

Minutes: Online Mini–CAP Meeting – Raumati Adaptation Area: Excluding Options from the Long List

Date: Wednesday, 25 October 2023
Location: Online (MS teams–link in invite)
Time: 3.00 pm – 4.30 pm

Attendees: Jim Bolger (Chair), Donald Day, Martin Manning, Susie Mills, John Barrett, Moira Poutama, , Olivia Bird, Kelvin Nixon, Stephen Daysh, Kate MacDonald, Iain Dawe, Jason Holland, Sandhira Naidoo, Yvonna Chrzanowska, Alfred Lison, Aastha Shrestha and Abbey Morris

Observers: Tim Sutton and Sophie Handford

Apologies: Kris Pervan, Jerry Mateparae, Te Rangimārie Williams, Derek Todd, Deanna Rudd, Michael Moore, Mark Taratoa, and Glen Olsen

Agenda Item	Comments
Opening & Welcome	<p>Opening Karakia by Moira Poutama</p> <p>Welcome by Jim Bolger, Chair</p>
Excluding Options from the Long List for Raumati Adaptation Area (RAA)	<p>Kate MacDonald (Jacobs) and Stephen Daysh (Mitchell Daysh)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kate provided an overview regarding the exclusion of certain long-list actions within the RAA. Kate explained that the RAA has a high erosion hazard because of limited sediment coming to that part of the coastline. Sediment travels from the north of the district down the coastline but becomes trapped around Paraparaumu in the wave shadow of Kāpiti Island, preventing its movement further south to the Raumati area. The construction of seawalls in response to storms from the 1950s has, at times, exacerbated beach steepening, leading to beach lowering and narrowing, with no sediment reaching the area to mitigate the effects. Kate explained that the inundation hazard in the RAA is generally confined to the Wharemauku Stream, with some low-lying old dune areas that sit behind the coastline. In summary, Raumati faces a high erosion hazard and relatively low to moderate inundation hazard. Kate systematically outlined the reasons behind TAG's decision to exclude certain actions from the options list, citing the specific rationale provided in the table presented to CAP. This table with commentary and endorsement from CAP is included within Appendix 1 to these minutes. <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kelvin raised that currently numerous individual seawalls are being constructed along the coastline by individuals, which are inconsistent in design and placement. He suggested that it might be a potential decision to consider building an offshore breakwater on the existing sandbar, located a bit further down the coast. Kate concurred with Kelvin that maintaining consistency is a huge challenge along the coastline. The disconnects between structure design, structure material, structure lifetime, and future liability of subsequent owners to maintain structures. Instead, a more effective approach would be to establish onshore consistency, such as onshore walls, revetments, or concrete walls, rather than pursuing the offshore breakwater option. Kate further explained that an offshore breakwater would likely face consenting hurdles and in and of itself would have limited benefits, as some form of onshore hard protection would also be needed for that breakwater to make a substantial impact. Iain expanded on Kate's remarks, highlighting the complexity of implementing breakwaters. He explained that it wouldn't suffice to build a single, continuous structure; instead, a series of breakwaters would be required. These structures

might be around 80 meters in length and would need to be placed in parallel to the shore with similar spacing between them, possibly spanning several hundred meters. Iain noted that during storm surges, which cause temporary sea-level elevation, the waves could swamp and potentially submerge these structures, despite their intended function of dampening wave activity in typical conditions. As Kate mentioned, even with breakwaters, some form of onshore protection would still be necessary.

- Iain also highlighted the primary purpose of breakwaters, which is to mitigate day-to-day wave activity and potentially trap sand. However, there's uncertainty about whether there's a sufficient supply of sand in the system for this purpose, as very little sediment is currently making its way down the shore. He echoed Kelvin's mention of the sandbar, explaining that it is a characteristic of sandy beach processes, where sand is eroded off the shore, transported to nearby areas, and cyclically returned to the beach.
- Iain expressed his reservations about the suitability of breakwaters as an option, considering the potential high costs associated with modelling and building these structures and the limited benefits they may offer.
- Stephen pointed out that while offshore breakwaters were retained as an option for the Central Adaptation Area (CAA), the TAG is advising the CAP that they should be excluded as an adaptation option for the RAA for CAP's pathway development. He sought clarification on whether TAG's recommendation to remove offshore breakwaters from consideration was due to the differentiating unique coastal dynamics in the RAA compared to the CAA due to these differences in coastal environments. Kate confirmed yes.
- Kate pointed out an option under 'Enhance' called "private owners' responsibility," suggesting that it might be a worthwhile topic for CAP to consider. This option essentially reflects the status quo in many areas within the RAA, where property owners are responsible for managing their protection.
- Martin stressed the importance of engaging in discussions with companies/locals who have successfully implemented artificial reefs eg Ecoreef. Abbey informed CAP that the Coastal Project team are arranging such.
- Susie asked about the type of structure under consideration regarding the artificial reef. Iain answered that it would be classed as a combination between a revetment made of rocks and a vertical seawall, which is essentially a hybrid version of those two structural ideas.
- Martin offered a clarification, stating that the interlocking mechanism used is distinct from conventional rock structures. When extended over several kilometers, it transforms into an interlocking wall rather than a rock.
- Iain further clarified his use of the term "hybrid" by indicating that it pertains to the combination of structural processes being mimicked, encompassing both a dissipative structure like riprap and a more rigid structure like a vertical seawall that remains in place.
- Kate pointed out that under 'Protect', there's an option under 'stepped seawall' which is interlocking pre-cast block seawall, which still fits under the interlocking concrete design.
- Stephen directed a question to TAG that in the RAA, a hard seawall of some form, such as a rock revetment or a solid concrete seawall, appears to be a primary consideration. He mentioned that the interlocking concrete seems to serve as a design element that falls between these two options, and he doesn't believe it should be ruled out.
- Stephen asked CAP to bear in mind that it is a component of the design solution, particularly for ecoreefs. He sought clarification from Kate and Iain regarding whether the interlocking concrete is solely a design detail and not off the table.
- Kate concurred with Stephen, affirming that the specific design details are not entirely off the table. This is to decide if we want to hold the line and protect it

where it is or set it back, a decision that encompasses broad considerations. It involves determining whether hard concrete structures will be employed or if softer, more environmentally friendly designs are feasible. Kate noted that this is where Martin's ecoreef solutions come into play, which could differentiate from concrete structures by offering potential ecological, social, and other benefits that may be factored into the MCDA scoring.

