

Memo

Date: Council 4 March 2025

From: Jane Morgan Team Leader, Coastal Adaptation, Tom Simons-Smith, Principal Advisor, Coastal Adaptation, Andrew Hensley, Traffic Engineer, Transport, Krystle Anderson, Senior Engagement Advisor

To: Council

Cc:

Reference: 25/260942

Coastal Hazards Adaptation Plan for Whakaraupo Lyttelton Harbour and Koukourarata Port Levy: Report back to Council

1. Purpose of this Memo Te take o tēnei Pānui

- 1.1 On 31 January 2025 Council heard from submitters on the draft Coastal Hazards Adaptation Plan for Whakaraupō Lyttelton Harbour and Koukourarata Port Levy (the draft Plan).
- 1.2 Following deputations from residents of Wharf Road, Port Levy, Council asked staff to engage further with residents to understand their preferences for the adaptation pathway.
- 1.3 This memo sets out the feedback received from Wharf Road residents, puts forward an updated staff recommendation to amend the draft Plan in response to submitters feedback, and responds to questions put forward by elected members at the Council meeting.
- 1.4 The information in this memo is not confidential and can be made public.

2. Staff recommendations

That the Council:

1. **Recommend** that the Coastal Hazards Adaptation Plan for Whakaraupō Lyttelton Harbour and Koukourarata Port Levy be adopted with amendments 1, 2, 3a, 3b and 3d proposed in the staff report to the 31 January Council meeting.
2. **Recommend** that amendment 3.c be updated as follows: Amend the preferred pathway for Wharf Road to retain the stages of Maintain + Lowered Levels of Service but remove the long-term preference and include three alternative options of Flood Proof & Protect, Closure and Move the section of Wharf Road located at the head of the harbour inland; and amend the plan to note that an additional \$200,000 is allocated to support shorefront protection works that are likely to be necessary ahead of the long-term option.
3. **Note** that minor edits will be required to re-word the Plan if Recommendation 2 is endorsed.

3. Update on the meeting with Wharf Road residents He Pānui

Discussions regarding the adaptation pathway in the Plan

- 3.1 The pathway proposed by the Coastal Panel in the draft Plan for Wharf Road was Maintain + Lower levels of Service + Close Wharf Road. An alternative option of Flood-Proofing & Protection was included but not preferred.
- 3.2 Following submissions, staff had proposed that an additional alternative long-term option of Moving the section of Wharf Road located at the head of the harbour inland should be included, but also not preferred.
- 3.3 On 15 February staff met with 16 residents at the Port Levy Church, followed by a site visit to Wharf Road. At this meeting, staff sought to further understand the community's preferred approach to managing Wharf Road.
- 3.4 Staff explained that based on the submissions received, staff would propose a further amendment to Council to remove Closure as the preferred long-term option and would instead signal that three long-term options are available: Flood-Proofing & Protection, Move a section of road and Closure. This change would mean that no preferred pathway is indicated beyond the short and medium-term pathway of Maintain + Lowered Levels of Service which are expected to be effective at managing the risks until around 35 years from now. As signals and triggers are met, further consultation will occur with future residents to inform a Council decision regarding which of the three long-term pathways above are taken.
- 3.5 Staff received positive feedback at the meeting regarding this proposed amendment and heard general agreement that consultation around the long-term option for Wharf Road should be had with future residents and with the benefit of a clearer picture of the risk, issues and needs at that time.
- 3.6 Staff offered residents an opportunity to provide further feedback via email, and five individuals and the groups legal representative sent additional feedback through (see Appendix One). The main themes were:
 - The residents preferred long term pathway is to Flood Proof & Protect the road.
 - The residents want Wharf Road to be maintained as a Council owned, public asset.
 - The residents had ideas for short or medium-term maintenance and protection measures that could extend the life of the road.

Costings

- 3.7 Residents referenced (at the meeting and in written feedback) a cost estimate that had been discussed at the Council meeting on 31 January. This estimate related to the cost to supply rock to raise Wharf Road. Staff note that this estimate did not account for the full range of components that contribute to the overall project cost, including:
 - provision for design and consenting requirements
 - protection of the shorefront from coastal erosion (such as rock armouring)
 - installation of drainage (culverts, lateral drainage and bridge upgrades)
 - allowance for the correct quantity of rock and metal base course, given the length of road and the requirement to widen the road corridor to achieve the appropriate road corridor height
 - the need to manage access and safety over the period of construction
 - an appropriate level of contingency that reflects the high-level nature of the cost estimate.

- 3.8 Staff seek to clarify these points, so that residents and Council can appreciate the breadth of work necessary to achieve a robust solution for the community, and to better contextualise the cost estimates shared by staff to date.

Issues to be addressed outside the Plan

- 3.9 During the meeting and in subsequent emails, staff received feedback on current road maintenance and heard concerns around protection of the shorefront from coastal erosion.
- 3.10 Follow-up contact with Wharf Road residents will be facilitated through a Transport & Waste Unit staff member, including discussions regarding any maintenance or interim works that might occur.
- 3.11 Staff communicated to residents that a bridge on Wharf Road is scheduled for renewal in the next 12 -18 months and explained that this work falls within the types of activities covered by the Maintain stage of the adaptation pathway.

4. Questions asked by Council

- 4.1 Two questions were submitted by Council for staff responses as follows.

Question	Response
An update on where staff are at with Wharf Rd would be helpful	Addressed within the contents of this memo.
Are we able to support the local residents in planning for the future, what would that support look like, and do we have to adjust the resolution to achieve that?	A staff member from the Transport & Waste Unit will liaise with residents regarding maintenance and any interim works. As signals and triggers are met, consultation will be initiated with future residents to inform the long-term approach. As outlined in the draft Plan, signals provide early warning that a trigger (decision point) is approaching and therefore allow for sufficient lead-in time for this consultation to be held. It is not considered necessary for the resolution to be adjusted to achieve these outcomes.

5. Conclusion Whakakapinga

- 5.1 Staff recommend that the preferred pathway for Wharf Road is amended to remove Closure as the long-term preference, while retaining the short and medium-term preferred pathway of Maintain + Lowered Levels of Service. No long-term preference would be signalled in the Plan but three long-term options of Flood-Proof & Protect, Closure and Move the road would be included.
- 5.2 Maintain + Lowered Levels of Service are expected to be effective at managing the risks until around 35 years from now. As signals and triggers are met, further consultation would occur with future residents to inform a Council decision regarding which of the three long-term pathways above are taken. In the interim, staff propose that the current resident's preference for Flood Proofing & Protection is captured in a note within the Plan, alongside the Coastal Panel's earlier preference of Closure.
- 5.3 Staff note that shoreline protection will likely be necessary to limit erosion of the shorefront, in order to protect the road over the coming decades. Following recent investigations, staff therefore propose that an additional sum of \$200,000 is allocated to fund the protection of relatively small sections of Wharf Road that are likely to require works over the next 10-30 years. As noted in previous reports, there are no immediate costs to Council. Funds will be sought through future Long-Term Plan and Annual Plan processes.

Attachments Ngā Tāpirihanga

No.	Title	Reference
A	Table of additional feedback from Wharf Road residents	25/330904

Signatories Ngā Kaiwaitohu

Authors	Jane Morgan - Team Leader Coastal Hazards Adaptation Planning Tom Simons-Smith - Principal Advisor Coastal Adaptation Andrew Hensley - