**COASTAL RATEPAYERS UNITED INC**

**Minutes of a Round Table Meeting with Kāpiti Coast District Council Members**

**Kāpiti Airport Conference Room,**

**2pm, Tuesday 8 February 2022**

**In Attendance:**

**Coastal Rate Payers United CRU Experts KCDC Councillors**

Salima Padamsey – CRU Chair Kathy Moody -Planning Councillor Halliday – Prm Ward

Quentin Poole Jeff Ashby – Science Councillor Pravnov -Wkn Ward

Joanna Poole Councillor Handford – Paekr

Roger Foley

Salima Padamsey thanked everyone for attending and noted that the purpose of the meeting was to get a better understanding of the Jacobs Report and how to move forward in regard to strategy and communication.

Around table introductions were given by CRU and Council members.

**Apologies** were received from:

* Mayor Gurunathan
* Deputy Mayor Janet Holborrow
* Councillor Jackie Elliott
* Councillor Bernie Randall
* Councillor Gwynn Compton

Councillors that did not acknowledge or respond to CRU’s invitation to attend the meeting:

* Councillor James Cootes
* Councillor Angela Buswell
* Councillor Rob McCann

Salima introduced Katharine Moody, Senior Tutor at Massey University, Planning Programme and College of Sciences and Dr Jeff Ashby, PhD in Geology and Member of the Geological Society of NZ, the NZ Geotechnical Society and the NZ Drillers Federation. Jeff has been involved in climate change research, mainly through his association with the Antarctic Research Centre. Jeff contributed commentary on the critical analysis of the original Shand reports [[1]](#footnote-1)on the Kapiti Coast.

**Presentation on Coastal Hazards, Risk Identification/Assessment and Hazard Management**

Katharine Moody, CRU’s Expert Planner gave a presentation to meeting attendees on Coastal Hazards, Risk Identification/Assessment and Hazard Management in the context of the Resource Management Act (RMA) and NZ Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS).

Katharine’s presentation included discussion on the following points:

* There was a misunderstanding in general between the distinction of a risk assessment and risk management in terms of legislation and academia. The definition (of what – risk assessment?) includes reference to Australian and NZ Standard for Risk Management.
* Need someone who understands the legislation on risk.
* Risk management and risk assessment are completely different. Council do risk management and scientists do risk assessment.
* The Scope of work that KCDC contracted Jacobs to do was a coastal risk hazard assessment
* Notwithstanding their contract, Jacobs noted in Volume 1, page 8, of their report, that they did not do a risk assessment but had done a ‘susceptibility and vulnerability’ assessment. That is, the scope of works that Jacobs actually did changed from a Risk Assessment to a Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment but they did not give an explanation why they didn’t do a risk assessment.
* A susceptibility and vulnerability assessment is not in accordance with the NZCPS which requires definition of risk and its likelihood.
* The Scope of Works and explanation of vulnerability basis of a good adaptation plan is good science, however as it does not include risk, cannot be used for the purposes of planning
* CRU met with the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment (PCE) in 2015 on Risk Assessment versus Risk Management. The PCE noted the need to separate scientific (risk) assessment and decision making (management).
* Risk Assessment needs to be based on the-best available scientific information.
* Notwithstanding that Jacobs stated they have not done a risk assessment (but a vulnerability and susceptibility assessment), Jacobs Vol 1 report was prepared based on Intergovermental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) AR5 (2014) and updated to include changes from IPCC (2019) but has not been updated to take into account the most recent IPCC AR6 (2021) findings.
* Earlier scenario projections made by the IPCC for 2020 are now recognised to be outdated and the IPCC are now indicating that the RCP8.5 projection used is implausible and unlikely to unfold.
* Reviewed likelihoods and the distribution of hazard risks. The Council should not attempt to put hazard lines on people’s properties without reference to a degree of certainty (e.g., a 90% chance of coastal inundation occurring within the next 50 years, etc.) – and there are legislative guidelines for this
* Noted the need to use up to date information and modelling methodologies.
* Discussed CAP, its purpose and the fact that as of date there are no terms of reference yet.

Katharine concluded by saying that Coastal hazard lines need to be based on sound science in accordance with NZCPS Policy 24 parameters.