- Kate summarised that CAP's potential recommendations could involve holding the line while incorporating ecological and recreational benefits. This might involve using local suppliers, as suggested by Martin, which could be integrated into CAP's report.
- Martin commented on the issue of cost and emphasised the need to determine cost of any alternative and relocation as a part of retreat. Obtaining advice from the Council on these matters is essential, as CAP currently lacks information regarding the costs involved. Kelvin commented that costs wouldn't be CAP's responsibility.
- Abbey responded that there will be analysis of the pathways and an economic assessment towards the project's conclusion which will help determine what option would be more expensive. Technically at this stage, primary focus is on identifying what is most beneficial and effective adaptation option, with costs being considered later in the project. She concurred with Martin that 'retreat' likely is going to be expensive in comparison to other adaptation options.
- The Chair asked if CAP were content to move with accepting the TAG recommendations or if they have further questions.
- Martin accepted in trust conditional to further analysis of costs and benefits. Stephen commented that TAG would be evaluating the costs and benefits of the top three pathway options, which will provide valuable insights into the cost implications. He suggested that, before presenting their report to the Council, CAP might want to review their preferred pathways based on this additional cost information, which could potentially lead to adjustments in their recommendations.
- Stephen emphasised the importance of this stage, where CAP has the opportunity to question or discuss any of the options from TAG's recommendations that they wish to retain or endorse.
- John commented that TAG's recommendations made sense, were easy to read, and acknowledging their job well done.
- Susie expressed her concern about removing 'beach nourishment' under 'protect', that if this action would eliminate the possibility of implementing something akin to the approach in Paekākāriki, which involved the use of large rocks.
- Abbey responded, suggesting that it might be prudent to retain "beach nourishment" as an option to demonstrate its consideration and include it within a pathway for MCDA scoring. This would allow CAP to showcase that they considered this option and determined whether it was beneficial, especially given the limited availability of beach space for dune reconstruction.
- Jim suggested that there should be a note stating that 'CAP further discussed the retention of the "beach nourishment" option and will access its suitability during the MCDA scoring.'
- Iain contributed by discussing various types of renourishment options, including spot renourishment along the back of the beach, which can be scaled according to the specific problem at hand. He mentioned a case in Wharemauku-Marine Parade intersection where a revetment transitioned into a block wall, and this approach involved placing sand as a sacrificial buffer on the beach. While it served its purpose, the sand's longevity was limited, and the process required ongoing replenishment. People tend to express concerns when they continually witness sand being added and removed. In the case of a

	<p>beach like Raumati Beach, which already has a substantial deficit of sand, the renourishment might not last very long.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Iain mentioned an alternative approach utilised in Australia and Florida, where significant sediment bypassing offshore trench or pump system is implemented to extract large volumes of sediment from offshore areas and transport it onshore. He noted that such a method could potentially have severe ecological implications due to sand deficiency, requiring a comprehensive ecological assessment. He also commented that there has been some gravel in the beach at Paekākāriki in the past, but not enough to supply to the beach. • Susie clarified that she agreed with Iain but something like this would still need to be discussed and considered as part of the MCDA scoring. • Kelvin commented that the idea of extraction would be akin to beach scraping in terms of the ecological impact it would have. Iain responded that it would be, and going further offshore would have severe ecological impacts. • Kate posed a question to Iain regarding renourishment, whether it would be a feasible short-term option considering the existing modifications such as seawalls, or if it should be considered as a measure in the future, potentially paired alongside a retreat strategy to create space for the beach to naturally expand. Iain responded by explaining that in a high-energy environment like the one in front of a seawall, the beach becomes saturated and highly erodible during rough, stormy conditions. Consequently, any renourishment efforts undertaken in front of the seawall would likely be stripped away during such conditions. • Iain stressed the importance of space at the back of the beach, above the wave activity limit, for maintaining a sand stock. In the context of a long-term retreat plan, it would be essential to carefully manage (in a structured and controlled way) shoreline adjustments upon removing hard protection structures. At that point, renourishment and dune reconstruction might be considered in conjunction. • The chair moved to accept TAG's recommendation besides beach renourishment. CAP reached a consensus to accept. Kelvin moved the motion and Susie seconded it. • Stephen informed CAP that Wharekawa Coast 2120 Community Panel has just submitted their report to the three councils – the Waikato District, Coromandel District, and Waikato Regional Council. He mentioned that this was the second community-led CAP following the Hawke's Bay study. He also shared that the Chair of that CAP reported that their report contained around 100 recommendations for the three councils, which would be an interesting read for CAP and TAG • Jim suggested Abbey should obtain a copy of the report and distribute it to CAP members to read.
Next Steps	<p>Abbey Morris (KCDC)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abbey provided an update on the extended CAP workshop, where they will cover risk assessments for the built environment and natural character. She mentioned that ecological and human domain risk assessments are still pending. The Coastal Project team is in the process of finalising the values document which correlates the community responses from the community values workshop and online "Have your say" survey. • Abbey also reminded CAP about the upcoming Paekākāriki Community Values Workshop on 7th November, with the possibility of an additional workshop if there is substantial interest from the Paekākāriki community. • Iain shared that he had been conducting community talks on tsunami hazards and risks. He mentioned an encounter with a community member in Te Horo who had concerns about Jacob's report and didn't fully understand CAP's

	<p>processes. This interaction highlighted a potential misunderstanding among some community members, and the need to address such concerns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jason highlighted that Council had emailed ratepayers to provide information about the project and CAP. • Martin drew from his experience and suggested that approaches like the dynamic adaptive pathway approach help navigate disagreements on present conditions and future actions. He recommended integrating this conditional approach into policy and design, where decisions consider potential future scenarios and actions. This approach allows for progressive adaptation over time and helps address issues that lack clear-cut solutions.
--	--

Closing Karakia	By Moira
------------------------	-----------------

ATTACHMENTS

Excluding of long-list options and actions for the Raumati Adaptation Area PDF

ACTIONS

Finalise details for Ecoreef talking to CAP

Distribute Wharekawa Coast 2120 Community Panel Report to CAP

Appendix 1: Excluding of long-list options and actions for the Raumati Adaptation Area

From Takutai Kāpiti Decision-Making Framework: Phase 2, Task 3: Excluding from long list of actions

The Takutai Kāpiti Decision-making Framework outlines the following tasks for this part of the decision-making process.

Using the long list of options confirmed by the CAP in Phase 1, the CAP will be tasked with excluding any adaptation options and actions that would not be suitable for the Adaptation Area under consideration. This will be done in a workshop environment where the CAP, along with technical advice from the TAG, will determine whether an action is not practical for the Adaptation Area, and therefore should be discarded. Reasons for excluding the action from the long list will be recorded in this table.

For simplicity of record against the long list, the following reasons for excluding (A-F) should be considered and recorded where appropriate for excluding. If there are reasons other than these, then they should also be recorded as G - Other:

- A. Will not provide for the objectives defined by the CAP
- B. Does not have a good track record of being successful in this environment
- C. Insufficient or limited space to implement the action
- D. Not suitable for the environment is it being applied to
- E. It is not a practical solution
- F. Limited benefits
- G. Other

The remaining actions deemed relevant for application within the Adaption Area by the CAP will form the ‘short list’ of actions, which can then be used to form adaptation pathways.

This Document: Excluding of long-list options for the Raumati Adaptation Area

This document provides a record of the reasons for excluding long-list areas for the Raumati Adaptation Area from both the TAG advice and the CAP’s discussion in the workshop.

