

RECORD OF MEETING



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

Key Stakeholder Forum meeting held in the Wainui Surf Lifesaving Club, Moana Road, Gisborne on Wednesday 28 November 2012 at 6.05pm

PRESENT:

Councillors: Cr Brian Wilson, Cr Andy Cranston, Cr Pat Seymour

Gisborne District Council staff: Water Utilities Manager Kevin Strongman, Property Services Manager Grahame Smail, Special Projects Manager Kim Smith, Utilities Administration 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:

Larry Foster, Jennie Harre-Hindmarsh, Fleur Ferris, Pete Anderson, Stewart Patrick, Sandy Bull, Colleen Bull and Susie Bull

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

1. WELCOME

Cr Wilson welcomed everyone, including Cr Pat Seymour, to the meeting. He said it was a large agenda to get through and suggested that where decisions are clear cut that the preference for the meeting was to make the decision and carry on and where not the item be parked and revisited later during the meeting.

2. APOLOGIES

Apologies listed above were noted.

3. MINUTES

It was suggested that the Wainui Beach Management "Plan" be changed to the Wainui Beach Management "Strategy". This change was supported by those present.

MOVED by Nikki Searancke, Seconded by Anne Muir

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

4. PURPOSE

Cr Wilson outlined the purpose of the meeting being:

- To understand survey feedback ie “What is important to KSF that WBMS addresses”.
- To endorse the WG recommendations, or request further work.
- To agree format and high level content for WBMS Discussion document.

Cr Wilson thanked the Working Group for all their hard work and long hours. Cr Wilson then outlined the agenda.

5. PLANNING CONTROLS

DECISION ITEM

Cr Wilson invited Kim Smith, Special Projects Manager, Gisborne District Council to talk to her presentation.

Kim outlined :

1. Why the 2010 Rock Revetment Consent was refused
2. Research on how Coastal Hazard Planning Controls are being applied
3. Issues with current hazard planning

Kim said it was a complicated planning framework for the coastal environment. Kim stated that in her opinion the application of the rules for hazard planning was not successful. She then proposed some planning controls content for the WBMS Discussion Document. Cr Wilson thanked Kim and asked for feedback from the Forum:

Kevin Strongman clarified that we are just putting forward some decisions to work through to a discussion document. The discussion document then comes back through the KSF for approval. The following points were raised:

- Interpretation of words 'hard protection' which appeared to be used a lot. Is the wall at Tuahine Crescent classified as hard protection? Kevin agreed that it was.
- Hazard zones – the group asked if Gisborne District Council Planners could give an illustration of various hazard lines that have been drawn over the years. Council reviewed the hazard lines seaward which allowed for more development. Now they are moving landward. It would be beneficial for the KSF to see where they were when first drawn and where they are now.
- What has actually eroded over the years. Kevin said historic photos show long term erosion. Kevin said that a lot of survey work has been done but no detailed assessment has been carried out to date.

DECISION

Planning Control Content for WMBS Discussion Document –

- Review hazard zones.
- Consider options to guide decisions on applications for new development in hazard zones eg:
 - Where any increase in capital value is and is not acceptable.
 - Where relocatability is acceptable and design assessment processes.
- Consider best practice in other districts.
- Consider how long term retreat may be supported by Council plans.

A show of cards was asked for and members **AGREED**.

6. KSF SURVEY FEEDBACK

Kevin told the group that 28 people sit on KSF and 21 feedback forms were received. The relevance is to have a set of criteria to measure future options that arise that are acceptable to the community.

The Group asked how was the decision made to select the top 6 as the cut off line? Cr Wilson said there was no significance about the 6. All rankings were taken into account by the WG.

