Takutai Kāpiti.

Kāpiti Coast DISTRICT COUNCIL
Me Huri Whakamuri, Ka Titiro Whakamua

Minutes:
CAP Meeting – Raumati Adaptation Area: In-person Extended CAP Meeting

Date: Wednesday, 15 November 2023

Location: Robin's Nest, Ngā Manu Nature Reserve, 74 Ngā Manu Reserve Road, Waikanae

(MS teams- link in invite)

Time: 1.00 pm – 6.00 pm

Attendees: Jim Bolger (Chair), Jerry Mateparae, Donald Day, Susie Mills, John Barrett, Moira Poutama, Mark Taratoa, Olivia Bird, Stephen Daysh, Kate MacDonald, Damian Debski, Derek Todd (Online), Rhys Girven (Online), Iain Dawe, Deanna Rudd, Jason Holland, Yvonna Chrzanowska, Alfred Lison, Oskar Temel and Abbey Morris

Observers: Sophie Handford, Bede Laracy

Apologies: Kelvin Nixon, Martin Manning, Glen Olsen, Michael Moore, Tim Sutton, Kris Pervan, Sandhira Naidoo, Aastha Shrestha.

Agenda Item	Comments
Opening & Introductions	**Opening Karakia** by **Deanna** **Welcome** by **Jim Bolger, Chair** Jim extended welcome to Bede Laracy, and Sophie Handford who were the CAP Observers. Apologies were noted.
Confirmation of the Minutes	**Confirmation of the Minutes** • Jim motioned to move the minutes be accepted. • Don supported the motion to move the minutes and Olivia seconded the motion.
Debrief from Paekākāriki Engagement Workshop	**Jim Bolger, Chair** Jim provided an update on the Paekākāriki values community workshop, held on Tuesday 7 November 2023, and which 60 community members RSVPed to attend. He invited CAP to share their experience. • Olivia said the workshop went well as a whole but observed that those attending wanted more context about the decision-making process, and why they were being asked the values questions, and next steps. Jerry supported Olivia's observation. • Susie asked if Paekākāriki residents will be getting more information from technical perspective. Abbey responded saying that post-it notes questions (with responses) and the FAQ's will be shared with those who signed up for workshop and through the Takutai Kapiti (TK) newsletter. • Jerry noted that quite a few non-Paekākāriki residents in attendance. Abbey explained that an honesty system was in place where people RSVPing were trusted to give an honest answer to whether they were from Paekākāriki or not. Based on the finalised RSVP ticketed list, six people outside of Paekākāriki received tickets to attend the workshop. • Stephen observed good engagement from tables, and good quality responses were received from residents in the values questions and via the post-it notes.
Project Update	**Abbey Morris (KCDC)** • Abbey informed CAP that there is a new work programme and explained the focus of three workshops scheduled before Christmas. • Abbey noted that letters had been received from the Ministry for the Environment (MfE) and Department of Conservation (DOC) in response to the letters from Darren Edwards (Chief Executive, KCDC) sent regarding the use of government guidance. Both MfE and

	DOC have responded, and all of these letters are publicly available on the new Takutai Kāpiti website. A key element from MfE's response is that they have confirmed Jacobs are correctly following the guidance, including the usage of the SSP5-8.5 scenario. • The Council has sent CAP the Raumati Adaptation Area (RAA) engagement summary report which has correlated the values provided from the community through the Raumati community values workshop and Have Your Say online survey. The report identifies key themes and shows all values/comments received from the community in the appendixes of the report. The report will be made available on the new Takutai Kapiti website. • Abbey shared that Dr Paula Blackett and Dr Danielle Johnson from NIWA have joined TAG to support the project and CAP with the human domain risk assessments for Paekākāriki and Raumati Adaptation Areas. They will also undertake the MCDA scoring commentary for the human domain. Paula Blackett has expertise in human domain and was the lead for the human domain for MfE's guidance on contributed to the *National Climate Change Risk Assessment for New Zealand* (MfE 2020). • Also shared that a new ecologist is about to join the TAG.
Presentation of Built Environment and Natural Character Risk Assessments for Raumati Adaptation Area	**Kate MacDonald and Damian Debski, Jacobs (Facilitated information session with discussion)** *Presentation: Raumati Adaptation Area Risk Assessment (PowerPoint)* • Kate ran the CAP through the presentation providing a refresher on the purpose of risk assessments and methodology used. She explained that only the Built Environment and Natural Character Domains are being presented today. • Kate spoke to the **Built Environment** elements in general. She explained that Jacobs' information on the status of the Raumati seawalls were based on the condition assessment completed by Tonkin & Taylor in 2017 and 2021, which identified the residual life of the structures (between 10 - 30 years). As with all risk assessments, the assessment is made based on a 'nothing done situation', so the risk assessments look at what would happen whilst the seawalls are in place, and after their life as if they were not replaced. Therefore the risk assessments do not consider what the risks could be if a new seawall is established to replace the existing ones once past their life expectancy. • Kate explained that this risk assessment divides the RAA into two areas: Raumati Beach & Raumati South, using the SA2 boundaries. Stephen clarified that SA2 stands for Statistical Area boundaries. • Kate explained that for the property element, the erosion and inundation risks are assessed across the 3600 properties in the whole adaptation area. In addition, for erosion, the assessment also looks at the specific risk to the 250 properties that are considered beachfront. The percentages relate to properties at risk across the whole RAA, and for erosion, as a percentage of total beachfront properties. • Kate then spoke to the erosion risk to the Built Environment elements. Kate explained that the risk assessment looked at what would happen in a storm event if the structures failed in the present day, based on a 'do nothing' situation. Structure failure would expose the 250 properties to extreme erosion risk. Kate explained that when this number of properties is considered against all properties within the whole RAA, this presents as a moderate risk (7% of total RAA properties). But when looked at in relation to just beachfront properties alone, the risk to these properties becomes extreme in all timeframes and sea level rise scenarios. This equates to 89% of beachfront properties in Raumati Beach section and 116 properties in the Raumati South section (or 99% of beachfront properties) if no adaptation options are undertaken. These properties also have extreme sensitivity due to erosion line intersecting not just a property boundary, but also across dwellings on many properties.

