



Notes and Actions

Thames-Coromandel Shoreline Management Plans

Meeting Three (M3)

Values & Objectives; Adaption Menu

Thames/Thames Coast

Time: 2.00pm – 4.00pm

Date: 25 Nov 2020

Venue: TCDC – Thames
Council Chambers
Microsoft Teams Meeting (Recorded)

Chairperson: Amon Martin

Attendees: TCDC – Jamie Boyle (JB), Amon Martin (AM),
Monique Jenkinson (MJ), Frank Thorne (FT)
RHDHV - Sian John (SJ)

Community Board Members – Cherie Staples, Peter Revell

Panel Members – April Chang, Chris Dale, Clive Monds, Eric Carter, Murray Wakelin, Peter Feran, Ron Jamieson

TCDC Councilor – Robin Sinclair, Martin Rodley
MS Teams Online - TCDC Councilor – Terry Walker

Apologies: Panel Member – Jordan Downes, Mary Thomson

Agenda Items

1. Introduction

- AM recited Karakia, welcomed the attendees and opened the meeting.
- Actions from previous meetings were reviewed. Only one was outstanding, i.e. production of a paper on how the outputs from the SMP project will be used. **ACTION SJ.**
- MS Shared drive / Drop box shared folder – **ACTION MJ.**

2. Coastal Panel Terms of Reference (TOR):

- **TOR** (as they currently stand) adopted by all groups.
- Update to cover the following points and reissue as final:
 - Cover the extent to which the Project will consider groundwater flooding as part of point 2.3.
 - Risk of saltwater intrusion from drinking water and challenges associated with drainage noted. Stormwater management should be considered, particularly with reference to how water will escape (pumping/limiting seawater ingress).

3. Nomination of a Chair

- Peter Revell nominated and appointed as Chair

4. Consider what we value?

- CP Paper 1 summarises the findings of the 2019/20 Summer Survey on values.
- The second pass risk assessment will refine the categorisation of whole stretches of coast (Management Areas) as a high or low risk (etc.) and pick-up areas of particular risk within these stretches.
- Meeting participants indicated, for each relevant Management Area, what they valued.
- Overarching values were also discussed.
- This information will be collated, summarised and analysed. A summary of the outputs will be provided back to the Coastal Panel ahead of Meeting 4.

5. Set Objectives

- The long list of objectives from the planning documents (CP Paper 2) are to be distilled by the Project Office to create a shorter set (4 to 5), specific to the SMP Project, for discussion with the Coastal Panels - **ACTION SJ.**
- Items to note:
 - Need to reflect the avoidance of risk to life, infrastructure, lifestyles; provision of a safe place to live.
 - Need to refer to timelines and possible acceleration of change; and the intergenerational nature of the project (i.e. enhance and protect for future generations).
 - Need a flexible agile framework - not business as usual.
 - Acknowledge locally lead initiatives and community response strategies.
 - A strategy for buyback is desirable.
 - Need a more integrated approach between private and public actions.
 - The objectives should reflect the continuum (and different densities) of development.
 - Aspiration to achieve a balance between defended locations and natural locations; retaining the beach.
 - Solutions tailored to challenges.
 - Equitable transition.
 - Objective relating to guaranteeing access is too general (i.e. refer to managing access).
 - Objective on sustainability is too vague; should refer to regeneration.
 - IWI objective to form an overarching principle.

6. Options for adaptation – an introduction

- SJ gave an introductory presentation on adaptation options and the sequencing such; in line with the Adaptation Menu provided in advance of the meeting. The following comments arose:
 - a. Options 1 and 2 should be neutral (rather than green).
 - b. The issue of Tsunami warnings still needs to be resolved. Some of the Emergency Response Plan work is inaccurate. TCDC to pass this message to the Civil Defence team – **ACTION JB**
 - c. The social and environmental consequences column should be split; as should the NAI column.
 - d. MR guidance is required from Central Government.
 - e. The Action Plans should ease the consenting process and will include monitoring proposals.

Where houses are to be raised, how is in ground infrastructure dealt with (e.g. septic tanks)?

7. Reflections and close

- CP members requested that their contact details (phone numbers and email addresses) and information on their role of the panel (e.g. community group rep etc.) is shared within their own panels. **ACTION MJ**
- Risk associated with lack of IWI engagement noted. Suggested that relevant IWI reps are invited to attend as observers. **ACTION AM**
- Project Office to look again at the involvement of youth in the project (e.g. survey of values in schools?). **ACTION PO**
- NZTA to be involved in future meetings as appropriate and be asked to provide information on what they see as the lifespan on SH25 etc. Particularly relevant to the Thames Coast.
- Request for WRC (and specifically the Consenting Team) and DOC to attend Coastal Panel meetings when appropriate (e.g. the hazard presentations in February). The overlap between the SMP Project and Catchment Management Plans was also acknowledged. **ACTION PO**
- Insurance retreat impact and consequences. Insurance representative to be invited to future meetings to provide appropriate information/outcomes. **ACTION SJ**

Going forward:

Suggestion was made that a future survey of the wider public could cover concerns, options and preferences. The nominated preferences would then be assessed.

Meeting closed 4.00pm

Date for next meeting (M4): 18th February 2.00pm – 5.00pm Thames Council Chambers & Lounge

(Topic: Hazard information)