7. WORKING GROUP PROGRESS REPORT and RECOMMENDATIONS

WG Report (Effectiveness of Existing Infrastructure 1) - GROYNES

Kevin asked for guidance from the KSF that they are comfortable with the following:

- Hamanatua Stream training wall works in terms of controlling the stream.
- Southern groynes 2, 3 & 4 buried since training wall constructed and are ineffective.
- Effectiveness/impact of Groyne 27 at the Southern end – causes beach scouring to the north locally, lowering the beach sand levels (eddy effect) and adds to the backshore erosion pressure. (Note: Expert advice is that Groyne 27 is not having an impact on the Stockroute area).

Cr Wilson suggested that each bullet point be dealt with individually.

DECISIONS

First bullet point – **AGREED**

Second bullet point – **AGREED**

Third bullet point – **DISAGREED**

Kevin said that there was disagreement within the WG originally. Dr Amber Dunn and Richard Reinen-Hamill said that basically Groyne 27 is doing more harm than good particularly for the localized area.

Cr Wilson asked for another show of cards on the third bullet point and there was still disagreement. It was decided to park bullet point 3 and revisit later in the meeting.

WG Report (Effectiveness of Existing Infrastructure 2) – SEAWALLS

The group discussed the following:

- What is potential impact on surf conditions?
- Could the first bullet point start with “May”? It was agreed to change the first bullet point to read – “May help protect properties directly behind them.”

DECISION

- Help protect properties directly behind them.
- Negative in terms of sand on the beach – cause scouring.

A show of cards was asked for and members **AGREED**.

WG Report (Effectiveness of Existing Infrastructure 3) – RIP RAP

DECISION

- May help to protect properties directly behind them.
- Improved performance (relative to seawall) on coastal processes enhanced by flatter slope and porosity.
- Positive (relative to seawall) in terms of sand on beach (does not prevent sand coming back) – minimal scouring.
- Take a bigger footprint on the beach (relative to seawall).

(Noted that the end of Lloyd George Road [No. 23] is best example – built to specific Dave Peacock specifications.)

A show of cards was asked for and members **AGREED**.

WG Report (Effectiveness of Existing Infrastructure 4) – GABIONS

DECISION

- Work short term – property protection at toe.
- Similar characteristics to a seawall.
- Because of height are overtopped.
- Most of time buried therefore minimal effect on natural sand flow.
- Have a limited effect in storm situations.
- Can use small rock (that may be more readily available).

A show of cards was asked for and members **AGREED**.

WG View Regarding Cyclical vs Long Term Erosion

The group asked that No. 2 be changed to read:

“Predominant effect of waves from the south which, in conjunction with lowering of the reef, impacts on beach rotation”.

The group asked that No. 3 have the following sentence added:

“But also there is cyclical erosion from a NE swell”.

DECISION

1. There is cyclical erosion with storm events and long term erosion.
2. Predominant effect of waves from the south which, in conjunction with lowering of the reef, impacts on beach rotation
3. If one holds the control point between beach and cliff it has the potential to slow the long term land retreat but will not prevent long term rotation of the beach. But also there is cyclical erosion from a NE swell
4. Tuaheni Point is eroding over time (about 1 – 2 metres per decade landward retreat – Gibb Report 2001).
5. There is short term erosion of Makorori Point that may increase sand movement to the north and loss from the beach system.
6. 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.

A show of cards was asked for and members **AGREED**.

WBMP Timeframes – the WG agreed the following TIMEFRAMES

Kevin said that Planning must consider what is going to happen in the long term. He said these timeframes will be promoted in any document produced.

DECISION

- Now: 0 – 20 years
- Mid: 20 – 50 years
- Long term: 50 – 100 years

A show of cards was asked for and members **AGREED**.

Preliminary Options Screening Approach

Kevin explained to the group the preliminary approach taken to screening options. He also explained that some are hard options, some soft and some are planning options. All options have to be considered at a very high level to rule some out. All options not eliminated in the preliminary screening will be assessed against the full criteria listed.

Preliminary Screening Options – DECISION ITEM

The traffic light system was used to outline the scoring of each option against the preliminary screening criteria. A report has been received from Richard Reinen-Hamill (Tonkin & Taylor) detailing to what degree each option is fit for purpose. A copy had just been received and was distributed to the KSF group.