	• With other elements, over a 100 year period the erosion risks to infrastructure become very high. This is because along the Raumati coastline (except for The Esplanade), majority of infrastructure runs along the road corridors, and they connect the broader 3-waters network and services to houses. In 2050 and 2070 scenarios, the shoreline comes back and interacts with some of the infrastructure, and these services are connected to houses, and are being impacted at the same time. • At 2130, scenarios indicate the shoreline cuts back into Rosetta Road, the Esplanade, and parts of Wharemauku road, which disrupts the wider network, so pipes and services are likely to be impacted. Stephen asked to clarify why wastewater and gas are at higher risk. Kate said they ranked higher based on higher sensitivities around failure causing hygiene and health and safety risks. • Abbey said once the RAA risk assessment report is finalised, and peer reviewed it will be made available to the public. • Jason added that higher order planning documents (New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement, Regional Policy Statement) do offer some support to the use of hard protection to protect existing development and infrastructure assets. • Damian spoke on the impact on inundation on Built Environment elements. The assessment was done using a combination of vulnerability and exposure (e.g. length of road, number of properties, etc) and coastal inundation mapping, over different sea-level rise scenarios. The RAA risk assessment shows the exposure to coastal inundation is low to very low across all scenarios, due to higher ground levels for much of the land in the RAA. However, there are some low-lying areas around the Wharemauku Stream which are projected to be impacted. In the lower sea level rise scenario, there is a relatively low number of properties at risk of inundation (present day indicates 54 properties are in the hazard area) compared to all houses in RAA. As sea level rise increases, low-lying areas are more at risk of storm tides, which can travel upstream and overtop into properties. Over medium and longer timeframes, the numbers of properties at risk increases but are still rated as low risk due to small amount of properties at risk compared to the amount of all properties within the RAA. • Other risk assessment considerations include: the adaptive capacity, and for most Built Environment elements this is very low, as hard physical work is required to adapt. Sensitivity is related primarily to depth of flooding, and because the land is higher and the flooding depths are lower, the sensitivity rating is low. • Damien pointed out that despite the low overall risk rating, there still are a few properties located in moderate to high vulnerability categories. He suggested that CAP consider pathways that allow for local measures that address specific properties at risk. Jerry asked for clarification on where the most at risk elements are located. Damian confirmed that low-lying areas exist near Wharemauku and other streams, and between Rosetta Road and the beach and behind Rosetta Road, as well as Matatua Road, and Moa Road and pathways for inundation where these areas connected by stormwater drains. • Jerry asked what the Insurance Council would know about these risks. He noted the anxiety and concern at the RAA community engagement workshop from some attendees about the impact of risk assessments on the value of property and insurability. Damian reminded that this risk assessment covers coastal inundation only. He stressed that this is only one of the overall risk profiles for the area and noted that there are many other risks that insurance companies consider and are aware of. • Iain added that in conversations with Insurance Council members and hazard and risk assessors on this topic, that most companies already have information on the level of risk (often well before councils) and are aware of the risks to the assets they insure.

	• Stephen noted to the CAP the difference of risks between Adaptation Areas. The NAA and CAA are projected to experience higher risk of inundation, whilst lower erosion risks compared to the RAA. For the RAA, erosion on the beachfront is the predominate issue for this area. Overall, the context in RAA different, as many properties in RAA are in low-risk areas. • Jerry observed that those not owning beachfront properties may question whether they should contribute to protect beachfront houses. Jim added that the challenge and difficulty will be around funding decisions and how they will be made regarding private properties at erosion risk. • Jerry sought clarification on whether coastal property owners were required to pay extra rates. Jim asked if this could be confirmed. Abbey said she would check to see if there are rating units currently dedicated to coastal ratepayers. • Jason noted that the feedback from the GM is that it will be a Council decision to work out how the costs of adaptation will be shared, and that such decisions may be a 2027 LTP decision. • Jim noted that for the CAP report it will likely cost a lot of money to protect the properties on the Raumati coastline at risk, and this will need to be determined by Council on how it will be funded and presented to the public. • Jason shared that in the current (2021) long-term plan, there is Council funding set aside for the "like for like" replacement of the Raumati public seawall. • Stephen provided background to the Hawkes Bay situation where the councils (Regional, Napier and Hastings) looked at how the distribution of adaptation costs would be funded over time, as part of their long-term plan consultation. A decision was made that the Regional Council was the appropriate agency to administer the rates. There is a likelihood that post Takutai Kapiti and CAP, Council and Greater Wellington Regional Council would need to determine which entity would be responsible for establishing rating costs for certain properties that are projected to be at risk of coastal hazards. • Jim then invited Rhys to present the **Natural Character Risk Assessment**. • Rhys explained that this area has an overall low to moderate rating for natural character, based on broader Coastal Terrestrial Area 2 information for the coastal area between Waikanae and QE Park. For the Raumati coastal section, no areas of high natural character are identified. This is because we are looking at a part of coastal environment which has seawalls and residential development and therefore relatively high levels of modification, hence relatively low sensitivity levels in terms of natural character. • Rhys noted that in the Raumati section, the extent of coastal environment is relatively narrow, because of the residential development, which reduces the influences, processes, and qualities of the coastal environment. The band where natural character purposes is defined includes about 100m to Rosetta Road. • Rhys summarised the natural character risk assessment for coastal inundation, where the risks are relatively localised with low sensitivity, low exposure, and therefore low overall risk. But for erosion, the risks to natural character are higher, and have been rated as moderate. Over time, the erosion effects on coastal environment continue, and by 2130 the risks are predicted to extend beyond the defined 100m inland extent zone, and the risk to natural character becomes high.
Define Objective for Raumati Adaptation Area	**Stephen Daysh, Mitchell Daysh** *(Facilitated discussion with CAP decision required)* • Stephen ran through the RAA Capturing Values to Inform Objectives Presentation. He reminded the CAP of how community values fit into the decision-making process and that using values specific to Raumati sets a clear objective to guide the CAP's decisions particular to the RAA.

