

Takutai Kāpiti MCDA Criteria and Scoring Guide

	#	Criteria	Description	Scoring Guide				
				5. Highly Desirable	4. Desirable	3. Neutral	2. Undesirable	1. Highly Undesirable
Impact Criteria	1.	<b>Ecology</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact or enhancement on indigenous biodiversity values and habitat; and ecosystem functioning within the coastal environment and surroundings.</li> <li>Ability to protect the natural adaptive capacity of the ecosystem.</li> </ul>	Highly likely to provide for enhancement and increase of ecological habitats and values	Likely to provide for some enhancement and increase of ecological habitats and values	Little change likely to ecological habitats and values present	Some reduction in ecological habitats or values. Likely to be limited to the footprint of the options or short term.	Highly likely there will be a reduction in ecological habitat and values, which could be for larger footprint than existing protection and long-lasting
	2.	<b>Landscape</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact on the natural character of coastal environment and surroundings.</li> <li>Aesthetic outcomes of implementing the option and the meaning of this to the community.</li> <li>Ability to protect the natural adaptive capacity of natural character.</li> </ul>	Positive impact or enhancement of the natural character of the coast, and aesthetic outcomes which align with community expectations.	Likely to provide some increase to the natural character of the coastal environment and aesthetic outcomes mostly align with the community expectations.	Little change likely to the present-day natural character and aesthetics of the coastal environment.	Slight negative impact on natural character and aesthetic outcomes. Aesthetic outcomes do not align with some of the community.	Highly likely to have a negative impact on the natural character of the coastal environment. Aesthetic outcomes do not align with community expectations.
	3.	<b>Te ao Māori values</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>Maintains access to, and enables the carrying out of customary activities, such as mahinga kai.</li> </ul>	Highly likely to have a positive impact or enhancement on the identified Māori cultural values in the area	Likely to have some positive impact to identified Māori cultural values identified in the area	Little change likely to Māori cultural values identified in the area.	Likely small negative impact to identified Māori cultural values in the area	Likely large negative impact to identified Māori cultural values in the area
	4.	<b>Community Social and Economic Wellbeing</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Health and safety of the community</li> <li>Certainty around future of community</li> <li>Social cohesion within the community</li> <li>Maintain the insurability of personal assets.</li> </ul>	Highly likely to provide for all factors which contribute to community social and economic wellbeing.	Likely to provide for most factors which contribute to community social and economic wellbeing.	Little change from the present-day community social and economic wellbeing.	Only likely to provide for some factors which contribute to community social and economic wellbeing.	Unlikely to provide for any factors which contribute to community social and economic wellbeing.
	5.	<b>Public Access and Recreation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wider community/district use of the coastal environment</li> <li>Opportunities for recreation</li> <li>Public access to the coastal environment</li> </ul>	Highly likely to increase and enhance recreational opportunities and public access to the coastal environment.	Likely to have an increase in recreational opportunities and public access to the coastal environment.	Little change to recreational opportunities and public access from the present day.	Likely to restrict some recreational opportunities and public access to the coastal environment.	Highly likely there will be large restrictions or total loss of public access and recreational opportunities in the coastal environment.
Technical Criteria	6.	<b>Regulatory consenting and policy risk</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regulatory consenting and policy risks of implementing an option including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consenting requirements;</li> <li>District plan changes; and</li> <li>Consistency with statutory framework.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Carbon footprint associated with the pathway.</li> </ul>	Low to no risk - Consents are not required or can be easily obtained. No plan change required. Not contrary to statutory framework.	Low risk - Consent or plan change is required but unlikely to be challenged. Not contrary to statutory framework.	Some risk – Requires resource consenting or plan change which could be challenged but is aligned with the current statutory framework.	High risk - Consenting or plan change required which is likely to be challenged. Some elements which are contrary to current statutory framework.	Very high risk - Requires resource consenting or plan change which is highly likely to be challenged by multiple parties, and is contrary to current statutory framework
	7.	<b>Effectively manages the risks of coastal erosion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effectively manages the risks of Coastal Erosion.</li> <li>Proportionate to the nature and scale of the risk over time.</li> <li>Avoids the exacerbation of risk in other areas.</li> <li>Approaches are supported by best practice and a robust consideration of the science/Mātauranga</li> </ul>	Highly likely to provide for all the factors listed which manage the risk of coastal erosion.	Likely to provide for most of the factors listed which manage the risk of coastal erosion.	Likely to provide for some of the factors listed to manage the risks of coastal erosion.	Only likely to provide for one of the factors listed which manage the risk of coastal erosion.	Unlikely to provide for any of the listed factors which manage the risk of coastal erosion.
	8.	<b>Effectively manages the risks of coastal inundation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effectively manages the risks of Coastal Flooding.</li> <li>Proportionate to the nature and scale of the risk over time.</li> <li>Avoids the exacerbation of risk in other areas.</li> <li>Approaches are supported by best practice and a robust consideration of the science/Mātauranga</li> </ul>	Highly likely to provide for all the factors listed which manage the risk of coastal flooding.	Likely to provide for most of the factors listed which manage the risk of coastal flooding.	Likely to provide for some of the factors listed to manage the risks of coastal flooding.	Only likely to provide for one of the factors listed which manage the risk of coastal flooding.	Unlikely to provide for any of the listed factors which manage the risk of coastal flooding.

## Takutai Kāpiti MCDA Criteria and Scoring Guide

#	Criteria	Description	Scoring Guide				
			5. Highly Desirable	4. Desirable	3. Neutral	2. Undesirable	1. Highly Undesirable
	<p><b>Guideline notes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. All pathways that reach the short list for assessment will need to:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. have the ability to adapt and deal with an increase in the hazard and risk; and</li> <li>ii. not restrict future implementation of other options (and pathways)</li> </ul> </li> <li>b. Scoring is relative between the shortlisted pathways</li> <li>c. In scoring the pathways, the CAP is cognisant of the greater certainty surrounding short term options.</li> <li>d. Do not necessarily have to have a full range of scores between the pathways – e.g. all pathways could score the same for a criteria. The scoring does not need to be sequential, and does not need to be ranked.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>						