

30 June 2021

Kia ora

Request for Official Information responded to under the Local Government and Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA) – reference: 8447855 (OIR: 2021-281)

I refer to your information request we received on 9 June 2021 for the following:

I am writing to ascertain where the Paekakariki Seawall is at. You will be aware of the correspondence I have had with you concerning the ability of KCDC to have a seawall that meets the budgetry restriction of \$17 million and at the same time is the sounded option for ensuring sand retention on the beach by the wall having a stepped face.

1. Scientific and engineering data that you have proving that your proposed vertical sea wall is the best and most appropriate long term solution to sand retention at Paekakariki.

Council does not hold this information. On that basis I must decline this part of your request as the documents alleged to contain the information requested do not exist or, despite reasonable efforts to locate them, cannot be found, Section 17(e) of the Act refers.

One of the primary concerns expressed by the Community Design group in developing a seawall option was access to the beach and limiting any further encroachment onto the beach.

2. Any reports or data you have comparing the performance of vertical walls compared to stepped walls.

In August 2017, we engaged Tonkin and Taylor to carry out a high-level assessment on the AuzCon Stepped Concrete Wall and the report is attached herewith (Attachment 1).

3. The science you have relied on to opt for vertical walling.

Council does not hold this information. On that basis I must decline this part of your request as the documents alleged to contain the information requested do not exist or, despite reasonable efforts to locate them, cannot be found, Section 17(e) of the Act refers.

The original preferred replacement option that gained resource consent from Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) was based on the Community Design groups objection to any further encroachment onto the beach associated with non-vertical options such as rock revetments. This was a vertical seawall of either timber or concrete construction.

4. Have you referred the engineering reports I have supplied to any internationally regarded expert to confirm this well-established science?

Yes, please refer to my response to Question 2 above. Tonkin and Taylor are a New Zealand company, but they are resourced with International experts.

5. Have you taken any steps to action my report?

According to Tonkin and Taylor's high-level assessment the stepped option is not feasible for the Paekākāriki seawall replacement and therefore no further action was taken.

6. Please supply the specifications you provided to the company who have provided you with an estimate of \$17 million for a wooden vertical sea wall.

Please refer to Attachment 2 prepared by Samcon Civil Engineers.

7. Have you already predetermined that a vertical seawall will be built?

Paekakariki seawall replacement was identified as one of the key projects in 2021 Long Term Plan. In May 2021 the community was asked the question whether to proceed with the concrete option at a cost of \$27M or to replace with a like for like timber wall. Nealy 70.9% responded in favor of the "like for like" timber option whereas 29.1% responded with the consented concrete option.

On the 24 June 2021 Council approved the "like for like timber option" for the replacement of the seawall.

8. In getting your \$27 million estimate for a concrete wall what were your specifications and how many firms did you consult in order to establish this figure?

We supplied the detailed designs, construction specifications and GWRC resource consent to Bond Construction to prepare the estimate. Please refer to Attachment 3 for the specifications.

9. In favouring a vertical wall what costings have you done on beach replenishment over the 25/30 year life that will be required as a result of sever scouring at the base of that wall?

We have not completed a cost comparison between the vertical wall option and beach replenishment option. We do not hold this information. On that basis I must decline this part of your request as the documents alleged to contain the information requested do not exist or, despite reasonable efforts to locate them, cannot be found, Section 17(e) of the Act refers.

10. I have produced to you evidence of scouring at the base of seawall on this coastline. What have you done with this valuable scientific data showing actual performancenot mere computer modelling?

Council has relied on Tonkin and Taylor to provide design parameters for the seawall replacement scour requirements. This included information provided from their discussions with you and other historical information.

11. In the light of the proposed 25/30 year temporary vertical wall which will deplete sand from our beach are you considering to eventually relocate council public services along the Parade in line with your Managed Retreat policy as with GWRC's demolition of the QE Park footbridge under that policy?

We do not have a "Managed Retreat Policy" at Kāpiti Coast District Council. We are still working on what is best for us in line with the climate change and Central government guidelines on this subject area. The Takutai Kāpiti project currently being undertaken by Council will consider future coastal erosion issues along the enire Kāpiti coastline. Details on this can be found on their website <u>https://takutaikapiti.nz/</u>.

12. Have you factored in the cost of such a plan?

The financial implications associated with coastal erosion and the impacts of climate change will be part of the Takutai Kāpiti project considered over the next 12 months of the project.

You have the right to request the Ombudsman to review this decision. Complaints can be sent by email to <u>info@ombudsman.parliament.nz</u>, by fax to (04) 471 2254, or by post to The Ombudsman, PO Box 10152, Wellington 6143.

Ngā mihi

Haller

Sean Mallon Group Manager Infrastructure Services Te Kaihautū Ratonga Pakiaka