

OIR: 2324/855

19 April 2024

██████████
██

Tēnā koe ██████████

Request for Information under the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (the Act) (the LGOIMA)

Thank you for your email of **20 March 2024** requesting the following information:

Will you please advise on the following questions:

- 1. Will you be voting on this in May? If you are voting on this, I would like to urge you to read the report thoroughly and consider the contents and the impact on us before casting your vote.***

I confirm that as a Council officer I will not be voting or making decisions on the Panel's recommendations, at any point.

I want to clarify that:

- Elected Councillors will receive the Panel's recommendations in June 2024; however, I don't expect that specific decisions will be immediately made.
- Elected Councillors will be asked to receive the Panel's Report at the Council meeting and will be briefed by the CAP on their recommendations.
- An accompanying paper prepared by Council officers will note that Council operations will provide advice to Elected Members on next steps for each recommendation at a later date. I anticipate that this advice would be provided in tranches over a longer timeframe (for example 6, 12, and 18 months); and that it will note the elements of further engagement with the community.
- Any subsequent advice on decisions would be scheduled through Committee meetings and be publicly available.
- Any options that required significant change or additional work, from that already outlined in the Long-term Plan 2024-34, would need to be formally consulted with the community.

Please note that any information provided in response to your request may be published on the Council website, with your personal details removed.

Regarding the coastal hazard science and modelling work by Jacobs, I note you have expressed concern in your email about the use of scenario RCP/SSP8.5+.

Local authorities, such as the Kapiti Coast District Council, are required to follow legislative requirements set by central government. The Ministry for the Environment (MfE), and Department of Conservation (DoC), confirmed in correspondence to Council the requirements that should be followed. This is available from the following website (see heading “Kāpiti Coast District Council clarification request to Central Government”):

[Takutai Kāpiti - Documents | Have Your Say | Kāpiti Coast \(kapiticoast.govt.nz\)](https://www.kapiticoast.govt.nz/takutai-kapiti-documents-have-your-say-kapiti-coast)

The scenarios modelled by Jacobs in their report finalised in 2022 were consistent with the national guidance available at the time.

However, recent updates to international and national guidance led to the preparation by Jacobs of an Addendum to their report, informed by feedback from the MfE and DoC. Reflective of those updates, the Addendum removed the RCP/SSP8.5+ scenario for the purposes of coastal hazard assessment work (eg, risk assessments and adaptation planning).

The Jacobs Report is available at:

<https://www.kapiticoast.govt.nz/media/pwynpxj1/coastal-hazard-technical-assessment-technical-report-volume-2-report.pdf>

The recent Addendum to the Jacobs Report is available at:

<https://www.kapiticoast.govt.nz/media/5oocz2tw/addendum-to-k%C4%81piti-coast-coastal-hazards-susceptibility-and-vulnerability-assessment-february-2024.pdf>

2. Can you confirm if this is loaded to our home's LIM report - [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] ?

I have interpreted your question as referring to the Jacobs Report.

I can confirm that since February 2022 all newly issued LIMs for all properties within the district (including any LIM requested [REDACTED]) have included the following wording:

“Coastal Erosion and Inundation Hazards

Council holds a set of reports prepared by environmental engineering consultancy Jacobs NZ Ltd covering susceptibility and vulnerability assessments of the coastal areas of the District based on a range of sea level rise scenarios over periods of 30, 50 and 100 years. The Council intends using these reports to inform future district plan work which will consider any necessary changes to land use and subdivision controls in areas which may be affected. Various parties have raised concerns regarding the approach taken in those reports. Those concerns will be addressed during consideration of the submissions received during the plan change process. The information on coastal hazards that the Council holds is available on the following link: www.kapiticoast.govt.nz/coastal-science”

3. Do you think it is reasonable to implement managed retreat if the threat is not imminent and how exactly will managed retreat work?

Council operations has no work currently underway around Managed Retreat.

I expect that national direction will inform options that local authorities consider about Managed Retreat, in future periods. Further work will be required before the viability of Managed Retreat can be determined.