Stephen Daysh, Mitchell Daysh	• Stephen noted that values show that maintaining access to beach and recreation is important. Regarding the natural environment, there is some recognition from community that while the dune system has been built on, there some potential for dune protection. Bede added that it is most likely that people in Raumati were thinking about dune protection in relation to QE Park. The community expressed that they are wanting to stay in their local community and to feel secure and wanting good infrastructure and governance processes. **Discussion** • Bede expressed that he was impressed that the five themes captured the RAA community's concerns that have been shared with him. • Stephen explained there is a strong desire to stay in place. This a priority for the Raumati community. • Jim acknowledged people's desire to stay in place and asked Bede if this co-relates to people's willingness to pay more rates to stay there. Bede responded that not all of the community necessarily accepts the cost to maintain the right to stay in place. However, over time, if it becomes inevitable that infrastructure needs fixing, then these discussions about costs will need to occur. Bede added that those beachfront residents living north of Wharemauku Stream, where there are private seawalls, are coming to terms with needing to pay. He indicated that those living further south, that have protection with the council seawall, may be less likely to want to pay more. • Jerry noted that some property owners have put in their own secondary wall above the council seawall. • Iain added that these beachfront properties have been built on top of quite steep dunes, and the council seawall can be readily overtopped. This can lead to properties being eroded during storm events. • Stephen noted that the RAA community strongly values having a local seawall. He noted that the MCDA process will also look at the realities of ongoing infrastructure costs. • Abbey explained that the top three adaptation pathways for RAA will be decided by CAP and presented to community as options. Next April, the economics analysis of the top pathway for each Adaptation Area will begin, allowing options to be costed and shared with the community. • Stephen noted that Value 5 – showed the importance of communication about adaptation planning to keep community on the journey. Abbey commented that this value was not unique to RAA, as CAA and NAA also indicated this. • Stephen presented a draft objective based on the themes identified for the RAA as a starter, and opened the discussion to CAP to determine their own objective for the RAA. • Jerry noted that for the RAA the natural coastal environment occupies a narrow strip and is not a big feature, other than the beach. • Iain noted that regarding accessibility, at high tide, some of the foreshore cannot be accessed. • Stephen noted that at higher sea level rise (SLR) scenarios and over time, there will be changes to accessibility and natural environment. He suggested introducing the wording "for as long as possible" into the objective. There was discussion about where this wording should go, and it was agreed it should be placed in the opening sentence, after words "stay in place". • Bede cautioned that some of the angrier voices in community, may perceive that wording indicates that managed retreat is the underlying agenda. • Olivia suggested that CAA objective should indicate the long-term approach. Susie suggested adding the words "for the long term".

	• Olivia suggested adding the words "maintain and enhance" to bullets 2 and 3, and adding "and implement" after the word "develop" in the first sentence. • Bede asked if the words "local seawall" relates to only the council seawall. He suggested those who had private seawalls may be concerned that this was part of CAP's remit, so clarification was needed. Abbey said the responses from community values engagement did not specify between public or private seawalls. • Jason suggested that the wording "our seawall" refers to the council (public) seawall. • Sophie suggested remove "local" and replace with word "public" seawall. She also questioned whether the word "stay in place" may predetermine a 'Protect' adaptation option approach, even when technically it is not the most feasible nor sensible options or may not continue to provide other community benefits. • Stephen agreed and added that a range of long-term options are important to keep on the table in order to have some flexibility to respond. • Jim agreed that using the words long term provides some assurance to the community. He queried if those who had privately owned seawalls also needed to continue to maintain their own seawalls over the long term. • Bede cautioned that some residents would be looking for signs in the wording that managed retreat was predetermined. • Iain concerned that 'Retreat' pathway may be cut off now as a potential option. He suggested the option remain, because while the impact of future coastal hazards is uncertain, managed retreat may eventually become an option that needs to be considered. • Stephen suggested including wording "where practicable and affordable", as another qualifier regarding long term options. • Damian pointed out that over time, depending on the risks and level of built infrastructure in place, people may not want to remain there. • Abbey said the erosion risks in the RAA affects a proportionately small number of properties and the community strongly expressed that they wish to stay. She noted that listening to the community is an important part of this work, hence TAG has created a new form of 'Retreat' adaptation option called 'Re-establish the line with a setback sea wall'. This means only the frontline properties are retreated to make way for a new seawall to be established further inland. Therefore, the wider community can remain and be protected with only a small number of houses impacted by managed retreat. Of course, it would be up to the CAP to determine if they believe this is an appropriate adaptation option for the RAA.
TEA BREAK (3.50pm – 4.00pm)	
Define Objective for Raumati Adaptation Area (continued) Stephen Daysh, Mitchell Daysh	• Stephen noted the wording could potentially lock CAP into a hard protection pathway. He suggested adding "as long as" and either "practical" (definition: an idea/plan or method likely to succeed or be effective in real circumstances); "practicable" (definition: able to be done or put into practice successfully) or "feasible" (definition: possible to do easily or conveniently), to bullet 3 to keep the pathways open. CAP considered the definitions and preferred the wording "as long as practical". • Bede sought clarification on how "as long as practical" relates to "essential" infrastructure. Stephen responded that "essential infrastructure" applies to roading and water infrastructure. He added this phrase also relates to the public seawall. • Abbey noted that long term, continued maintenance and provision of established infrastructure services may be reconsidered by council if these come at too high a cost or risk. • CAP confirmed that they had landed their objective for the RAA.