The first eight columns of the following Table are from the original Long List Adaptation Actions presented to the CAP at their July 2022 CAP workshop, with some amendments based on conversations with the CAP on options for the NAA and CAA. In the following Table there are an additional two columns added to the right-hand side of the long list Table. The second to right column contains pre-workshop commentary by the TAG for actions which in their opinion should be considered to be removed from the list for the technically feasibility reasons given above (Reasons B to E) and other (Reason G). Since the Coastal Adaptation Objectives for the Raumati Adaptation Area have not been confirmed yet, the above excluding reason A - not provide for the objectives of the Raumati Adaptation Area, has not been part of the TAG consideration.

Commentary and decisions from the upcoming CAP workshop will be recorded in the right-hand column during the workshop. It is recognized that additional adaptation actions may be excluded from the long-list at the workshop as a result of the discussions and confirmation of the adaptation objectives for the Raumati Adaptation Area.

It is also recognised that the actions remaining on the list may be used at a range of timeframes over the 100 years of the assessment, with some being better implemented in the short term and others in the longer-term as indicated in Column 5 of the Table.

It is further recognised that not all of the remaining actions may be used in a short-listed adaptation pathway which the CAP will be undertaking in Task 4: Develop Pathways (November 2023 CAP Workshop).



Enhance: We maintain and improve what we are already doing

Enhancement actions utilise existing infrastructure, assets, knowledge and information to build on and improve. These actions involve physical works, such as strengthen existing protection structures or dune planting and reshaping; district wide initiatives to increase community awareness around hazards; improvements to environmental monitoring; and improvements to emergency management in large events. These actions build on systems, information, and assets that we already have.

Option	Action	Hazard	Description	Approximate timeframe it could be used for (Short term/ Medium term/ long term)	Optimal environment/setting to be applied	Advantages/Positive	Disadvantages/Limitations	TAG commentary for excluding	CAP commentary for excluding
Enhance	Enhance and strengthen existing structures	Erosion	Adding material to existing structures to increase the level of protection (from both overtopping inundation and erosion).	Short term	Existing structures that are adaptable and can still be utilized.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can be low cost Can be easier to consent than replacement/new protection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May not have certainty in the asset's performance Difficult to meet design requirements of material size and shape to provide necessary level of protection. Long term durability of existing structures not addressed. May not address other issues (e.g. access, aesthetics). Limited ability to be adapted in the future to provide for sea level rise. 		
	Enhance existing inundation protection	Inundation	Increase existing stop banks to provide greater protection from storm surge inundation. Incorporate SLR and higher intensity events into the design of stormwater management when it is being upgraded.	Short to medium term.	Coastal/fluvial environments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can be designed or adapted for longer term protection with future sea level rise Stopbanks/bunds can be grassed over and planted to look more natural along the banks edge. Utilises existing structures so could be lower cost relative to building new stopbanks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Depending on how extensive stopbank network is, it could be an expensive exercise due to the length required. May cause some backing up of the river/lagoon water levels, which may divert the flooding further upstream. If stopbanks are overtopped water can be trapped with no pathway back to the sea/river. 		
	Access steps and ramps	Erosion/Inundation	Structures that provide pedestrian and/or small boat access to the coast.	Short to medium term	Anywhere where access is required to the coast	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing for access to the coast (NZCPS alignment) Way to encourage pedestrians to use access, rather than to walk across dunes and ruin vegetation. Providing safe access to ensure pedestrians do not need to climb down or over hard structures. 			
	Dune and wetland enhancement/r esilience	Erosion/Inundation	Dune enhancement by building wind trap fences on the seaward side of an existing dune to trap sand and promote dune growth, vegetation planting to stabilise dunes, and/or making artificial dunes. Wetland enhancement by managing coastal wetlands and riparian planting. Pest control, weed control and continued maintenance of plantings.	Short to medium term, depending on the level of hazard.	Dune and wetland environments with good sediment supply, with land area behind the beach suitable for planting and enhancement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promotes vegetation planting to stabilise the dunes/wetland and dune/wetland growth. Enhances the dune/wetland ecosystem Natural beach is a good aesthetic outcome. Low-cost option Will increase longevity of the dune/wetland. Limited consenting required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Depending on local conditions, it may not be an effective long-term (100 year) solution against sea level rise, particularly on narrow beaches with limited capacity for retreat behind the dune. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (D) Not suitable for the environment it is being applied to. (E) It is not a practical solution in an area with high projected coastal erosion hazard, and no existing dunes or wetlands to enhance. The shoreline in RAA is primarily structured, and therefore no real opportunity for enhancement of dunes or wetlands, except around the Wharemauku Stream where there is a small existing natural duneland and at the end of Marine Parade. There are three natural inland wetlands within 	



Enhance: We maintain and improve what we are already doing

Enhancement actions utilise existing infrastructure, assets, knowledge and information to build on and improve. These actions involve physical works, such as strengthen existing protection structures or dune planting and reshaping; district wide initiatives to increase community awareness around hazards; improvements to environmental monitoring; and improvements to emergency management in large events. These actions build on systems, information, and assets that we already have.

Option	Action	Hazard	Description	Approximate timeframe it could be used for (Short term/ Medium term/ long term)	Optimal environment/setting to be applied	Advantages/Positive	Disadvantages/Limitations	TAG commentary for excluding	CAP commentary for excluding
								the RAA, however they do not interact with the coastal inundation or erosion hazard.	
	Continue emergency management	Erosion/Inundation	Emergency management, including the creation of hazard maps, evacuation plans, civil defence emergency management, and temporary accommodation and protection measures continues.	Short to long term	District wide.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased preparation and knowledge behind hazards. Already have systems in place to further develop and enhance. Increasing community awareness and knowledge will help them become more aware and accountable for risks. Being prepared will increase the safety of people during large events (e.g. being able to evacuate). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not address the risks to assets and infrastructure. 		
	Continue environmental monitoring	Erosion/Inundation	Environmental monitoring may include topographic and bathymetric surveys, shoreline mapping, storm events, ecological surveys, structural assessments, and morphological change assessments	Medium to long term	District wide in the coastal environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing monitoring of triggers for understanding of hazards. Increase understanding of the risks as new information develops 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can be resource intensive over a long timeframe. Requires commitment to establish useful long-term datasets. Does not directly address the risks to assets and infrastructure. 		
	Continue to increase community education and risk awareness	Erosion/Inundation	As people build an understanding of the impacts of climate change it is seen to encourage changes in their attitude and behavior, and helps them adapt to climate change. Education and awareness also allows people to make informed decisions and play a role in both climate change mitigation and adaptation. This can be done through organized events, engagement with schools, updating and sharing online resources.	Short to long term	District wide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increasing awareness Allowing people to take ownership of their risks as their understanding of the hazards increases. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can be resource intensive. 		
	Private owner's responsibility	Erosion/Inundation	Through planning tools (district and regional), Council allows for owners of private structures to own and maintain their own structures.	Short to long term depending on provisions.	Where there are good condition structures and consistency in materials and level of protection over several property lengths, and there is commitment from land owners to provide and maintain protection.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No cost to council or rate payer Private owners can manage their own risks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costs might be too high for private property owners. Having ad hoc structures could lead to weak spots which could lead to damage of individual properties. 		