The specifics of how Managed Retreat could work on the Kāpiti Coast has not been investigated as part of the Takutai Kāpiti project, as the Panel is only developing recommendations for the Council (Elected Councillors) to consider. However, the Coastal Advisory Panel has identified Managed Retreat as a *potential* option for consideration in the draft adaptation pathways they are seeking community feedback on.

Further engagement with communities is expected to determine what action should be taken, and when, if Coastal changes occur (this includes setting ‘triggers, signals and thresholds’). This approach is designed to recognise uncertainties and to ensure that action only occurs if required, while also providing sufficient time to plan ahead. For more information on signals, triggers and thresholds, please see the [FAQs on the Takutai Kapiti website](#).

4. Do you understand the science behind this report and find it reasonable to take the absolute worst case scenario, and these extreme measures?

While I am not a scientist with expertise in this area, I believe I have a reasonable understanding of the Jacobs Report, the subsequent Addendum update to the Jacobs Report, and the wider information that the Coastal Advisory Panel (“Panel”) have considered through their deliberations.

As noted in the response to question 1, Council officers wrote to the MfE and DoC to share concerns, raised by our community, about the sea level rise scenarios that were required to be used, and to confirm national expectations. Their responses can be seen on the [Takutai Kapiti website](#).

In this response, MfE confirmed that the sea level rise projection scenario of SSP5-8.5 is recommended to be used by local authorities, for stress testing the upper bound of hazard assessments, and is considerably less likely since AR5 but cannot be ruled out. They have also advised that medium confidence scenarios should be used alongside this scenario.

5. Do you think there might be missing considerations in these reports, like the seawalls or consideration of historical data?

I can confirm that Council is open to considering any information which is useful to inform decision-making; and am open to receive feedback on the Jacobs Report. Further, that the Jacobs Report has been peer reviewed by both Greater Wellington Regional Council and Beca.

To assist you to consider if you have or are aware of any information that may be useful, we have asked Jacobs to clarify how the Jacobs Coastal Hazard Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment takes into consideration the existing protection structures and historical data. Jacobs have supplied the following information:

Existing protection structures:¹

- For Present Day Erosion Susceptibility, the observed erosion following failure of the protection structures in the September 1976 storm event (largest on record – classified by Lane et al (2012) as being close to 0.5% AEP for joint wave and storm tide occurrence) reported in Gibb & Wiltshire (1976) was used based on the assumption that this magnitude of erosion could occur again if the existing seawalls failed in an extreme storm event.
- For future erosion susceptibility, the assumption was that the structures that are already in place would continue to function and provide protection until the end of their maximum residual life as identified in the Council coastal structure database (Tonkin & Taylor, 2016). These maximum residual lifetimes were banded into 10-year intervals and ranged from 10 years to 50 years. Therefore, over these time frames the projected erosion from extrapolation of long-term rates and due to sea level rise would be zero, and the only projected erosion would be due to failure in an extreme storm as calculated for present day susceptibility. For modelling purposes, at the end of their maximum residual life, it is assumed that the structures have failed, are removed, and not replaced.

Historical Data used in the erosion modelling:

- Vertical aerial photographs between 1948 and to 2017 used in the Digital Shoreline Analysis System (DSAS) to calculate past rates of shoreline movements. This included images from 16 different years and give the longest possible record of comparable shoreline change.
- Periodic beach profiles surveyed for Council at 26 sites between 2000 & 2018 were used to obtain average beach and dune profiles for determine beach closure slopes for input into the calculation of sea level rise effects on shoreline position.
- Bathymetric profiles from surveys undertaken in 2000 as presented in Lumsden (2003). These were used to determine beach closure slopes for input into the calculation of sea level rise effects on shoreline position, and to determine dune slopes for the calculation of dune stability factor in the erosion projections.
- Observations of shoreline erosion in the extreme September 1976 event as reported by Gibb & Wiltshire (1976) to determine short-term storm losses for inclusion in the erosion projections.

¹ You may also be interested to know that part of the recommendations that the Panel has been developing includes looking at ways to adapt to erosion once the seawalls (including proposed replacement seawalls as in the long term plan) have come to the end of their residual life.