	The CAP's RAA Objective can be found in Appendix 1 of these minutes.
Developing Pathways for Raumati Adaptation Area	**Stephen Daysh, Mitchell Daysh & Kate MacDonald, Jacobs** *(Facilitated discussion session resulting in CAP decision required)* Kate ran the CAP through the RAA Adaptation Pathways presentation. • She reminded the CAP of the aim of the session and explained that three management units exist for the RAA. This comprises of two erosion units north (9a) and south of Wharemauku Stream (10A), and one inundation unit for the whole area (9B). Kate explained the reason for two erosion units (9A and 10A) is that primarily north of Wharemauku Stream, the majority of seawalls are privately owned and maintained. Moira asked about the number of seawalls, and Kate responded that there are about 60 privately owned seawalls. • In the south, the council seawall has been identified to be rebuilt in the 2021 long term plan with a "like for like" replacement. The design life of the replacement seawall south of Wharemauku Stream, is 25 years. • Kate presented the updated list of adaptation options, which includes the *"re-establish the line with setback seawall"*, under the retreat heading. • Kate then explained the Draft Adaption Pathways for each management unit and referred to the descriptions in the RAA High-Level Menu of Pathway Options. • Stephen briefly explained to Bede, that Dynamic Adaptive Pathway Planning (DAPP) considers signals, triggers and thresholds to move to the next option on that pathway. Signals, triggers and thresholds will be discussed at a CAP workshop in December. The pathways will then be assessed by CAP based on the eight MCDA criteria. • Stephen then asked CAP to consider the draft pathway options and to make them their own. **Pathways Proposed for Unit 10A - South of the Wharemauku Stream** • As requested by CAP, the 'Beach Renourishment' (item 10 on the High-Level Menu) option has been included. Kate added this pathway is not feasible in RAA, unless a setback mechanism is implemented for the shoreline, to allow space to develop or construct a dune. • Stephen mentioned that the "re-establish the line" option was used at Te Awanga, where first line properties would need to move back. He sought clarification on where a line would likely exist in the RAA. Kate said future erosion projections in the risk assessment could inform where a line could be drawn, also considering the disruption to roads, essential services, gas supply, etc. This information would indicate a logical place for a new line. • Susie suggested that PW6 (beach renourishment) could be removed, based on previous discussions. Stephen checked with CAP who all agreed to remove PW6. • Don asked for clarification about PW4 & PW5. Kate explained that in PW 4, once the Status Quo replacement seawall is no longer effective, the next step in the medium term is to retreat the line and re-establish seawall further back. This would allow beach to have space to move, but given in Raumati there is a sediment deficit, erosion will eventually meet the setback seawall. If this wall becomes ineffective, there is a long-term option, to build another seawall. • Kate explained that PW 5 is a more transformative pathway for CAP to consider. In medium term, it also retreats the line and uses the setback seawall and adds the construction of a dune in front of wall. The sea wall then acts as the backstop, with some dune in front. This could be effective in lower SLR scenarios, however would require ongoing dune renourishment to maintain it. • John asked if dune renourishment would use locally sourced material. Kate said this would be determined at the time. Iain added that if the houses that currently exist on

	the frontal dune were removed, this could provide some sand, but it is likely more material would need to be brought in. • Stephen concluded that for PW5 renourishment in the medium term would require further renourishment to keep this option effective for a longer period. • Abbey clarified that Status Quo includes the new approved seawall as outlined in the long-term plan. Abbey noted that in PW4 in medium and long term, it would be a staggered approach to updating a seawall. Once the current seawall no longer effective, move the wall in the medium term (rebuild), the long-term seawall build another stronger seawall. • Jim queried the rationale for building several sea walls in a pathway. He added that important we don't continue to build houses in high-risk areas. • Jason reiterated that there is a workshop to discuss the "Avoid" pathway planned for December. • Abbey asked if the CAP were okay that for Unit 10A, that the retreat (8) (mass managed retreat) option is not offered and that they agree with the re-establish the line with setback sea wall option (9) instead. CAP agreed with the PW options presented by TAG. • Stephen confirmed the revisions made to pathways 1-5 for RAA, and removal of PW6, CAP has unanimously agreed to the amended pathways. ***The CAP approved draft pathways for Unit 10 A are included in these minutes, in Appendix 2*** **Pathways Proposed for Unit 9A – North of the Wharemauku Stream** • Stephen reminded CAP that Unit 9A relates to the section where there is no Council seawall and presented the nine pathways for discussion. • Derek noted that in this unit, for seawalls, "Enhance" refers to piecemeal approach of individual seawalls along the coastline. • Abbey noted that PW8 offers the option of a new or replacement continuous seawall to be built, as opposed to the current piecemeal approach. Derek said that seawall could still be a private seawall but could have the benefits of a coordinated design and location to ensure a consistency in protection level. • Olivia asked TAG why PW 4 not appropriate. Kate explained that beach renourishment is difficult and costly to do due to massive amount of sediment needed. Also, there is not enough area available to build up a beach. Stephen asked CAP about whether to remove PW4. CAP confirmed they agreed PW4 should be removed. • Stephen asked Kate to clarify the terminology used for this unit. Kate explained that in this area "Status Quo" recognised the age of the various individual seawalls (i.e., residual life of structures), piecemeal approach and the likelihood that this approach would not continue to be effective in the near future. "Enhance" means allowing owners to continue maintenance and upgrade. Kate said Status Quo and Enhance are both uncoordinated approaches. The seawall option in PW8 is different as it proposes a co-ordinated approach to a seawall, as a technical approach that would best manage the erosion risk. The extent of council involvement would need to be determined. • John asked Bede if anyone in community would be keen on a coordinated approach. Bede responded that some people had shown interest in Council doing project management, or consultation to have a coordinated effort to the risk. Some have mentioned having targeted rates to cover costs. • Olivia suggested some overlap between pathways (PW 1,2,3) and suggested removing one of the pathways. Stephen suggested removing PW 1 and CAP agreed. • Abbey suggested that pathways with Status Quo in short term are not necessary a good option for dealing with erosion hazards, given the lifespan of many of the private seawalls.

