

COMMISSIONER, COUNCILLORS, PLANNERS, ENGINEERS AND NEIGHBOURS

Allow me to start with a conclusion. It is Mike Jacobson's* summary of a paper he delivered at an EDS conference in Auckland June 2009 "Reform in Paradise".

"Coastal governance in NZ is not in a healthy state, and climate change is bearing down on us.

Are we going to recognise the need for some fundamental reforms to coastal governance?

If we do recognise the need, will it still be put it in the 'too-hard basket (until we are forced to take action by some social or financial catastrophe that cannot be ignored)?

Or will we be farsighted and brave enough to do a proper job of making and taking opportunities for meaningful reform of coastal governance?

In other words, will we pursue truly sustainable management for our coastal environment? Or will we muddle along and wait for a catastrophe, or until ratepayers and taxpayers are paupered by attempts to hold back the tide, King Canute fashion?"

Right now is just the type of opportunity that Mike Jacobson is talking about, to be part of a sea-change if you like. In December 2017 The Ministry of the Environment published 'Coastal Hazards and Climate Change: Guidance for Local Government'. They are calling it a major revision from the 2008 version. It updates scientific understanding, there is new material on hazards, risks and vulnerability assessments.

It starts out with a brand-new approach. DAPP... Dynamic Adaptive Pathways Planning. This method is being implemented globally and is being recommended to local government by the Ministry for the Environment for the first time.

It is my opinion that we should adopt this new approach before we consider any new hard engineered protections to be placed on the beach. That now is a good time to give up on 'holding the line' and instead of working against nature to start working alongside. I would like to see a much greater emphasis placed on a managed retreat option that is not only sustainable in the long term but may also prove to be more cost effective over time. If we keep putting up man made structures for immediate to short term protection all we are doing is perpetuating the problem and passing it along to future generations.

In a paper by Laura Tinker who wrote 'Managed Retreat from Coastal Erosion A Movement of People and Their Coastlines', December 2013 for her work towards her Masters at Otago. She found that people who live on the edge would rather be in an evacuation type scenario than have to relocate their home. That's fine by me, just please stop asking for rock revetments or other hard engineered solutions that subtract from what natural character remains of our coastline and that are ultimately unsustainable.

*Mike Jacobson: Department of Conservation in 1988 from the Water and Soil Division of the Ministry of Works and Development, and was there for the transition from the Harbours Act 1950 to the RMA Act 1991, before working at local level with the Kapiti Coast District Council and then as an independent coastal management consultant.

So by now you know I am not a fan of hard engineering to solve our erosion issues. I do not support the application for a rock revetment to be placed in the vicinity of Tuahine Crescent for all of the reasons that I've just given as well as for the following concerns:

1. Lack of design detail of how the two ends of the revetment are going to tie into the groyne area to the south and the existing log and rail structure to the north. The log and rail system that the proposed revetment is to tie into is not sound and is deteriorating and would no doubt fail in the near future which in turn could induce additional erosion.
2. I believe that the revetment will accelerate erosion at the toe and at its northern finishing point creating more erosion in front of properties that currently still have a beach. Effectively passing on the problem while lowering the amenity values of the effected properties.
3. I oppose the provision for the revetment to be upgraded and made even larger if required.
4. We would be losing ground in our bid to protect our natural features and landscapes. A big rock revetment is not a thing of beauty.
5. The new design will encroach even further onto the beach limiting public use and access of what little beach remains at the Tuahine area. We would be narrowing the beach considerably with the physical placement of the rocks. We would quite likely be narrowing the beach that lies further north due to the wave energy that will be deflected by the new revetment causing more erosion than normal.
6. The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement Policy 18 highlights the important role that Esplanade Reserves and Strips can have in meeting public open space needs. In Appendix C, 25 October 2017 T&T response for further information in regards to adverse effects of the revetment say that the revetment ties into the existing log and rail wall on the north side which is zoned as Esplanade Reserve and is seen as "sacrificial land to accommodate any erosion events." Clearly not what the NZCP had in mind. And you have to wonder how the home owners behind the Esplanade feel.
7. The 2010 application for consent to build a rock revetment was refused. One of the reasons given by the Commissioners was that they were not convinced that Wainui was currently experiencing any long-term trend to retreat. That based on the opinions of Dr Dunn and the most current research suggested that Wainui is a dynamic shoreline and the primary risk is from episodic storm erosion. More than once in this Decision document it is recommended that a review of the current hazard zones be undertaken. Dr Gibb's report from the early 80's should be reviewed before any decisions are made.
8. Cost. At present, it is undecided on how the revetment is to be paid for. Because I am not for building a revetment I am really not for having to pay for it. If it were to go

ahead I believe that the owners of the properties who would benefit from the protection should foot the expense for the building and the maintaining.

9. Within the Wainui Beach Erosion Management Strategy it is recommend that consideration be given to a complete removal of the rock revetments from the coast in 2024. Depending on how this revetment gets funded...it could be that the rocks are finally paid for only to turn around to find that the plan now considers it prudent to remove all revetments. Who would own the rocks? What would an owner do with them if they have to come out?
10. NZCPS Policy 27.4 “Hard protection structures, where considered necessary to protect private assets, should not be located on public land if there is not significant public or environmental benefit in do so”. Many of the property boundaries within the Tuahine area are often underwater. I would not think that any of us in this area consider any shoreline below high tide as private property. Where the revetment is proposed to be built is on a shoreline and Esplanade area that is currently being enjoyed by the Gisborne community.

I would like to see the outcome of this hearing decide that before any hard protection works take place at Wainui that the Wainui Beach Erosion Management Strategy be revised using the new guidance protocol that is recommended by the Ministry. I would like to see the hazard zones reviewed as was recommended in the Commissionaire’s decision 2010. I would like to see more emphasis on a managed retreat option....maybe it is not a scary as we think.

I wish for the Gisborne District Council to decline this resource application for a rock revetment at Wainui Beach. I would like to see a manage retreat start now with the removal of the entire rock and rail structure systematically removed allowing what rocks are there to find their natural fall line. In my perfect world the council would employ behavioural phycologists instead of coastal engineers the next time hard protection works are proposed to protect private property.

Laurie Lautmann
8 February 2018
58 Murphy Road
Wainui Beach
Gisborne