Environment.</li> <li>● Kate covered key take aways from the Built Environment, the Ecological, the Human, and the Natural Character domains;</li> <li>● Kate noted that the Cultural Risk Assessment is not yet finalised and will be brought to the next CAP workshop with the overall risk assessment report.</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Stephen requested an update on the latest Awa flooding work. Derek shared that there is no further information to add to date and that any further information will be incorporated later if any updated information results in any differences.</li> <li>● Abbey shared that she is meeting with Awa later in the week and will be looking for an update. Abbey confirmed it will not be ready in time for the Northern Adaptation Area but noted that if there are any</li> </ul>

	<p>discrepancies, there is potentially time at the end of the project that it can be factored in retrospectively;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Martin commented that the SSP scenarios being used (SSP2 – 4.5 and SSP5 – 8.5) are only mid-range estimates and are conservative. Martin shared his concern that the project is not using an appropriate scenario. Kate confirmed the project is following the Ministry for the Environment national guidance for local government for the SSP scenarios;             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Aroha questioned if it was possible to show the highest scenarios and what that would look like for this project. Kate confirms that the graph on slide 8 of the NAA Risk Assessment Presentation shows the two scenarios looking at the current likely scenario and the upper limit showing 4 degrees of warming; and</li> <li>○ Kate confirmed the Jacobs Volume 2: Results report did look at the 8.5+ scenario which identified an upper limit of 1.65 metres sea level rise by 2120. The work for the project has been adjusted to 8.5 scenario instead as recommended by the guidance in the National Adaptation Plan released in August 2022.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Derek summarised the risk assessment work by pointing out that the risks change through time, are different for erosion and inundation, and varies between domains. Derek points out that the CAP will need to decide if they can protect everything, or if not, what is important to protect.</li> </ul>
	TEA BREAK
<p><b>Define Objectives for Northern Adaptation Area</b> <i>(Facilitated discussion with CAP decision required)</i></p>	<p><b>Stephen Daysh, Mitchell Daysh:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stephen walked the CAP through the values collected from previous public engagement sessions (not including iwi values), the themes and explained why it was important with the aid of the slides.</li> <li>• Stephen posed the objective found on slide 13 of the NAA Capturing Values to Inform Objectives Presentation to the room to cover the Northern Adaptation Area;</li> <li>• Stephen motioned for agreement on the objective for the Northern Adaptation Area as it was shown on slide 13. The CAP agreed to revisit this and confirm it during the next workshop once values from NHoŌ have been defined.</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• John queried if the provided values have been from extensive engagement. The Chair noted he believes it has not been so far and pointed out the importance of engaging further as the project moves down the coast;</li> <li>• Stephen requested that Aroha and NHoŌ return back to the next CAP workshop in April with confirmed values for the iwi;</li> <li>• Jerry notes the public are requesting more clarity and involvement in the process. Abbey noted that there is the expected possibility that some information, that will inform Cultural Risk Assessments (eg locations of sites of significance for iwi), will not be shared with</li> </ul>