6. Are you willing to consider alternative risk assessment reports; do you think it is reasonable to base decisions from one model that has not gone through peer review?

Council is open to considering alternative risk assessments.

CAP recommendations, informed by the Jacob's Report and wider data and evidence they have considered, will be one source of such information.

7. How will this affect our ability to sell the properties and what will happen if insurance companies refuse to insure our homes?

The Insurance Council of New Zealand determines insurance settings, and I can confirm that Kāpiti Coast District Council has no direct involvement in this process. An insurance company's decision on whether or not to insure a property will be based on their own policies.

I acknowledge that the potential impact to insurance premiums, or to insurance cover, as a result of identifying potential risk hazards is a concern for many homeowners. I can confirm that Council will be writing to the Insurance Council of New Zealand on this matter, with a view to understanding how any perceived increase in risk (if that is confirmed as an issue) can be mitigated or reduced at a local level. This will help to determine steps to support homeowners if this potential impact in fact occurs.

8. Who will be responsible for the hardships that will arise from this process?

While I am not a Councillor, below are my brief observations in relation to costs.

Preparing for the possible future impacts of climate change is likely to impose costs over many decades on communities throughout the district. What those costs will be, and how those costs will be distributed is a question that will require further work, and discussion with the community beyond the life of the Takutai Kāpiti process.

It is important that I reiterate that the Panel is only making recommendations to Council. The Panel has yet to finalise those recommendations, and Council has yet to receive them and, at a later date, to make decisions on them. After Council makes those decisions, more work and community engagement will be needed around next steps, which may include implementing the Panel's recommendations.

In relation to the costs of adaptation, as noted in the response to question 8 above, should Council wish to undertake any significant expenditure on any new adaptation actions not already budgeted for in the Long-term Plan, it will need to formally consult the public about how that will be paid for in future Annual or Long-Term Plan processes.

There will also be public consultation opportunities to make submissions on a future district plan change dealing with coastal hazards. This process will also occur after completion of Takutai Kāpiti.

9. Why has the council not told us about this and why do we have to hear from a group like CALM?

The Takutai Kāpiti project began work in 2020 and has provided updates on its work through regular e-newsletters to subscribers since March 2020.


I understand that since then, the community have been notified about Takutai Kāpiti through a variety of communication channels. These include:

- The Takutai Kāpiti newsletters
- Newspaper articles
- Newspaper public notices
- Newspaper surveys
- Features within Everything Kāpiti newsletter
- Facebook posts and ads
- Community Boards members have shared about it on their Community Board Facebook pages.
- Instagram reels, posts, and ads
- Have Your Say
- Antenno
- Flyers put up in community locations.
- On Paekākāriki town centre chalkboard
- Multiple community engagement pop ups including at Libraries; Community markets; Coastlands Shopping Centre; and the Ōtaki Expo.
- A district-wide public information event at Paraparaumu Beach Community Centre on 23 July 2022
- Rangatahi session in Ōtaki on 31 August 2022
- Community engagement workshop at Ōtaki Rotary Club on 24 September 2022 – for Northern Adaptation Area
- Community engagement workshop at Otaihanga Boating Club on 6 May 2023 – for Central Adaptation Area
- Series of Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki wananga
- Community feedback session at Ōtaki Baptist Church on 1 July 2023 – for Northern Adaptation Area
- Community engagement workshop at Raumati Bowling Club on 29 July 2023 – for Raumati Adaptation Area
- Community engagement workshop at St Peter's Village Hall on 7 November 2023 – for Paekākāriki Adaptation Area
- Various Community Board meetings.

Further to this, [On 19 October 2023, we sent out an email to all ratepayers](#) to share an update on Takutai Kapiti including what the project is intended to achieve, why we are doing this work now, our progress to date, and how people can get involved.

Council also recently mailed letters to all ratepayers informing them of the project and opportunities to provide feedback on the Panel's draft recommendations.

Ngā mihi,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Kris Pervan', with a stylized, cursive script.

Kris Pervan

Group Manager Strategy and Growth
Te Kaihautū Rautaki me te Tupu