	• Stephen suggested that in light of status quo being not favourable in the short term, that PW3 also be removed. He suggested that because this is a complex unit, keeping 6 pathways on the table is sensible and provides a range of options. • Don asked question on the long-term Beach Renourishment approach that PW7 takes. Kate explained that it is similar to unit 10A, where in the medium term, this pathway could be transformative. This is done by using a "Re-established line with a setback sea wall" (9), and "Dune Reconstruction" (11) approach, to provide a more natural environment. Iain reminded CAP that in long term option, Beach Renourishment would be required to maintain the dune. • Kate suggested add "Enhanced Seawall" (12) to PW9 as a long term option, as per discussion from the previous unit. Derek added that should include PW 8 and PW6. • Moira asked how effective the coordinated approach has been in Australia's Gold Coast. Derek responded saying a coordinated approach has been effective, however, where individual owners did not contribute to seawall costs, that some gaps in a seawall will impact its overall effectiveness. Stephen notes that in Hawkes Bay sometimes people did not want to contribute. Stephen noted that the menu makes it pretty clear that a coordinated approach will be taken. • Stephen summarised the discussion and proposed that six pathways be retained for CAPs consideration with the shortlist including PW 2,5,6,7,8,9; and removal of Pathways 1, 3 and 4. CAP agreed to the shortlisted pathways as proposed. • Jerry noted that PW 2 has been retained to test the efficacy of the status quo pathway, against the MCDA criteria. ***The CAP approved draft pathways for Unit 9 A are included in these minutes, in Appendix 2*** **Pathways Proposed for Unit 9B – Inundation Unit** • Damian provided an overview of the properties and elements at risk in this unit. He explained that pathways reflect the risk profile, based on low number of properties with limited exposure and vulnerability to inundation. In the short term, status quo (1) and community education and emergency management (4) measures can be used to inform owners of at-risk properties on the actions they can take. Education can help property owners limit their exposure to risks from king tides, storm tides, etc, and are less costly options for managing the risk especially since there is a low inundation risk for the RAA. • Damian explained that in the medium-term options for enhancing existing inundation protection (3), Protect (13, 14, 15) and Accommodate (5, 7) options are proposed. In the longer term, with some higher inundation probabilities likely, enhancing with new inundation protection, (PW 4 & PW5) is proposed. Also, PW1 moving to protect using Additional Hard Protection (13, 14, 15), and to continue efforts to Accommodate (5 & 7). • Damian explained that the PW 1 – PW3, are around lower scale actions in short-med term and reflect the risk profile and have different approaches for the longer term. He suggested that CAP may want to rationalise PW1-3 down. For PWs 4-7 the reflect pathways responses to higher scenarios. • Don asked in question about the two long-term accommodate options (elevate floor levels and flood proofing) and whether they could be combined into one pathway. Stephen suggested combining PW 2 and PW3 and CAP agreed to this combination. • Stephen suggested that given the low risk profile in the short term that PW 5,6, & 7 be deleted. He asked CAP for their input, and they agreed with the deletion. • Damian pointed out to CAP that there is no retreat in the mix for this management unit. ***CAP approved draft pathways for Unit 9 B are included in these minutes, in Appendix 2***
TEA BREAK	

Defining Multiple Criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA) Weightings for Raumati Adaptation Area	**Stephen Daysh, Mitchell Daysh & Derek Todd, Jacobs** *(Facilitated discussion session resulting in CAP decision required)* • Stephen guided the CAP through two existing documents (handouts): the *Takutai Kapiti MCDA weighting chart* and the *MCDA Criteria and Scoring Guide*. He reminded the CAP of the purpose of the weightings, which will be assigned to the RAA MCDA criteria to assign relative importance. He reminded CAP that relative importance of criteria may vary between Adaptation Areas, and that is important, because it shows that the MCDA scoring is responding to individual adaptation areas. • Stephen suggested that the discussion on weighting could start with Susie's pre-scored reasons and numbers. CAP agreed. • In reference to Ecology, the weighting proposed was 2. The reasons provided included a seawall may not be good for ecology, and likely existing damage to ecological values. • In reference to Landscape, Stephen said that a 2 seems logical to him, as it is not a high natural character area. Jim agreed and asked the CAP for their thoughts. CAP also agreed. • In reference to Te ao Māori values, Jim said he is inclined to give it a 3, Olivia echoed this. Jim asked for John's opinion. John said he couldn't think of a reason why it wouldn't be a 3. Stephen shared that the whole coast has a high value to mana whenua so wouldn't treat Raumati different to anywhere else. John added there were some specific sites of significance, naming Wharemauku Stream mouth and Pā tuna (eel) as an example. • In reference to Community Social and Economic Wellbeing, Olivia shared that the prescoring was to give it a 3, reason being that the community values this highly. Jim asked if CAP agrees with giving it a 3, CAP agreed. • In reference Public Access and Recreation, Stephen said that the RAA is a highly recreated area, CAP agreed to give it a 3. • In reference to Regulatory consenting and policy risk, Don shared Suzie's prescoring as a 2/3 (with a circle around 2). Abbey shared that if something is rated high it's going to be given a lot more consideration as to whether it is the best adaptation option. If seawalls are a big part of this drive, CAP need to be mindful that there are many regulatory requirements to build sea walls. • Abbey asked Jason to comment. Jason said MCDA scoring of the "consenting and policy risk" criteria would occur at a future CAP workshop – the decision today is just to decide the weighting of this criteria. Jason shared, based on what CAP has done in previous adaptation areas, CAP has weighted this criterion quite low. The reason being that if a pathway scores highly for the other criteria, CAP should still recommend it even if the consenting process could be challenging. Stephen shared that he feels this is fundamentally right approach. • Stephen asked CAP what they thought on the weighting for Consenting. CAP agreed on a weighting of 1. • In reference to Effectively manages the risk of coastal erosion, CAP agreed on a weighting of 3. • In reference to Effectively manages the risk of coastal inundation erosion, the suggested score was 3. Abbey asked CAP if this weighting is too high, when compared to the weighting for this criterion in the other Adaptation Areas, as the RAA has a low risk for inundation. CAP agreed to a 2 weighting for inundation. • Stephen suggested that before weightings are finalised that CAP check the weightings against the RAA objective that was previously agreed. • Olivia queried the weighting for Ecology. She was concerned that adaptation options should not further detriment ecology and could have the potential to provide enhancements. Iain agreed that design could incorporate features that aide ecological values. After discussion, CAP agreed to weighting ecology at 3.

