

RECORD OF MEETING



P O Box 747, Gisborne, Ph 867 2049 Fax 867 8076
Email lynnette@gdc.govt.nz Web www.gdc.govt.nz

Key Stakeholder Forum meeting held in the Wainui Surf Lifesaving Club, Moana Road, Gisborne on Wednesday 17 October 2012 at 6.10pm

PRESENT:

Councillors: Brian Wilson

Gisborne District Council staff: Water Utilities Manager Kevin Strongman, Property Services Manager Grahame Smail, Special Projects Manager Kim Smith, Utilities Admin Assistant Lynnette Brown and Secretarial Services Supervisor Jill Simpson.

Project Team Member/Facilitator: Sheryl Smail

IN ATTENDANCE:

Members of the public (refer to attendance register attached),

APOLOGIES:

David McIntyre, Dein Ferris Peter Higgs and Susie Bull

Record of Wainui Beach Management Strategy (WBMS) – Key Stakeholders Forum Meeting

1. Welcome and Purpose

Cr Wilson welcomed everyone to the meeting and told members that Kim Smith, Special Projects Manager, Gisborne District Council will be presenting on planning issues. Cr Wilson asked for feedback on the time the meetings were commencing, the duration of the meetings and if members would like the proceedings to be moved along at a faster pace. All members were happy with the present structure.

2. Apologies

Apologies listed above were noted.

3. Minutes

MOVED by Anne Muir, Seconded by Dick Calcott

THAT the Minutes of the KSF meeting held on Monday 17 September 2012 be accepted as a true and correct record.

4. Purpose

The purpose of the meeting was outlined as followed:

- To identify key issues WBMP needs to address.

- To identify what is important to KSF members.
- To monitor WG progress.
- To endorse WG recommendations, or request further work.
- To agree WG Work Plan.

All members present agreed on the purpose of the meeting.

5. Key WBMP Criteria

Facilitator Sheryl Small explained the purpose of this item was to identify what is important to the KSF that the WBMP achieves. Members were reminded to think of the various perspectives they represented as well as their own individual views. Time was given for individual reflection on the statement "It is important to me that the WBMP ..". These areas were then discussed in small groups and documented.

The areas identified will be collated then KSF members surveyed for their feedback on the relative importance of each area. The endpoint is a list of the relative importance to the KSF of what needs to be achieved and taken into account in the development of the WBMP.

6. Key Issues WBMP Needs to Address

The following issues were identified:

- Issue 1:** Not to have to redo in nine years time. A timeline needs to be implemented for what is decided.
- Issue 2:** The plan should follow the NZ Coastal Policy Statement.
- Issue 3:** The beach is beautiful from the beach looking in and the properties looking out.
- Issue 4:** Must be financially affordable.
- Issue 5:** The protection works consistent along the length of the beach and aesthetically acceptable.
- Issue 6:** Maintain and further enhance the quality of the beach and foredunes.
- Issue 7:** Maintain and further enhance the quality of the beach and restore the foredunes where scientific evidence shows that it is warranted.
- Issue 8:** The different issues along different parts of the beach need to be taken into account.
- Issue 9:** Volume of stormwater in the Wainui Stream is affecting erosion on the southern end of the beach.
- Issue 10:** The quality of the water.
- Issue 11:** The quality of the surf breaks is recognised as an area of national significance and should be protected.
- Issue 12:** The quality of the water as it impacts on recreation and visual seafood and monitoring of the quality of the water (pollution).
- Issue 13:** Understanding and prioritising the beach from a holistic perspective when addressing sub issues.
- Issue 14:** Prevent further erosion of beachfront properties.
- Issue 15:** The protection of wildlife of the whole beach including marine mammals, reptiles and endangered plants.
- Issue 16:** Protection of wahi tapu – challenges that can't be seen particularly relating to Wainui Stream.

Issue 17: The restoration of natural flora and fauna.

One member also asked why Wainui and not Makorori? Are we covering too many issues? Are we too much into Wainui rather than all beaches? Could the whole Plan be over-complicated?

Sheryl Small explained that these issues would be included in the survey and members would be asked to rank their relative importance.

7. Working Group Progress Report and Recommendations – DECISION ITEM

Water Utilities Manager Kevin Strongman spoke to the following slides and then asked if there were any questions regarding clarification, any discussion required and if there was a KSF consensus? Brian asked that the members present use the card system to show consensus or not.

Slide 1 - How the Beach Works 1 – KSF view on what the experts agree regarding ALL beaches:

- No parts in nature only WHOLES – the beach is only part of a system.
- Sand is meant to move and is a vital part of the beach's protective system.
- Moving sand offers natural protection.
- Sand dunes act as store of sand for the beach.
- Storms, rips, surges will strike and cause erosion.

After a show of cards all members present agreed on the issues relating to "How the Beach Works 1".

Slide 2 – How the Beach Works 2 – KSF view on what the experts agree regarding WAINUI BEACH:

- Beach needs to be considered as a whole (part of a broader whole) although geometric variances.
- Beach (as modified by man) is a thin sand veneer over a variable rocky basement with thin layer of cobbles for some parts of the beach.
- The beach is considered to be mostly closed.
- Generally sand movement is "in and out" and along the beach.
- Cyclic cut and fill of sand occurring along the beach from storm events.
- Southern end showing more sand movement than northern end in southerly storm events.
- Large storm events have caused significant erosion.
- Astronomical (tidal) cycles coincide with significant erosion.
- Sea level rise occurring at faster rate than tectonic uplift.

