

RECORD OF MEETING



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

Held in the Wainui Surf Lifesaving Club, Moana Rd, Gisborne on Wednesday 22 August 2012 at 6pm

PRESENT:

Councillors: Brian Wilson, Andy Cranston and Rehette Stoltz

Gisborne District Council staff: Group Manager Engineering & Works Peter Higgs, Water Utilities Manager Kevin Strongman, Property Services Manager Grahame Smail, Special Projects Manager Kim Smith, Utilities Admin Assistant Lynnette Brown and Democracy & Support Services Manager Eileen Cronin.

Project Team Member/Facilitator: Sheryl Smail

IN ATTENDANCE:

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

APOLOGIES:

Michael & Anne Muir, Simon Cave, Colleen Bull, Clr Pat Seymour, Andrew Donaldson

Record of **Wainui Beach Management Strategy (WBMS)** – Broad Stakeholders Meeting

1. Welcome & Purpose

Clr Wilson welcomed everyone to the meeting and spoke to slides 1-4 of the power point presentation highlighting the purpose and process of the meeting and key points:

- **Purpose:** overview of the WBMS project and seek feedback on the proposed engagement and communication plan
- **Not about:** The content and detail of how to manage the beach at this stage

2. Apologies

Apologies listed above were noted.

3. Agenda & process for meeting

Clr Wilson talked about the agenda items and described how group discussion would work. Those unable to attend the whole meeting were invited to leave contact details if they wished to be kept up to date/involved in the project.

4. WBMS Review Background

Kevin Strongman spoke to slides 5–15 highlighting key points and responded to questions from the floor as follows:

- Noted the “silo thinking” concern raised and spoke about other linked plans such as the Freshwater Plan
- Introduced the Project Sponsor – Peter Higgs who distributed his card to some of the attendees
- Clarified that the project was about Coastal Hazards including but not limited to erosion by storm surge and tsunami
- Agreed that because of the diversity of issues the engagement and project have been designed with this in mind
- Confirmed the definition of the Wainui Beach area in the project was from Makorori Headland to Tuahine Point

Two questions from this section of the meeting were noted (Fridge) as requiring follow up by the project team.

- Concerns with reference to the “silo” approach about the Wainui Stream
- That the Dave Peacock report that included discussion about the Wainui Stream outlet be considered

5. Proposed approach to involve Stakeholders (6.35pm–6.55pm)

Sheryl Smail spoke to slides 16–26 describing the Engagement Proposal:

- Terms, definitions, roles and membership of the Key Stakeholder Forum and Working Group
- Timelines and decision making process

In response to questions Sheryl Smail and Kevin Strongman clarified that:

- There was only one Working Group for the whole project
- The Gibb report will be included as part of the information to be taken into consideration
- All overseas and other owners that do not reside in the district (Wainui beachfront properties) are key stakeholders and will be kept informed
- Clr Wilson is the Chair of the Key Stakeholder Forum and Kevin Strongman is the Chair of the Working Group

For those who were unable to stay for the whole meeting Sheryl then spoke to slides 27 and 28 and invited those leaving to register their details if they wished to be on the Key Stakeholder Forum or to be considered for membership on the Working Group.

Some attendees then left the meeting before the smaller group discussions began.

6. Consultation on proposed approach (7pm–7.35pm)

Following presentation of the proposed approach to engaging stakeholders with the WBMS review, attendees broke into 5 smaller groups to discuss the proposed approach and give their feedback. This feedback is provided below.

Hard copies of the questions and a handout were available at each table (copies attached).

7. Feedback session (7.40pm – 8.05pm)

LEVEL OF SUPPORT FOR PROPOSED ENGAGEMENT PROCESS

Each group scored its level of support (out of 10) for the proposed engagement process as 7 or 8, with two groups expressing that this was contingent on some improvements being accepted.

Record of ideas to improve proposed process:

The ideas received from groups to improve the proposed engagement process are:

- A Life stage perspective should be included (different age group perspectives)
- An ability to modify the WBMS scope
- The Working Group should be comprised of Wainui/Okitu residents and ratepayers and acceptable to the Key Stakeholder Forum
- Need clear role delineation between the Key Stakeholder Forum and the Working Group, so that there is no re-litigation
- The scope should include consideration of wider effects of development
- The experts should be made available to inform the wider stakeholder group
- Increase the level of involvement of the wider ratepayer stakeholder group, e.g. keep them informed so that they can contribute meaningfully
- Make sure the previous work on the Wainui Beach is included
- Query whether the previous Wainui Beach Management Plan committee should be a key stakeholder
- There needs to be a Wainui Streamfront person on the Working Group
- Given the commitment of time involved, consider an honorarium for Working Group members

Concern was expressed about the December 2012 January 2013 period timeframe to take account of festive period.

The importance of robust communication was stressed

Working Group membership

Gaps in the Proposed Perspectives

Feedback from groups expressed the following gaps in perspectives on the Working Group:

- The young and the old
- Wainui Streamfront person

- Wainui Beach School
- Surf Club
- Horse riders

Concerns about the Working Group process and/or membership

Feedback from groups expressed the following concerns regarding the proposed Working Group:

- Surfers can be represented without it being necessary to be affiliated to a formal group (surfing community)
- Will it be properly financially resourced? Is the budget sufficient for the required investigation (how extensive)?
- Who is setting the work programme for the Working Group – the Project Team or the Key Stakeholder Forum?

Record of idea to improve the Working Group, its role and membership

The Key Stakeholder Forum should have the ability to ratify the Working Group before it is formally appointed.

Key Stakeholder Forum

Only two groups considered their overall level of support for the Key Stakeholder Forum membership, scoring it 7 and 8 out of 10.

Record of ideas to improve the proposed Key Stakeholder Forum, its role and membership:

- Ratepayers voice and community awareness
- Concern with self-selection
- The perspective of all residents, not just Wainui/Okitu, should be represented on the Working Group
- Add to criteria the genuine commitment of members to contribute e.g. to get on top of information to make an informed contribution
- If individuals are willing to get on top of the WBMS information to make an informed contribution, then individual membership, not just representation from a group, should be allowed
- Feedback/communication back to constituent members of Key Stakeholder Forum and vice versa (especially on technical matters)
- Access to technical discussion for the wider community
- Avenue for people not on the Key Stakeholder Forum to get matters onto the agenda and communicate ideas
- Maintain flexibility whilst maintaining momentum
- Important to have clarity around decision making processes and clarity about the distinction between the Working Group and Key Stakeholder Forum

- Important to manage the risk of politically powerful key stakeholders with strongly held views staying outside of the process because they pose a high risk of scuttling the outcome
- Need to be clear about what consensus looks like
- Concern that beachfront ratepayers have an effective voice, i.e. there is a balance in membership of the Key Stakeholder Forum

Communication

Following presentation of the proposed approach to communication, attendees indicated a general level of support with the following recommendations for improvements:

- Provision for non-face to face communication and attendance at meetings
- Be more explicit about internal and external communication
- Prior notice of agendas to key stakeholders, rather than finding out after the meeting
- Clarity around meeting agendas and how stakeholders can contribute and provide input

8. Wrap up

Sheryl Smail spoke to the final slides of the presentation reconfirming where to from here and where information would be available.

Clr Wilson thanked everyone for their attendance and noted the success of a similar engagement process with the Wastewater Advisory Group.

The meeting closed at 8.15pm

ACTIONS:

Action Required	Officer	When

Clr Brian Wilson
Convenor

Next Meeting: Yet to be confirmed