	• After discussion, CAP considered and agreed on the final weightings. ***The CAP approved weightings and reasons are included in these minutes, in Appendix 3***
Next Steps	**Abbey Morris (KCDC)** • Abbey confirmed that the next CAP meeting will be on Thurs 30 November 2-4pm and will cover Thresholds for the NAA & CAA. CAP's Thresholds recommendations could be a starter for Council to consider during further engagement with the community. Abbey explained that after Takutai Kāpiti finishes in June 2024, further engagement will be done in each management unit on signals, triggers, and thresholds. • Jerry asked what is after Takutai Kāpiti. Abbey replied that CAP will present the recommendation report to Council. After Takutai Kāpiti further engagement will be required with the community down to a management unit to determine each community's signals, triggers and thresholds. Additionally, further engagement would be needed with the community before any adaptation options are implemented. Currently there is a bid in as part of prepare the next long-term plan, which covers a request for funding to carry out further engagement with the community regarding adapting to coastal hazards. • Jerry asked when does CAP finish and when does CAP get to engage next with community? Abbey answered the CAP recommendation report is due late May 2024 and that will be the last step for CAP as part of Takutai Kāpiti. Regarding CAP further engaging with the community, once CAP has completed their draft pathways recommendations for the Central, Raumati, and Paekākāriki adaptation areas further will be feedback sessions per Adaptation Area like was done for Northern. Then there will be another final district wide engagement once CAP has considered the economic analysis for their draft pathways and made any adjustments. This final engagement is scheduled to take place in April 2024. • Jerry shared that at the Paekākāriki community meeting, there was a concern that the community felt they were not getting enough information. People he spoke with want to understand the process, to know that peer review has been done and want an expert to be present at the community meetings. Jerry shared concern that CAP needs to continue to engage and share information with the community and to consider the personal impact on residents. • Abbey responded that there was a Q&A session at the Northern (NAA) pathways presentation to community, which Jacobs attended. Another potential opportunity for CAP to engage for Takutai Kāpiti, is to attend the Vision Kāpiti pop-up sessions in the new year. These sessions enable the community to talk to councillors one on one. • Jerry stressed that the independence of CAP was important. He noted that if everything CAP does is scheduled and shaped by Council, then it is noticed by the community. There must be another way for CAP to demonstrate independence. • Jim shared that more meetings may not be so productive given the progress made, and would require an additional time commitment from CAP. He was comfortable that community has had the opportunity for input and that the variety of community concerns expressed at engagements have provided CAP with a good understanding. He then asked the members of CAP for their thoughts. • Don shared concerns that CAP focuses too much on Council organised events, which has led CAP to be seen as a sub-committee for Council rather than an independent community panel. The community want to know more about CAP and what they do. He suggested that CAP fill the void between specified Council events and continue to engage with community, on all parts of the process. • Don shared that some people at the Paekākāriki workshop were sent letters from the Council saying the event would be the only opportunity to be in the same room as the CAP. Don expressed that this is not how the CAP operate and not in accordance with the

	Terms of Reference, and changes need to be made. Abbey shared she was surprised to hear this as Council has never said to this to the community, nor written any letters saying such. • Don suggested that CAP be more available for engagement to meet with members of community. He suggested that CAP attend Paekākāriki and Raumati Community boards meetings, despite being told by Council that it is not a good idea. • Don expressed noted that there was one table with young people (under 30's) in Paekākāriki, and he would like to see hear more from younger age-group. • Jim asked Don what he is suggesting. Don replied pop-ups in community like what was done in 2022 at markets and libraries. He added that being more active with using technology that is available to connect with wider audience, in particular the silent majority who we don't hear from, e.g. HYS to get ongoing conversations going. He recognised that this takes effort, and he is willing to put time into this. He said a number of different initiatives that could work. Don attempted to engage with Youth Council but they are not available till Feb 2024. Community Boards are an integral point of connections to engagement, so CAP could work alongside them, to update and provide information and to receive feedback. He believed there were lost opportunities. • Jim expressed concern as to what would come out of further discussions and the risk to all of the work done to date. • Jerry said that Don is suggesting that CAP go to the community and say: "this is what we heard, the process is this X, the point we are at now is Y, and next steps are Z". This is a way to provide feedback to the community about what CAP is doing. He added that online is not always accessible to community. Being visible is important, as how can we be a community panel if we are not there to listen. It is important for CAP to let people have their say, give people opportunity to engage. He added that he is happy to give up a day of his own time to give the community this opportunity, as are Kelvin, Martin, and Don. He expressed that a CAP engagement doesn't need to be overly organised, but the opportunity needs to be provided, otherwise CAP will be open to criticism. • Jerry said that when he shares with the public where CAP is getting to, for example, when about what happened in Ōtaki, where Mana Whenua helped CAP shape our Adaptation options, that this was appreciated by the community. • John agrees with what's been said. He added that the key issue regarding iwi engagement, is that what is presented has integrity to get the support of constituents (Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai). He has arranged one hui so far to share more information and has received huge interest in this Kaupapa. He has asked for another meeting before Christmas, where he will share more details and be satisfied that his community is brought along. • Jim invited Stephen for comment. Stephen shared that the PAA meeting was good in term of questions that were asked. One person who wanted Q&A, was directed to add questions to the post-it-note board. It takes time to get answers to questions and get them shared or posted online. Stephen thinks the RAA was a hard meeting because people were fired up and people wanted to have their say. Stephen thinks Council has provided a good level of information and can't do much more than what has been provided. • The Q&A for CAA session will be important. Abbey said the te ao Māori values criterion has not yet been completed, and once done, that will finalise the pathways for the CAA. After the MCDA scoring is complete, the CAP's draft CAA pathways can be presented to the community and community feedback sought. As with the NAA feedback session, there was a technical expert (Derek from Jacobs) present to answer questions when the CAP asked them to – it will be possible to have Jacobs present again. • Abbey acknowledged that CAP is independent, and the CAP Terms of Reference (TOR) does state that CAP can do their own engagement. Council is working to the CAP work programme schedule (as approved by Jim and Council), which includes supporting CAP