The following points were discussed:

- Along with the rocky basin there are also areas of pug. Perhaps there should be clarification on the type of rock. After discussion it was decided the slide should be amended to read "over variable rocky basement".
- Discussion on the sea level rise occurring at a faster rate than tectonic uplift. Some reports say 2mm per year sea level rise but the most credible is the NIWA report which indicates 5mm with 10mm rise in areas prone to erosion.
- What is the evidence relating to sand loss? The evidence comes from the Jeremy Gibbs report and also from the work completed by Dr Amber Dunn.

After a show of cards all members present agreed on the issues relating to "How the Beach Works 2".

Slide 3 – How the Beach Works 3 – Experts differ regarding the long term erosion:

- WG view is that there is cyclical and potential for long term erosion.
- Also noting – when there is a lot of stormwater runoff from the land which permanently erodes property, the beach takes a long time to rebuild.
- WG agree that Tuaheni Point is eroding over time.

The following points were discussed:

- What does the WG base its view on regarding the potential for long term erosion. Kevin stated that Dr Amber Dunn says there is very little erosion whereas Richard Reinen-Hamill says there is significant long term erosion. The WG is sitting in between the two statements. Dr Amber Dunn and Richard Reinen-Hamill will be presenting to the Working Group at a later date on technical and non-technical issues.
- In 2003 a large part of Tuaheni Point became part of the Queen Elizabeth II National Trust and approximately 20,000 trees were planted. It was understood that this would not stop erosion. Tuaheni Point has eroded much quicker than anticipated. During this winter the land has eroded from the top, the sea has chopped it away and the NE have chewed the bottom out and there are photographs to show this recent erosion.

After a show of cards all members present agreed on the issues relating to "How the Beach Works 3".

Slide 4 – WG Report – Effect of remaining with status quo:

- Aesthetically not acceptable.
- Current piecemeal approach not acceptable
- Lack of uniformity of approach.
- Primary interest is an integrated approach along the beach.
- In part status quo works.
- Need to do better – not suitable for long term.
- Removal of hazardous infrastructure.
- **WG agreed that the status quo is NOT acceptable.**

The following points were discussed:

- There are different problems in different places and they may require different solutions. What is the uniformity of approach?. Kevin replied that it must be an integrated approach. It must be aesthetically pleasing. It was decided that the slide would reach "integrated approach".
- Where does the affordability come into all the issues? Kevin replied that at this stage they were avoiding the affordability issue as it would limit the options but would certainly be looked at further down the track.
- There are some aesthetically unacceptable structures that are actually working. If these are removed they must be replaced with structures that will work. Kevin replied that the WG have looked at the individual structures and no decision has been made at this stage on what would be removed.

Nothing will be removed without looking at what effect it will have on the beach as a whole.

The following issues were added to the whiteboard:

Issue 18: May need a varying scale over the beach.

Issue 19: Some of the status quo may not be aesthetically acceptable but it works. The solutions need to work if the status quo is removed – need to be replaced by something better.

Issue 20: Cannot make a final decision that the status quo is unacceptable until the alternative options are available.

Cr Wilson said that Issues 18, 19 and 20 will go back to the Working Group to be discussed.

After a show of cards all members present agreed with the Working Group that the status quo is not acceptable.

8. Planning Controls Presentation and Working Group Recommendations – DECISION ITEM

Kevin introduced Kim Smith Special Projects Manager from the Gisborne District Council to the meeting and Kim spoke to her presentation which outlined the following topics:

- Why is Planning important?
- Main Themes in the Guiding Policy (especially NZ Coastal Policy Statement) – including Policy 27.
- Resource consent requirements for protection works.
- Overview of coastal hazard overlays and associated planning controls.

Kim told the meeting that planning is important because consents may be required and also that planning attempts to control the risks eg land use activities in the area. The RMA is the guiding legislation.

Kim spoke on the coastal hazard overlays developed by Jeremy Gibb who has come up with four overlays. Kim pointed out the overlays are only for coastal erosion and do not consider events like tsunamis.

Kevin told the meeting that the Working Group had an in-depth presentation by Kim and that the following planning areas require further consideration:

- Understanding why the rock revetment consent was refused noting that the NZ Coastal Policy was not enacted at the time of the previous plan.
- How critical are width and length requirements of protection works to their acceptability under the Plans and Policy Statements?
- How critical is it for protection works to keep landward of mean high water springs.
- How are the current coastal hazard overlay rules (for buildings and structures) being applied?
- How does the Lysnar Reserve Management plan (and Wainui Reserve) address coastal hazards?

- What obligations does Council have to protect its reserves from coastal hazards under the Soil Conservation Act 1941 and the Reserves Act 1977 – s40?

Kim will be meeting with the Working Group and further develop the above issues. The members present were asked if they were comfortable with the Working Group concentrating on the above areas.

It was decided that a summary be prepared and presented to the next KSF meeting outlining the protection works on the beach, their location and their effectiveness.

After a show of cards all members present agreed with the planning areas as outlined requiring further consideration.

Kevin informed the meeting that all the WBMP background documents are on the Gisborne District Council website and asked if there was any other information required. It was decided that Kevin report to the next KSF meeting on the WBMS completed in 2000 particularly the area relating to the removal of cobbles in the late 1940's.

Kevin further explained to the meeting the Gisborne District Council will email out a survey and also a newsletter to the broader stakeholders on the progress of the work plan.

The meeting closed at 7.50pm

ACTIONS:

Action Required	Officer	When
Follow up with Phil Dreifuss the detail of his concern for consideration by the Project Team	Sheryl Smail	By 17 October
Summary prepared outlining the protection works on the beach, their location and their effectiveness.	Kevin Strongman	Next KSF Meeting
Report on WBMS completed in 2000, particularly as relates to the removal of cobbles.	Kevin Strongman	Next KSF Meeting

Cr Brian Wilson
Convenor

Next Meeting: Wednesday 28 November at 6pm at the Wainui Beach Surf Club.