Accommodate: We live with the hazard

Accommodation is about adapting our buildings and infrastructure to be able to withstand the consequences of the hazards. These actions are generally involve works done to individual properties (i.e. flood proofing, raising floor levels), making buildings adaptable and relocatable so they can be removed either temporarily in an event or permanently during retreat at a low cost; or increasing the resilience of existing infrastructure where it already exists.

Option	Action	Hazard	Description	Approximate timeframe it could be used for (Short term/ Medium term/ long term)	Optimal environment/settling to be applied	Advantages/Positive	Disadvantages/Limitations	TAG commentary for excluding	CAP commentary for excluding
Accommodate	Relocatable buildings	Erosion/ Inundation	Buildings can be relocatable to move away from the hazard, which can lower the cost of retreating in the longer term.	Short to long term solution, depending on the level of hazard.	Individual property basis, new builds.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can be applied to individual properties, so can be considered a suitable option where only a few properties/assets are likely to be affected. Lowers the cost of retreat in the future if buildings are relocatable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Likely to only be applicable to new builds so does not address risk to existing buildings. 		
	Building Design – Raising minimum floor levels of existing buildings	Inundation	Raising the floor levels of existing properties which are at risk from inundation.	Short to long term solution, depending on the level of hazard and how much the floor has been raised.	Buildings that are at high risk of frequent flooding.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can be a low-cost option if only a few buildings are likely to be affected in an isolated area. Can directly change the flood risk of an individual property. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can be an expensive option if lots of buildings require raising floor levels. May not be possible/practical for some buildings. Can divert the flood risk to neighboring properties. Increasing floor levels increases the height of the building which can become aesthetically unpleasing for neighboring properties. 		
	Flood proofing buildings	Inundation	Flood proofing measures are best applicable to coastal areas with a small inter-tidal range and where flood depths are low. This involves wet-proofing or dry proofing a building: Wet proofing – allowing water to enter the structure but minimizing the structural damage through using flood resistant materials or elevating structures. Dry proofing – making buildings water-tight so that water cannot enter.	Short to medium term solution	Buildings that are at high risk of frequent flooding.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wet proofing can be a low-cost option for areas where the flood depths and risks are low. Will ensure that a new/ existing building will be protected from small flood events. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only addresses the risk at an individual property basis. May not be possible/practical for some buildings. 		
	Flood proofing infrastructure	Inundation	Flood proofing infrastructure such as wastewater, stormwater and drinking water infrastructure, telecommunication infrastructure, and roads. This may involve modifying existing infrastructure or designing new or replacement infrastructure to withstand coastal hazards.	Medium-long term solution.	Existing or new infrastructure that is at high risk of frequent flooding, or consequences of being flooded are unacceptable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flood proofing existing infrastructure will be a lower cost than replacement as it utilises existing material. By flood proofing the infrastructure it could reduce the need for maintenance over the lifetime of the asset. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designing new or replacement infrastructure will be expensive 		



Protect: We keep the hazard away

Protection of our people, values, assets and infrastructure from the hazards generally is in the form of soft or hard engineering actions. Soft engineering actions generally involve utilizing natural resources to reshape beaches, add material to systems, or enhance the environment to build resilience. Hard engineering actions are generally in the form of designed protection structures which can be placed along a shoreline.

Option	Action	Hazard	Description	Approximate timeframe it could be used for (Short term/ Medium term/ long term)	Optimal environment/ setting to be applied	Advantages/Positive	Disadvantages/Limitations	TAG commentary for excluding	CAP commentary for excluding
Protect	Beach drainage	Erosion	Beach drainage (also referred to as coastal drainage or beach dewatering) involves the placement of drains parallel to the shoreline, under the exposed beach face, which are connected to a well so that water which enters the system can be pumped out. Beach drainage lowers the water table and therefore increases the depth of the unsaturated zone under the ground. This lowering of the ground water table also encourages sediments to be deposited on the beach and reduces the sea-ward transport of sediment and therefore accretes sediment at the shore	Medium to long term, depending on the intensity of the erosion hazard.	Sand beaches where there is mild upper beach and dune erosion.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Encourages sediments to be deposited on the beach and reduces the sea-ward transport of sediment. Can promote accretion on the beach.Can provide a natural looking aesthetic outcome.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Not as well known and tested of a technique, certainty in success is unknown.Drain may be exposed during storms.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">(B) Does not have a proven track record of being successfully implemented.(C) Limited space/environmental conditions to implement the option successfully.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
	Beach scraping	Erosion/ Inundation	Redistribution of sediment across a beach profile to increase the dune/crest elevation on the beach from taking material from the lower beach and moving it to the upper beach profile.	Short to medium term	Sand or gravel beaches with lowered crests.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Natural beach is a good aesthetic outcome.Provides good access to the beach.No adverse effects on coastal processes.Doesn't cut off any future adaptation pathways that could involve putting in more permanent (soft/hard) engineered structures.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">High energy environment will likely move the sediment away from the shoreline fairly quickly, and therefore unlikely to be a long-term solution unless end containments barriers (e.g. small artificial headlands) are included along with regular maintenance top ups and replacements.There would be on-going whole of life costs involved in continuously providing increasing maintenance requirements.Disturbance of dune/crest ridge vegetation and ecology.Ecological impacts of beach scraping in tidal zone on shellfish populations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">(D) Not suitable for the environment it is being applied to – would require the beach to have some surplus material which required redistributing to provide better protection – this is not the case where there are sea walls present.(E) This is not a practical solution.(G) This option was removed from consideration by the CAP in NAA & CAA due to the potential impact on shellfish on the foreshore.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
	Dune Reconstruction	Erosion/Inundation	Redistribution of sediment across a beach profile to increase the dune/crest elevation on the beach. This can sometimes require additional sand it be brought into the system to help build up volume if there is not enough sand locally available. The new dune can be replanted to help build resilience and encourage further growth of the dune.	Short to medium term	Sand beaches with lowered crests	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Natural beach is a good aesthetic outcome.Provides good access to the beach.No adverse effects on coastal processes.Doesn't cut off any future adaptation pathways that could involve putting in more permanent (soft/hard) engineered structures.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">High energy environment will likely move the sediment away from the shoreline fairly quickly, and therefore unlikely to be a long-term solution unless end containments barriers (e.g. small artificial headlands) are included along with regular maintenance top ups and replacements.There would be on-going whole of life costs involved in continuously providing increasing maintenance requirements.Disturbance of dune/crest ridge vegetation and ecology	<ul style="list-style-type: none">(D) Not suitable for the environment it is being applied to, as there is not space or existing dune environment to undertake reconstruction (with potential exception of northern edge of Wharemauku Stream).(C) Insufficient or limited space to implement the action.There is potential for this option to be paired with setback/retreat,	<ul style="list-style-type: none">CAP wish to keep as an option to determine the suitability when it comes to the MCDA scoring.