	with the engagements related to this. Other CAP initiated engagements outside of the CAP work programme (e.g., Community Board meetings) are not part of the work programme schedule. However, CAP may choose to do such engagement on their own in line with the TOR. • Bede indicated that the 28 November is next Raumati Community Board meeting, and he extends an invitation for CAP members to attend. • Sophie invited CAP to attend the Paekākāriki Community Board meeting on 21 November 2023 too. • Jim asked Abbey about the next CAP meeting. Abbey confirmed the next meeting is online on Thurs 30 November (2-4pm) and will cover strawman thresholds for the NAA & CAA. • Jim asked Don to look at establishing independent CAP engagements. • Jim asked if there were any final remarks – there were none. He thanked everyone for attending and contributing to this meeting. He noted that CAP is making progress. He thanked the work of the Council in supporting the CAP, and Stephen for guiding the process.
Closing Karakia	By **Moira**

ATTACHMENTS
Risk Assessment Presentation
RAA Capturing Values to Inform Objective PowerPoint Presentation
RAA Draft Adaptation Pathways Presentation
RAA High-level Menu of Pathway Options

ACTIONS		
	• **Abbey to provide clarification on if rating units exist for coastal property owners currently.**	
	• **Don to look at establishing independent CAP engagements.**	

Appendix 1: CAP's Objective for the Raumati Adaptation Area

Develop and implement responses to coastal hazards that protects our whole community so we can stay in place for the long term while:

- *Continuing to enjoy access to our coastline;*
- *Maintaining and enhancing our natural environment and recreation spaces;*
- *Maintaining and enhancing our public sea wall and other essential infrastructure for as long as practical; and*

Keeping the community informed and involved about the types of solutions and associated costs.

Takutai Kāpiti.

Kāpiti Coast DISTRICT COUNCIL
Me Huri Whakamuri, Ka Titiro Whakamua

Appendix 2: CAP's Draft Pathways for the Raumati Adaptation Area

Pathways Template

Sub-area: 9A Raumati (North of Wharemauku Stream)

Management Unit	Pathway	Short term	→	Medium term	→	Long term
Management Unit: 10A Raumati (North of Wharemauku Stream) erosion unit	Pathway 1	Status Quo[1] and Community Education and Emergency Management[4]	→	Enhance existing protection structure[2], Community Education and Emergency Management[4] (Enhance)	→	Re-establish the line with a setback sea wall[9] (Retreat & Protect)
	Pathway 2	Enhance existing protection structure[2], Community Education and Emergency Management[4] (Enhance)	→	Sea wall[12] (Protect – Hard Engineering)	→	Re-establish the line with a setback sea wall[9] (Retreat & Protect)
	Pathway 3	Enhance existing protection structure[2], Community Education and Emergency Management[4] (Enhance)	→	Re-establish the line with a setback sea wall[9] (Retreat & Protect)	→	Enhance Sea wall[12] (Protect – Hard Engineering)
	Pathway 4	Enhance existing protection structure[2], Community Education and Emergency Management[4] (Enhance)	→	Re-establish the line with a setback sea wall[9] & Dune reconstruction[11] (Retreat & Protect)	→	Beach renourishment[10] (Protect – Soft Engineering)
	Pathway 5	Sea wall[12] (Protect – Hard Engineering)	→	Enhance Sea wall[12] (Protect – Hard Engineering)	→	Enhance Sea wall[12] (Protect – Hard Engineering)
	Pathway 6	Sea wall[12] (Protect – Hard Engineering)	→	Re-establish the line with a setback sea wall[9] (Retreat & Protect)	→	Enhance Sea wall[12] (Protect – Hard Engineering)

All pathways at all timeframes to include "<u>Avoid</u>" option through land-use planning (e.g short term is new coastal hazard provisions in Coastal Environment District Plan Change).

- **Under existing RMA legislation, the success of planning actions is limited to re-developments and new developments by existing use rights. For re-development, this is dependent on the "turn-over" of building stock.**
- **Seawall is a coordinated approach, yet to be determined if it publicly or privately funded.**

Pathways Template

Sub-area: 10A Raumati (South of Wharemauku Stream)