	<p>Council nor publicly. Jerry asked that a note is added when information isn't made public that there is an explanation why;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Abbey informed the room that the Takutai Kāpiti website is currently being redone inhouse, and will be improved to make it easily accessible and more user friendly. Additionally, that the material shared in the CAP workshops are uploaded to the website afterwards for transparency;</li> <li>• Stephen confirmed there will be different objectives per adaptation area based on the public values that are collected;             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The CAP had robust discussion on the objective presented during the workshop;</li> <li>○ Martin queried if there is enough time to move people in event of managed retreat being recommended by the CAP. The Jacobs team confirmed this will be outlined in the pathways if chosen;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Discounting Options from Long List for Northern Adaptation Area</b> <i>(Facilitated discussion with CAP decision required)</i></p>	<p><b>Stephen Daysh, Mitchell Daysh &amp; Derek Todd &amp; Kate MacDonald, Jacobs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stephen, Derek and Kate walked through the long list with the aid of the slides:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Between now and the next workshop, the Jacobs team will draft pathways for discussion at the next workshop (April) based on the CAP's discounted long list;</li> <li>○ Stephen notes any options in the long list that the CAP believe do not suit the Northern Adaptation Area can be removed now.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Notes, changes and commentary made around the long list options and any decisions to remove or keep options are found in the Long List and Discussion Table at the end of these minutes.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aroha questioned whether there had been any shellfish surveys done around the hard engineering options and around population changes, and whether they have been considered in those options;             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Derek noted that effects would be an input into the MCDA criteria, and if there are positive and negative impacts on those criteria this would be reflected in the scoring;</li> <li>○ Stephen added that this would be looked at when assessing how elements will respond to risks;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Stephen noted that the CAP had agreed the discounted long list with guidance from Kate and Derek. The final decision and decision points are shown in the table below. The Jacobs team noted they will circulate the risk assessment report for the Northern Adaptation Area to the CAP once it had been drafted.</li> <li>• Stephen advised that the current Operative Kapiti Coast District Plan 2021 has flood hazards.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Abbey noted to the CAP that there will be an upcoming flood plan change to the District Plan which will incorporate the Awa work;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Chair questioned when KCDC can stop people building in the wrong place.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Abbey shared that this would require a district plan change, and in the meantime Proposed Plan Change 2: Intensification (which currently has hearings occurring) has proposed the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, which is a holding place that makes building three, 3-storey buildings a controlled activity for properties within this precinct along the coastline for the district.</li> </ul>
<b>Next Steps</b>	<p><b>Jim Bolger, CAP Chair</b> opened the floor for questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stephen noted the importance of the pre-reading for the CAP;</li> <li>• Abbey noted the Chair has requested to change the date of the next CAP workshop from 27<sup>th</sup> April to 26<sup>th</sup> of April. Abbey to liaise and confirm the CAP’s availability for this change and to confirm the venue;</li> <li>• Martin queried what Council is doing on the analysis of groundwater. Abbey confirmed that KCDC has started a process to cover this which is separate to the Takutai Kāpiti work.</li> </ul>
	<b>The meeting closed at 4.35</b>

<b>ACTIONS</b>		
	<b>Abbey to update CAP on AWA flood work</b>	
	<b>Aroha and NHoŌ to confirm iwi values before next workshop (April 2023)</b>	
	<b>Abbey (KCDC) to confirm the date of the next CAP Workshop</b>	

<b>ATTACHMENTS</b>
<b>Memo – Coastal Asset Management Activity – Kapiti Coast District</b>
<b>Kāpiti Coast District Council Dune Planting Presentation</b>
<b>NAA Risk Assessment Presentation</b>
<b>NAA Risk Matrices</b>
<b>Accompanying Notes for Jacobs NAA Risk Assessment Presentation</b>
<b>NAA Capturing Values to Inform Objectives Presentation</b>
<b>NAA Discounting Long-List Actions Presentation</b>
<b>NAA Discounted Long List Options and Actions</b>

**Long List Options and Discussion Table**

Long List Option	TAG Commentary	CAP Commentary	Final Motion
Beach Drainage	Suggest removing due to lack of global evidence of a working process.		CAP Agreed to remove
Groynes	Suggest removing due to longshore sediment processes occurring along Kāpiti Coast this option would prevent sediment from travelling south and increasing issues further down the coast.	Chair asked the room if they agree with TAG and Martin agreed that groynes can cause more damage in future.	CAP Agreed to remove
Storm Surge Barriers	Suggest removing due to the northern environment not being suitable for these to work, also due to the beach sediment types.		CAP Agreed to remove
Flood gates	Suggest removing due to the northern environment not being suitable for these to work, also due to the beach sediment types.	John & Martin both noted that flood gates are currently operating in Otaki and should remain an option.	CAP motion to keep option
Breakwaters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Note from TAG: To change the name to “Offshore Breakwaters”</li> <li>- Offshore breakwaters work to break up surf to reduce energy before it impacts the beach. Otaki is a surfing beach which may be impacted by this.</li> <li>- Stephen noted that offshore breakwaters can also damage cultural values and mahinga kai.</li> </ul>		
Maintain and strengthen existing structures	Derek advised that “Maintain and Strengthen existing structures” were taken out for erosion in the Northern Adaptation Area due to irrelevance where no protection structures are in place for erosion but should remain for inundation. Noted to change name of option to “Maintain and strengthen existing structures (erosion only)”		