

WCC Beach Grading Update #6

Task	% Completed	Estimated due date
<p>§ Engagement of the project team includes CHP Wellington Ltd. (<i>technical expertise to the grading works, i.e. contract management</i>), 4Sight Consulting (<i>development and application of rescore consent with GWRC</i>) and Dr. Pete Wilson (<i>Ecologist</i>).</p>	100%	Complete
<p>§ Initial discussion with GWRC to understand resource consent requirements for lodgement.</p>	100%	Complete
<p>§ Outcome from initial meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ü Identify Mean High Water Spring (MWHS) to determine where grading is a permitted activity ü Establish environment/ecological assessment is required for consenting ü Establish notifying affected stakeholders as part of resource consent application 	Noted.	Complete
<p>§ Engagement of Cardno (<i>surveyor</i>) to identify MHWS – to start survey on 30 July 2021</p>	100%	Complete
<p>§ Physical survey work By Cardno</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifying survey marks from previous work • Providing survey data from recently completed works • Information for site survey work completed • Topo survey completed. Surveyor asked to extend the survey to 104 Owhiro Bay Parade to be compatible with the eCoast report. 	100%	Complete

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey data provided to Engineer to finalise Construction Methodology. 		
<p>§ Construction Methodology</p> <p>ü The method statement of the proposed beach grading including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Extent of works o Identifying zones whereby activity is permitted or not, i.e. east of bridge not requiring a resource consent whereas stream outlet (west of bridge) requires RC o Calculating expected volumes for removal using existing information, e.g. seawall levels, etc. <p>The above plan of the beach regrading area with some cross-sections to show what it is intended in the works was issued last week.</p> <p>ü This construction plan was forwarded to Council's Iwi Advisor for further discussions with the Iwi. Still awaiting response.</p> <p>ü Collating info on existing rock revetment and carpark area</p> <p>ü Meeting with contractor deferred to next week to discuss construction methodology, timeline and resources.</p>	95%	3 September 2021
<p>§ Ecological Assessment (<i>actions so far</i>)</p> <p>ü Exploring a number of available reports describing various ecological aspects, including birds, and habitats but we have been advised that a field survey will also be necessary for this work.</p> <p>ü Clarification on the bounds and extent of the works to designing and conducting an ecological assessment.</p>	90%	3 September 2021

ü Noting the subtidal areas and rocky reefs will be the most sensitive habitats and likely be affected if sand is pushed further down the beach towards the water. Smothering of these habitats is likely to have substantial adverse ecological effects.

ü Noting there is the potential for shellfish beds in both intertidal and subtidal habitats, which will likely require surveying.

ü Noting the river flowing onto the beach is marked in the regional plan as significant inanga spawning habitat. The actual issue is around access up the stream, rather than spawning habitat in that specific location. Consideration will be required if regrading will affect the stream.

ü The area has an overlay for indigenous bird habitat and it has been noted that this area may be used by penguins – the site will need to be surveyed for burrows/potential habitat and bird presence.

ü Exploring intertidal assessments only, including bird presence, penguin burrows/habitat, intertidal shellfish.

ü Ecology site investigation completed.

ü eCoast to be requested for a coastal processes report that isn't covered by their previous report. The info requested by GWRC is as follows:

o Effects on shoreline stability (including dunes and nearshore) and the potential to create a coastal inundation hazard. You would need to provide a coastal processes report with the application. If material is removed is that going to create an erosion problem elsewhere? How often would it need to be done? What will the effects be on wave energy?

- Effects on the heritage values of structures and sites identified in Schedule E1 (heritage structures) or Schedule E4 (archaeological sites). I note that there a couple of Schedule E

<p>sites offshore – will the change in wave energy affect these sites?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecologist asked to mark on a plan of Owhiro Bay where the possible penguin habitat is located. DRAFT plan attached. Please note this is very prelim. from the Ecologist and may change in the final report. <p>ü Completed survey data provided to ecologist to finalise report.</p> <p>ü DRAFT ecological report to be provided today for project team’s review and comments before finalising for issue next week.</p>		
<p>§ Engagement with Affected Parties</p> <p>ü Meeting with Council’s Iwi Senior Advisor.</p> <p>ü Council’s Iwi Senior Advisor’s meeting with Ngati Toa - completed and awaiting response / advise from Council’s Iwi Senior Advisor (ongoing)</p> <p>ü Consultation DOC may not be required as proposed beach grading work is above MHWS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met with <i>DOC</i> to discuss “<i>what is being proposed and where exactly the works will take place as that’ll guide our involvement. It would also be good to understand the rationale, timing and frequency</i>”. • <i>DRAFT construction plan provided to DOC whom then confirmed that there is no issues with the planned works but would await the provision of the ecologist report.</i> <p>ü Meeting with GWRC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DRAFT survey plan was provided to GWRC showing the MWHS line which confirms that 	85%	3 September 2021

<p>the planned grading works is outside the CMA. GWRC verbally agreed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GWRC advised that the PNRP earthworks rule (and will confirm) that the rule provides for earthworks that affect up to 3000m2 of land in any 12 month period as a permitted activity. Confirmation received from GWRC that the PNRP rule does not apply to the beach re-grading works. • GWRC requested a Construction Process report to demonstrate the effects of the beach degrading works, i.e. effects of taking the beach material off site – ongoing. <p>ü Meeting with Shaw Meads (eCoast):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Meads agreed with the methodology regarding taking the beach material away rather than pushing into the CMA. • Mr. Meads has agreed (and therefore engaged) to develop and provide the Construction Process Report - ongoing <p>ü Consultation with Forest & Bird pending ecology site investigation</p>		
<p>§ Provide relevant documents to residents for review</p>	<p>0%</p>	<p>3 September 2021</p>
<p>§ Developing Resource Consent Documentation</p>	<p>5%</p>	<p>3 September 2021</p>
<p>§ Lodgement of Resource Consent Application</p>	<p>0%</p>	<p>3 September 2021</p>
<p>§ Procurement of Beach Grading Works</p>	<p>0%</p>	<p>3 September 2021</p>
<p>§ Co-Design of grading work with residents</p>	<p>0%</p>	<p>3 September 2021</p>

§ Physical Works	0%	Mid-end September 2021
------------------	----	---------------------------