Protect: We keep the hazard away

Protection of our people, values, assets and infrastructure from the hazards generally is in the form of soft or hard engineering actions. Soft engineering actions generally involve utilizing natural resources to reshape beaches, add material to systems, or enhance the environment to build resilience. Hard engineering actions are generally in the form of designed protection structures which can be placed along a shoreline.

Option	Action		Hazard	Description	Approximate timeframe it could be used for (Short term/ Medium term/ long term)	Optimal environment/ setting to be applied	Advantages/Positive	Disadvantages/Limitations	TAG commentary for excluding	CAP commentary for excluding
									where a dune could be constructed in the increased coastal margin area.	
	Renourishment (sand, gravel, cobbles)		Erosion	Adding sediment to the beach system, either onshore or in the nearshore.	Short to medium term	Lower energy coastal environment which can retain sediment in the system (e.g. won't be immediately shifted away).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural beach is a good aesthetic outcome. Provides good access to the beach No adverse effects on coastal processes Doesn't cut off any future adaptation pathways that could involve putting in more permanent engineered structures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High energy environment will likely move the sediment away from the shoreline fairly quickly, and therefore unlikely to be a long-term solution unless end containments barriers (e.g. small artificial headlands) are included along with regular maintenance top ups and replacements. There would be high on-going whole of life costs involved in continuously providing increasing maintenance requirements. Need readily available source of renourishment material near to the site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (B) Does not have a good track record of being successful in this environment – Was historically trialed at Marine Parade and was unsuccessful. (D) Not suitable for the environment it is being applied to – current shoreline is structured and has erosion projected in the future. (F) There would be limited benefits based on what we know about natural processes occurring in the RAA. Could be paired with groynes to reduce losses of sediment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CAP wish to keep as an option to determine the suitability when it comes to the MCDA scoring.
	Vertical Sea wall	Buried Terminal wall	Erosion	A buried wall (concrete, rock, gabion baskets, timber) at the landward limit of where it is acceptable for the beach to retreat to at some time in the future. Normal beach processes would continue in the intervening years, with the wall slowly becoming exposed until it was acting as a fully functional protection structure holding the shoreline in place.	Medium to long term	Beaches which do not have an immediate erosion hazard, but assets landward of the beach need to be protected in the longer term.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides certainty in future proofing erosion, particularly where dynamic short-term shoreline movements are a major issue. Could be designed to be adapted into a bigger structure once exposed. Can act as a trigger to show when erosion is becoming a significant issue requiring other planning actions (e.g. managed retreat) Beach could erode up the structure then reform in the front again as it recovers. Provides a final line of defense for erosion, generally to protect assets which are located at the back of the beach. Would allow for access to the beach whilst it is still buried. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Structure is generally small in size so that it can be buried, once exposed may require raising. Significant land disturbance required in burying the wall, which may disturb existing infrastructure (roads, pipework etc). Requires good tie in at the ends of structure to reduce future end effects erosion. Still likely to suffer beach losses from in front of the seawall once it was exposed. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none">
		Vertical Gabion wall	Erosion	Porous structure (wire basket filled with cobble sized boulders), which allows water to pass into and potentially through the structure with sediment movement being restricted by the use of geotextile fabric behind the gabion basket.	Short to Medium term	Low energy coastal environment (e.g. river mouth/lagoon environment).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Porous nature allows absorption of some wave energy from vertical face resulting in less wave reflection and run-up than other vertical wall types, hence less lowering of beach and/or nearshore bed and less wall height required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site works and ground disturbance for construction required. Some beach and/or nearshore bed lowering likely to occur. Less durable than other vertical wall types with performance relying on the integrity of the wire 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (D) Not as suitable for the open coast environment as the other proposed materials and would lack resilience in high energy environments. Wires and cobbles can 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">



Protect: We keep the hazard away

Protection of our people, values, assets and infrastructure from the hazards generally is in the form of soft or hard engineering actions. Soft engineering actions generally involve utilizing natural resources to reshape beaches, add material to systems, or enhance the environment to build resilience. Hard engineering actions are generally in the form of designed protection structures which can be placed along a shoreline.

Option	Action		Hazard	Description	Approximate timeframe it could be used for (Short term/ Medium term/ long term)	Optimal environment/ setting to be applied	Advantages/Positive	Disadvantages/Limitations	TAG commentary for excluding	CAP commentary for excluding
							<ul style="list-style-type: none">Occupies a relatively small footprint.Very easily adapted for longer-term protection with future sea level rise by adding additional gabion units.Less expensive than sheet pile or concrete vertical sea wall options.	mesh reliance, therefore whole-of-life costs may be higher.	breakdown in coastal environments and require ongoing maintenance and replacement.	
		Vertical sea walls (concrete, timber, sheet piles)	Erosion/ Inundation	Solid vertical barrier along shoreline which prevents the passing of water and sediment between the hinterland and the sea.	Medium to long term	Higher energy coastal environments (e.g. exposed open coast).	<ul style="list-style-type: none">If the wall is of sufficient height, it is very effective at preventing erosion (and inundation) of the hinterland.Occupies a relatively small footprint.Has good durability, particularly sheet piles and concrete.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Poor wave energy absorption from vertical face results in: 1) Reflection of energy resulting in lowering of the beach and/or nearshore estuary bed which over time results in reduction of intertidal vegetation habitat and potentially erosion and instability of the toe of the wall. 2) Higher wave run-up, resulting in need for increased structure height to prevent overtopping and back-scour compared to other engineering options.Need for relatively large-scale site works and ground disturbance for construction (compared to other engineering options).Difficult transition from vertical walls to other protection options.Relatively expensive compared to other engineering options, particularly for sheet piles and concrete.Does not look natural in a coastal environment.		<ul style="list-style-type: none">
	Stepped sea wall	Stepped concrete block wall	Erosion	Stepped concrete blocks placed along the shoreline to provide required crest height to prevent overtopping and prevent erosion.	Medium to long term	Low energy coastal environment (e.g. river mouth/lagoon environment).	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Provide a designed level of protection.Will provide good protection against scour along a shoreline.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Not suitable in high energy environments as blocks are not interlocked, so could be displaced easily.		<ul style="list-style-type: none">
		Geotextile Sand Containers	Erosion	Stepped solid barrier made of geotextiles along shoreline which prevents overtopping and scour.	Medium to long term	Low energy coastal environment (e.g. river mouth/lagoon environment).	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Can be placed over existing raised banks, scarps and bunds to enhance protection.Longshore flexibility to fit to shoreline shape.Can be designed or adapted for longer-term protection with future sea level rise.Damage/failure releases sand back onto beach	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Larger footprint than vertical seawalls.Would require a local sand supply to fill the containers.Does not look natural in the coastal environment and can deteriorate over time.More easily damaged than hard units and can be vandalized		<ul style="list-style-type: none">



Protect: We keep the hazard away

Protection of our people, values, assets and infrastructure from the hazards generally is in the form of soft or hard engineering actions. Soft engineering actions generally involve utilizing natural resources to reshape beaches, add material to systems, or enhance the environment to build resilience. Hard engineering actions are generally in the form of designed protection structures which can be placed along a shoreline.