Management Unit	Pathway	Short term	→	Medium term	→	Long term
Management Unit: 10A Raumati (South of Wharemauku Stream) erosion unit	Pathway 1	Status Quo[1] (Current new seawall as outlined in LTP) and Community Education and Emergency Management[4]	→	Enhance existing protection structure[2], Community Education and Emergency Management[4] (Enhance)	→	Sea wall[12] (Protect – Hard Engineering)
	Pathway 2	Status Quo[1] (Current new seawall as outlined in LTP) and Community Education and Emergency Management[4]	→	Enhance existing protection structure[2], Community Education and Emergency Management[4] (Enhance)	→	Re-establish the line with a setback sea wall[9] & Dune reconstruction[11] (Retreat & Protect)
	Pathway 3	Status Quo[1] (Current new seawall as outlined in LTP) and Community Education and Emergency Management[4]	→	Sea wall[12] (Protect – Hard Engineering)	→	Enhance Sea wall[12] (Protect – Hard Engineering)
	Pathway 4	Status Quo[1] (Current new seawall as outlined in LTP) and Community Education and Emergency Management[4]	→	Re-establish the line with a setback sea wall[9] (Retreat & Protect)	→	Enhance Sea wall[12] (Protect – Hard Engineering)
	Pathway 5	Status Quo[1] (Current new seawall as outlined in LTP) and Community Education and Emergency Management[4]	→	Re-establish the line with a setback sea wall[12] & Dune reconstruction[11] (Protect – Soft Engineering)	→	Beach renourishment[10] (Protect – Soft Engineering)

The proposed works for the Raumati seawall upgrade will have a design life of 25 years. Under 'status quo' it is assumed that these works will go ahead, and therefore will provide protection along this section of coastline for the next 25 years.

- **All pathways at all timeframes to include "Avoid" option through land-use planning (e.g short term is new coastal hazard provisions in Coastal Environment District Plan Change).**
- **Under existing RMA legislation, the success of planning actions is limited to re-developments and new developments by existing use rights. For re-development, this is dependent on the "turn-over" of building stock.**

Pathways Template

Sub-area: 9B Raumati (Inundation unit)

Management Unit	Pathway	Short term	→	Medium term	→	Long term
Management Unit B: Raumati Inundation Unit	Pathway 1	Status Quo[1] and Community Education and Emergency Management[4]	→	Enhance Existing Inundation Protection[3] and Community Education and Emergency Management[4] (Enhance)	→	Additional Hard Protection (e.g. Stopbanks[13] , Culverts[14], Pumpstations[15]) (Protect)
	Pathway 2	Status Quo[1] and Community Education and Emergency Management[4]	→	Enhance Existing Inundation Protection[3] and Community Education and Emergency Management[4] (Enhance)	→	Flood proofing buildings and infrastructure[5] and/or Elevate floor levels of buildings[7] (Accommodate)
	Pathway 3	Status Quo[1] and Community Education and Emergency Management[4]	→	Additional Hard Protection (e.g. Stopbanks[13] , Culverts[14], Pumpstations[15]) (Protect)	→	Enhance New Inundation Protection[3] (Enhance)

- **All pathways at all timeframes to include "Avoid" option through land-use planning (e.g short term is new coastal hazard provisions in Coastal Environment District Plan Change).**
- **Under existing RMA legislation, the success of planning actions is limited to re-developments and new developments by existing use rights. For re-development, this is dependent on the "turn-over" of building stock.**

Takutai Kāpiti.

Kāpiti Coast DISTRICT COUNCIL
Me Huri Whakamuri, Ka Titiro Whakamua

Appendix 3: Raumati Adaptation Area MCDA Weighting Chart

	#	Criteria	Description	Weighting	Key Reasons
Impact Criteria	1.	**Ecology**	• Impact or enhancement on indigenous biodiversity values and habitat; and ecosystem functioning within the coastal environment and surroundings. ▪ Ability to protect the natural adaptive capacity of the ecosystem.	3	• Seawall may not be good for ecology. • Seawalls are already existing in this adaptation area. However it is important to make sure implemented adaptation options have the opportunity to support ecology. It is important to consider if adaptation option would negatively impact ecology.
	2.	**Landscape**	• Impact on the natural character of coastal environment and surroundings. • Aesthetic outcomes of implementing the option and the meaning of this to the community. • Ability to protect the natural adaptive capacity of natural character.	2	• There is not a high-level of Natural Character within this adaptation area.
	3.	**Te ao Māori values**	• Impacts on or enhancement of the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu and other taonga. • Maintains access to, and enables the carrying out of customary activities, such as mahinga kai.	3	• Wharemauku Stream and stream mouth are highly valued. • Pa tuna (eel) is within this adaptation area.

	4.	**Community Social and Economic Wellbeing**	• The community has choice around: • Health and safety of the community • Certainty around future of community • Social cohesion within the community • Maintain the insurability of personal assets.	3	• There is a strong community value and enhances cohesion
	5.	**Public Access and Recreation**	• Wider community/district use of the coastal environment • Opportunities for recreation • Public access to the coastal environment	3	• The community values this criterion for this adaptation area. • Is a highly recreated area with good access to the coastline.

Technical Criteria	**6.**	**Regulatory consenting and policy risk**	• Regulatory consenting and policy risks of implementing an option including:
			  • Consenting requirements;
			  • District plan changes; and
			  • Consistency with statutory framework.
			• Carbon footprint associated with the pathway.
				1	• Do not want to reduce adaptation options too early based on regulatory, consenting and policy risks.

	7.	**Effectively manages the risks of coastal erosion**	• Effectively manages the risks of Coastal Erosion. • Proportionate to the nature and scale of the risk over time. • Avoids the exacerbation of risk in other areas. • Approaches are supported by best practice and a robust consideration of the • science/Mātauranga	3	• Erosion is the significant risk for this adaptation area.

	8.	**Effectively manages the risks of coastal inundation**	• Effectively manages the risks of Coastal Flooding. • Proportionate to the nature and scale of the risk over time. • Avoids the exacerbation of risk in other areas. • Approaches are supported by best practice and a robust consideration of the • science/Mātauranga	2	• As inundation is considered to be a low risk for this adaptation area, however the option still need to be effective.
	Guidance • All criteria must be 'weighted' on a scale of 1 to 3 (no half numbers) • Weightings are assigned to reflect relative importance between criteria • All criteria are important – wouldn't be included if they weren't • Weightings reflect that while all criteria are important, they are not all equally important to the task at hand • The Panel must debate and ultimately agree which weighting to apply to each criteria				