The Working group had also clustered into 3 broad categories the important issues identified through the KSF survey:

1. Natural environment
2. Access
3. Property protection

The Working group recommended that a more detailed analysis take place on the 7 options (beach nourishment and above) that scored 13 or more, along with inclusion of beach scraping in emergency and as a starting point for dune enhancement options and also training walls for the Wainui and Hamanatua Streams - long term: 50 – 100 years.

The KSF asked that the "Status Quo" be part of any further assessment.

Asked for clarification on beach scraping, Kevin said that in this context it is from one end of the beach to the other. Beach nourishment is generally bringing sand in from other areas. The KSF suggested that different options, including temporary or short term, be investigated.

DECISION

The following options be analysed in more detail:

- Prohibiting to 100 HZ.
- Cobble berm revetment.
- Dune enhancement.
- Emergency Geobag protection.
- Asset relocation/abandonment.
- Rock revetments.
- Beach nourishment.
- Status Quo
- Along with inclusion of beach scraping in emergency and as a starting point for dune enhancement options.
- Also training walls for the Wainui and Hamanatua Streams Long Term: 50 – 100 years.

A show of cards was asked for and members **AGREED**.

WG Criteria for assessing options

The Working group proposed 10 criteria for assessing the options. The KSF asked that 'based on research evidence be included in line with the high importance placed on this in the survey feedback.

1. Implementation timescale (0 – 20, 20 – 50, 50 – 100).
2. Effective life.
3. Laws of coast (consider whole beach).

4. Laws of coast (maintain/enhance sand flow).
5. Enhance/maintain access (public) and access (private).
6. Property protection (public) and property protection (private).
7. Protection of natural environment.
8. Protection of natural environment beach/offshore (including surf breaks).
9. Cultural/heritage values acknowledged.
10. Relative cost per 100m.
11. Based on research evidence

A show of cards was asked for and members **AGREED**.

WG Report (effectiveness of Existing Infrastructure 1) – GROYNES

The KSF then returned to the deferred decision item re Groynes. Discussion took place on the last bullet point regarding the effectiveness/impact of Groyne 27. This resulted in an amendment to this statement.

DECISION

- Effectiveness/impact of Groyne 27 at the southern end periodically causes beach scouring to the north locally, lowering the beach sand levels (eddy effect) and adds to the backshore erosion pressure. (Note: Expert advice is that Groyne 27 is not having an impact on the Stockroute area).

A show of cards was asked for and members **AGREED**.

8. WBMP DISCUSSION DOCUMENT

Kevin outlined the framework for the document and said that work will be commenced over the next couple of months to populate the document. He asked for feedback from the KSF within the next week if members wanted changes to the proposed content.

WBMS Process

Kevin told the Group that a broad stakeholder meeting will be held on 5 December. Brochures will be distributed throughout the Wainui community during the week. All non-residents will be posted out a brochure. Brochures will also be placed in local dairies and the Kaiti Mall. The meeting will be very well advertised.

The Working Group will meet again in February and then report back to the KSF in late February or early March.

By the end of April the KSF group will be proposing the WBMS. The Strategy will then be presented to the Gisborne District Council for a decision in May or June which will tie in with the Annual Plan.

9. WRAP UP

The Powerpoint presentation will be emailed out along with the document from Tonkin & Taylor Richard Reinen-Hamill) to all KSF members .

Cr Wilson thanked everyone for attending.

The meeting closed at 8.15pm

ACTIONS:

Action Required	Officer	When
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
Hazard Zones – show the various lines that have been drawn over the years. Show where they were first drawn and where they are now.	Kim Smith	Next KSF Meeting
Powerpoint presentation and document from Tonkin & Taylor be emailed to KSF	Lynette Brown	Dec 2012

Cr Brian Wilson

Convenor

Next Meeting: Tentatively 27 February at 6pm at the Wainui Beach Surf Club – To Be Confirmed in the New Year