Option	Action	Hazard	Description	Approximate timeframe it could be used for (Short term/ Medium term/ long term)	Optimal environment/ setting to be applied	Advantages/Positive	Disadvantages/Limitations	TAG commentary for excluding	CAP commentary for excluding
	Interlocking pre-caste concrete block seawall	Erosion/ Inundation	Hard protection structure. Solid vertical barrier constructed by interlocking concrete shapes normally constructed within the beach footprint to 'hold' the shoreline in a fixed location and prevent further shoreline retreat for a considerable timeframe depending on design and cross shore location. Depending on height, it could also reduce/eliminate wave overtopping in storm events, hence also provide protection from coastal inundation.	Medium to long term	Higher energy coastal environments (e.g. exposed open coast).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Occupies a relatively small footprint. Has good durability. Can be easily designed or adapted for longer-term protection with future sea level rise. Irregular shape variations in the front face breaks up wave run-up onto structure reducing overtopping potential and reflection of energy back onto the foreshore, therefore reducing beach losses in front of the wall. Can be tiered to reduce wave impacts, and can be placed over existing raised banks, scarps and bunds to enhance protection. Flat top and width of the interlocking wall allow for pedestrian provide access along the structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need for relatively large-scale site works and disturbance of the beach to ensure the structure is well founded against toe scour. Requires good tie in at the ends of structure to reduce end effects erosion, which is common issue with seawalls on open coasts. Still likely to suffer beach losses from in front of the seawall, potentially reducing beach recreational value (e.g. ability to walk along beach at all tides), but this will be at slower rates than for vertical seawalls. Difficult transition from this type of structure other protection options in the future. Initial construction costs likely to be relatively expensive compared to soft engineering options. Difficulty in providing access over seawalls - limited to fixed locations of steps. Does not look natural in the coastal environment. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none">
	Reno Mattress	Erosion	Sloping wire basket filled with cobble sized boulders. Placed at steeper slopes to protect the edge and at lower slopes below the edge to prevent lowering of the beach/upper intertidal nearshore.	Short to medium term	Low energy coastal environment (e.g. river mouth/lagoon environment).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Porous nature allows absorption of some wave energy resulting in less wave reflection and run-up than other vertical wall types. If overtopped, water can flow back through the structure to the sea. Could be adapted for longer-term protection with future sea level rise by adding additional mattresses or gabions. Likely to be less expensive than other sea wall options. Flat top and width of the reno mattress allow for pedestrian access along the structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not look natural in the coastal environment. Less resilient than other vertical wall types with performance relying on the integrity of the wire mesh baskets in an abrasive saltwater environment, with structural failure position with the failure of one gabion basket. Therefore, lifetime of the structure likely to be less, and whole-of-life costs may be higher. The use of the top of the structure for pedestrian access is likely to increase the wear on the wire baskets, reducing lifetimes and increasing maintenance costs. Need for relatively large-scale site works and disturbance of the beach/coastal environment to ensure the structure is well founded against toe scour. Requires good tie in at the ends of structure to reduce end effects erosion, which is common issue with seawalls on open coasts. Likely to be some localised scour around the base of the structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (D) Not suitable for the environment being applied to – Reno Mattresses are generally effective in lower lying, low energy environments. Unlikely to have a long life span on the open, high energy coast. May be suitable in combination with sea walls as toe scour protection but wouldn't consider them suitable on their own. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">



Protect: We keep the hazard away

Protection of our people, values, assets and infrastructure from the hazards generally is in the form of soft or hard engineering actions. Soft engineering actions generally involve utilizing natural resources to reshape beaches, add material to systems, or enhance the environment to build resilience. Hard engineering actions are generally in the form of designed protection structures which can be placed along a shoreline.

Option	Action		Hazard	Description	Approximate timeframe it could be used for (Short term/ Medium term/ long term)	Optimal environment/ setting to be applied	Advantages/Positive	Disadvantages/Limitations	TAG commentary for excluding	CAP commentary for excluding
		Rock Revetment	Erosion	Large sized rock placed on design slope on a shoreline to provide required crest height and mass to prevent overtopping or movement of individual rock units that would expose edge to erosion.	Medium-long term	Higher energy coastal environments (e.g. exposed open coast).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can be placed over existing raised banks, scarps and bunds to enhance protection. Good durability, particularly if using high density rock types (e.g. basalt). Easy maintenance in adding additional rocks as required. Can be designed or adapted for longer-term protection with future sea level rise. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs suitable rock availability and need to sort rock to design size/grade. Larger footprint than vertical seawalls, greater potential impact on foreshore habitats. Cost depends on rock availability and distance to source. Need for site works and disturbance of the beach to ensure the structure is well founded against toe scour. Requires good tie in at the ends of structure to reduce end effects erosion, which is common issue with seawalls/revetments on open coasts. Still likely to suffer beach losses from in front of the seawall, potentially reducing beach recreational value (e.g. ability to walk along beach at all tides), but this will be at slower rates than for vertical seawall options. Difficulty in providing access over revetment. Does not look natural in the coastal environment. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none">
	Groynes		Erosion	A groyne (or artificial headland) is a structure built perpendicular to the shoreline out into the sea to catch sediments that are transported along the coast by longshore drift. Can be built out of rock, timber, concrete materials.	Short to long term	Lower energy coastal environment with known longshore sediment transport mechanisms and good sediment supply.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can be durable depending on the material used (e.g. rock). Can promote accretion and buildup of sediment, but only in a localised area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For maximum efficiency and length of coast protected, needs to be of sufficient length to cross the surf zone to avoid sediment leakage around the structure(s). To protect sufficient length of coast at each settlement would require a multiple groyne field Does not look natural in a coastal environment. Can have downstream effects by stopping sediment supply reaching the downdrift of the groynes. Unlikely to be effective in a high energy coastal environment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (E) Not a practical solution as it moves any coastal erosion issues along the coast due to trapping of longshore sediment (D) There is not a strong sediment supply to this area of the coastline, and therefore would require pairing with renourishment to effectively trap sediment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
	Vertical permeable sill		Erosion	A structure within the gravel beach that dissipates wave energy, reducing erosion losses through backwash and longshore drift and promotes the retention of gravel behind the structure.	Short to medium term	Gravel beach environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promotes the retention of gravel behind the structure. Reduces erosion losses through backwash and longshore drift 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uncertainty around how successful it may be. Will not look natural in a coastal environment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (B) Uncertainty on success as no track record. (D) Not suitable for the sand beach environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">



Protect: We keep the hazard away

Protection of our people, values, assets and infrastructure from the hazards generally is in the form of soft or hard engineering actions. Soft engineering actions generally involve utilizing natural resources to reshape beaches, add material to systems, or enhance the environment to build resilience. Hard engineering actions are generally in the form of designed protection structures which can be placed along a shoreline.