Jeff Ashby explained that over the last decade scientists now have better tools and methodologies for getting better and more accurate information and commented that:

* IPCC initially did not assign probabilities to their scenarios but more recently have been doing this.
* Councillor Handford raised a comment about James Renwick
* Kathy answered that James Renwick was one of a number of high-profile scientists reported in the media who is on the alarmist end of the climate science continuum. There are many very good scientists who are in the middle of the continuum who could also provide a methodologically sound assessment of risk under conditions of uncertainty. (Salima noted that James Renwick publicly supported Dr Shand’s findings in the media the last time a coastal hazard assessment was done – and his science was found by a group of his own peers to be “unfit” for the purposes of planning.)
* he had approached Jim Bolger, the Chair of KCDC’s Community Adaptation Panel (CAP) to provide a presentation regarding the coast – similar to the one he did for Council in 2012 but he has not heard anything back

**Further discussion**

Councillor Prvanov summarised the points CRU’s presentation

Jeff Ashby noted that using the Bruun Rule is incorrect for use on Kapiti’s coastline – a sandy coast with a cuspate foreland.

Councillor Prvanov also noted that she was hearing that KCDC were not meeting with CRU – and asked given the information in Katharine’s presentation was important, why hadn’t KCDC met with CRU. Salima said that CRU had requested on several occasion[[2]](#footnote-2) a meeting with Council to meet since January 2021 without success.

Salima noted that:

* a risk assessment had not been undertaken by Jacobs, as required by the NZCPS.
* District Plan has policies for keeping coast natural but no coastal hazard policies – cannot have one without the other.

Discussion moved to the total cost for the previous Court case and Environment Court.

It was noted that if the Kapiti Coast District Council now says it want to wait for CAP’s recommendations before new coastal hazard provisions can be incorporated in KCDC’s District Plan, then it will be 10 years before the Council meets its District Plan requirements regarding coastal hazard provisions by way of a Plan Change. It is unfair to make homeowners wait so long for a remedy – Section 21 of the RMA does not allow for such delays. In the 2016 Environment Court case, Council said the new provisions would be introduced in four years - 2020).

Salima stated that she had received a call from Jim Bolger a week or two ago and that he said “CRU would not get anything they wanted”. Councillor Handford said he shouldn’t have made that call

Councillors Prvanov, Halliday and Handford agreed that they now had an understanding of the implications Jacobs report Volume 1 and as a result the issues that Volume 2 would raise – including a possible legal challenge.

Salima said Council had received a letter from CRU’s solicitor regarding LIMs -Councillors said that they hadn’t received a copy – Salima agreed to send them a copy

Salima also questioned KCDC’s line of “if we have the information, we have to put it on the LIM”. Salima said, using this logic, Council also has information from CRU and that too should be included in the LIMs and not cherry pick information.

**Communication with Council**

Salima asked the Councillors present at the meeting for reasons why KCDC would not engage with CRU and requested help and input from them to be able to move forward. It was noted that CRU had over 400 members.

Councillor noted that given the numbers of Councillors that were absent, it was disappointing that they did not want to come and hear with an open mind and discuss the issues CRU are bringing to my attention today. She did not know why KCDC Councillors and staff do not want to meet with CRU.

It was noted that the big stumbling block was Councillors and staff understanding the science, and amongst process, people having to juggle information being provided and being confused.

Councillors stated that it was felt that there was an issue with attitude and preconceived ideas on what conversations had taken place.

CRU noted that in an ideal world, Council would check with CRU before Volume 2 is issued – given that that information, based on Volume 1 – would be based on flawed science **and** that it was KCDC’s intention to put the information contained in Volume 2 would on ratepayers’ LIMs.

Councillor Halliday noted that in relation to standing orders, a motion on a particular issue could only be presented once within a 12 month period and that unless you had the Mayor or Deputy Mayor on board, motions would not be successful.

Councillor Prvanov proposed speaking to Councillors and discussing the issues raised today and would lobby to engage more councillors to have a discussion. Councillors were asked how long CRU would have to wait before it knew whether or not Councillors would be willing to engage with CRU. The Councillors agreed that they didn’t know.

Councillor Handford said that as first term Councillors they were very limited to what they could to help in improving communication and their roles in these types of issues were minimal. She also said that she appreciated that this round table was a very civil and informative discussion – not what she expected.

*Councillor Handford left the meeting at 3.38pm.*

It was noted that the LIMs information was an administration requirement under the Building Act and that the information put on LIMs regarding hazard lines needed to be fair and reasonable and site specific. Council’s current paragraph on LIMs regarding Coastal Hazard that has been put on every single property in the district is not in line with the legislative requirements for information to be site specific.

**Summary**

Councillor Prvanov, Councillor Halliday and Councillor Handford said they would have a conversation with KCDC staff and ask for a meeting to try. Councillors noted that this was all they could do at this stage.

It was noted that the building of the Kāpiti Gateway Centre on the Paraparaumu beachfront was indicative that Council does not believe in their own (coastal hazard) science.

Meeting concluded at 4.00pm

1. 2012 Coastal Erosion Report [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. CRU’s update to Council in November [↑](#footnote-ref-2)