Option	Action		Hazard	Description	Approximate timeframe it could be used for (Short term/ Medium term/ long term)	Optimal environment/ setting to be applied	Advantages/Positive	Disadvantages/Limitations	TAG commentary for excluding	CAP commentary for excluding
	Detached breakwaters and artificial reefs		Erosion	Offshore structure placed in the nearshore close to the shore to reduce the wave energy that is reaching the shore through dissipation, reflection and diffraction of oncoming waves. This creates a low-energy environment in the lee of the structure that encourages the deposition of sediment and the localised build-up of a wider beach.	Medium to long term	Lower energy coastal environment (e.g. low energy wave climate or sheltered environment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduces the wave energy that is reaching the shore through the dissipation, reflection and diffraction of oncoming waves. Creates a low-energy environment in the lee of the structure that encourages the deposition of sediment and therefore the localised build-up of a wider beach. Utilising good design material, there can be opportunities for habitat creation and enhancement (e.g. oyster reefs). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unlikely to be effective in a higher energy environment as structure could be easily displaced or damaged. High cost. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (D) It is not suitable for the environment it is being applied to along a structured coastline. (F) Limited benefits – the lack of sediment supply to this section of coast means that there would most likely be little to no formation of salient beaches, and therefore reduces benefits of these structures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
	Flood controls	Controlled/ planned mouth openings of lagoons and rivers	Inundation	Controlled openings of lagoons and stream mouths which naturally close with beach sediment building up across the mouth. Planned opening of the mouths will allow water to flow out to the sea/ lagoon in large fluvial events and reduce water backing up in tributaries further upstream.	Short to medium term.	River mouth environments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can be done on an ‘as required’ basis before forecasting large rainfall events to increase the efficiency of the discharge in the event. Low cost. No aesthetic effects from structures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential to allow sea water into the lagoons/river mouth during large coastal storms, which could result in sea water inundation. Requires reliable information around storm intensity, duration and timing as well as predicted coastal conditions to allow informed decision prior on opening prior to the event. Potential Health and Safety issues if attempting to open once storm has arrived. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (D) Not suitable in the environment it is being applied to, typically helps fluvial/pluvial flooding, and could let storm surge into the estuary and exacerbate the hazard. (F) Limited benefits for coastal flooding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
		Flapped culvert outfalls at smaller inlets	Inundation	Construction of culvert outfalls with flap gate valve at the entrance of a small inlet which would allow water to flow out of the inlet, but not in from the sea.	Short to medium term	Existing culverts or stormwater infrastructure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can be effective at restricting sea water coming into a lagoon or wetland environment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only cost effective to undertake the works on smaller inlets. Requires some elevation difference between the lagoon/wetland and sea to get water to flow through the flap valve. Sediment transport across and along the shore could block the flap valve for culverts on the beach. Requires frequent maintenance to ensure pipe does not get blocked with debris For raised pipe culverts need to accommodate for beach erosion at seaward end of the structure. Would become less effective as sea level rises. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none">
		Flood gates	Inundation	Adjustable gates used to prevent storm surges from entering existing waterways, in turn preventing upstream overtopping and flooding.	Medium to long term	River mouth environments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective way to reduce effects of storm surges travelling up waterways. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can be high cost. Does not look natural in a river mouth environment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">



Protect: We keep the hazard away

Protection of our people, values, assets and infrastructure from the hazards generally is in the form of soft or hard engineering actions. Soft engineering actions generally involve utilizing natural resources to reshape beaches, add material to systems, or enhance the environment to build resilience. Hard engineering actions are generally in the form of designed protection structures which can be placed along a shoreline.

Option	Action		Hazard	Description	Approximate timeframe it could be used for (Short term/ Medium term/ long term)	Optimal environment/ setting to be applied	Advantages/Positive	Disadvantages/Limitations	TAG commentary for excluding	CAP commentary for excluding
		Storm surge barriers	Inundation	Storm surge barriers are hard engineered structures that are primarily designed to prevent inundation due to storm surges in tidal inlets, rivers and estuaries, while also decreasing reliance on other flood defenses inland of the barrier	Long term	River mouth environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prevents inundation due to storm surges in tidal inlets, rivers and estuaries. Decreases reliance on other flood defenses inland of the barrier. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very high cost due to high requirements of construction work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (E) It is not a practical solution (F) Limited benefits in relation to the scale of works. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
		Pump stations	Inundation	A pump station is a storage and collection chamber that lifts and distributes stormwater when it cannot naturally be carried by gravity. This helps discharge excess stormwater in large events.	Medium to long term	Low lying settlements which are flooded in large events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective way to help manage the discharge of water in a large event. Can exclude tidal inflow to stormwater systems. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is not a preventative option which stops the area being flooded in the first place. Have a carbon cost associated with use and maintenance. Can have negative environmental effects. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none">
	Stopbanks		Inundation	Engineered stopbanks (most likely earth bunds), along the settlement boundaries to allow surface flooding to occur on the low-lying land around the settlement, but not allowing it to enter into the settlement. Crest height of the stopbanks would be informed through a design level for a specified flood frequency from both coastal and fluvial sources.	Medium-long term	Isolated communities/ settlements with land area around it which would be acceptable to allow to flood.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective way of controlling water flow in an extreme event. Can be designed or adapted for longer term protection with future sea level rise. Can be grassed over and planted to look more natural along the banks edge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Depending on how extensive stopbanks were could be an expensive exercise due to length required. Would still result in some overland flooding to occur up to the settlement boundary, which could have an effect on landuse (e.g. saltwater effects on crop land). If stopbanks are overtopped water can be trapped with no pathway back to the sea/river. Difficult to consent. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none">
	Earth Bunds		Inundation	Continuous elongated structure designed to protect low-lying areas from inundation. Bunds are similar physical structures when compared to stopbanks and serve a similar purpose to reduce flood risk, they can be quickly built and generally use local materials, and only involve minor foundation preparations.	Short term	Low energy environment (e.g. ponding water, not high energy flows) which is trying to keep water out.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower cost Quick to construct as require only minor foundation preparations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shouldn't be placed in a high energy environment. Generally, a temporary measure. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none">



Retreat: We move away from the hazard

Retreat is generally a form of land acquisition by one party in a hazardous area in order to move people away from the hazard permanently. There are several mechanisms which can be used to do this which can allow for different levels of compensation (e.g. cost or land), as well as different timeframes for the land to be utilised for before retreat is required.


Option	Action	Hazard	Description	Approximate timeframe it could be used for (Short term/ Medium term/ long term)	Optimal environment /setting to be applied	Advantages/Positive	Disadvantages/Limitations	TAG commentary for excluding	CAP commentary for excluding
Retreat	Buyouts/Land Acquisition	Erosion/ Inundation	Land buyout programs involve the local/national government acquiring land in at-risk areas by agreement, to reduce vulnerability to hazards. Buyouts involve the transfer of title to land and are typically only used in very high risk areas due to the cost associated with them.	Long term	Areas where the risk to hazards is intolerable (both flood and erosion)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removes the hazard risk by relocating people away from the hazard. Landowners receive a payment/compensation for their property. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential to be a costly exercise for council/government. Generally, a last resort option for communities. Both the affected community and wider community perception of this option is generally negative as they are worried about the cost via rates/taxes. Results in dispersal of community to other areas of the country/district – Councils will need to have factored this into strategies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is recommended that retreat is considered as a broad option by the CAP, and the details of the actions to implement the retreat are considered further after the Takutai Kāpiti process is completed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
	Future Interests	Erosion/ Inundation	The acquisition of a future interest involves the purchase of a right to acquire land in specified circumstances in return for an agreed upfront fee. For example, it may be agreed upon that once a certain height of sea level rise has been reached, the holder of the future interest (usually a government agency or council) has the right to acquire the land.	Long term	Areas where the risk to hazards is intolerable (both flood and erosion)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removes the hazard risk by relocating people away from the hazard. Allows land to be utilised until the risk becomes intolerable. Landowners receive a payment/compensation for their property. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for it to be a costly exercise. Generally, a last resort option for communities. Community perception of this option is generally negative. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none">
	Land Swaps	Erosion/ Inundation	During a land swap, landowners in a hazard zone are given the opportunity to swap their title to land for a comparable sized parcel in a lower risk area. The land that has been swapped then acts as a buffer against coastal hazards	Long term	Areas where the risk to hazards is intolerable (both flood and erosion)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removes the hazard risk by relocating people away from the hazard. Landowners are compensated. Opportunity for community to stay together. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for it to be a costly exercise to local/national government. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none">
	Leasebacks	Erosion/ Inundation	Leasebacks involve the acquisition of at-risk land by local council/ national government with provision for it to be leased back to the former owner or a third party with terms and conditions that facilitate the management of hazards. The former owners or third party, now the lessee, pays rent and uses the land in accordance with the terms of the lease, but no longer owns the land	Long term	Areas where the risk to hazards is intolerable (both flood and erosion)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removes the hazard risk by relocating people away from the hazard. Allows land to be utilised until the risk becomes intolerable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could be uncertainty around when people will need to relocate. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none">



Avoid: We don't move into the way of the hazard in the first place

Actions which are considered to 'avoid' the hazard are generally planning tools which will help future-proof the district. These planning tools are generally low cost to implement and will help prevent putting assets and infrastructure in places which could be susceptible to hazards in the future, however they generally do not address the risk to existing infrastructure and assets.

Option	Action	Hazard	Description	Approximate timeframe it could be used for (Short term/ Medium term/ long term)	Optimal environment/settling to be applied	Advantages/Positive	Disadvantages/Limitations	TAG commentary for excluding	CAP commentary for excluding
Avoid	Building design – Raising minimum floor levels of new builds	Inundation	Planning provisions in place for potentially susceptible areas to ensure floor levels are above design flood levels for new builds.	Medium-long term solution.	New builds in areas that are susceptible to flooding.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase the life and reduce the need for regular maintenance of the asset. ▪ Increase safety for building occupants. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Raising flood levels of new buildings will involve extra engineering and materials for construction resulting in increased costs. ▪ Can divert the flood risk to neighboring properties. ▪ Increasing floor levels increases the height of the building which can become aesthetically unpleasing for neighboring properties. ▪ May not be possible/practical for some buildings. 	▪	▪
	Reducing further intensification or development	Erosion/ Inundation	Planning restrictions to reduce further development or intensification within settlements that are likely to be affected by hazards in the future.	Medium-long term solution	New builds or developments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Will reduce the number of assets exposed to coastal hazards in the future. ▪ Low-cost option as is based on planning provisions rather than protection/infrastructure works. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does not deal with existing assets or properties that are at risk. ▪ Decreased area of land in the district which could be developed. 	▪	▪
	Trigger-based or time limited land use consents	Erosion/ Inundation	Trigger based or time limited land use consents include conditions linked to hazards such as sea level rise, flood depths, or erosion rates that create a finite term for a particular land use. The land use consents allow development or redevelopment with the expectation that such uses can only continue until specified trigger points are reached or for a specified time period.	Short to long term	New builds, developments or land uses.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Low-cost option ▪ Protects private property from erosion/inundation damage when the hazard reaches a certain level. ▪ Allows for land to be used whilst the risk is low. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Costs associated to private owners for relocation at the end of consent. ▪ Costs involved for council to have to provide short term services to the property which would eventually need to be removed. 	▪	▪
	Zoning and setback controls	Erosion/ Inundation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identifying and allowing increased development density in lower risk areas, and identifying areas where new development is not permitted. ▪ Changing future land uses in at-risk areas from low resilience to high resilience (e.g. from residential to public space) <p>Using planning policy and rules (Regional and District) to prohibit hard shoreline protection structures and promoting natural shoreline protection measures that support inland ecosystem migration.</p>	Medium to long term	New development in areas which could be susceptible to coastal hazards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduced risks of damage to buildings and infrastructure in the future. ▪ Low-cost option as is based on planning provisions rather than protection/infrastructure works 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decreased area available for development could result in an increase in land costs. ▪ Does not deal with existing assets or properties that are at risk. 	▪	▪
	Transferable development rights	Erosion/ Inundation	Transferable development rights (TDR's) are a mechanism that can be used to increase development potential in areas where development is desired, and decrease or eliminate the	Long term	Areas where development is not desired, with rights transferred to an area where	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduces future risk by not allowing development in undesirable locations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Only effects future development, not existing developments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ (E) Not a practical solution – Unlikely to be implemented in the Kāpiti Coast District. 	▪

<div><div></div><div>Avoid: We don't move into the way of the hazard in the first place <i>Actions which are considered to 'avoid' the hazard are generally planning tools which will help future-proof the district. These planning tools are generally low cost to implement and will help prevent putting assets and infrastructure in places which could be susceptible to hazards in the future, however they generally do not address the risk to existing infrastructure and assets.</i></div></div>									
Option	Action	Hazard	Description	Approximate timeframe it could be used for (Short term/ Medium term/ long term)	Optimal environment/setting to be applied	Advantages/Positive	Disadvantages/Limitations	TAG commentary for excluding	CAP commentary for excluding
			potential in areas that should be preserved, without requiring public investment. Development rights are separated from the land and can be transferred from one parcel over to land in an area where development is considered appropriate or is even desired. By purchasing development rights, a developer could increase the density of dwellings in their development; and land where the rights were transferred from would not be able to be developed any further.		development is desired.				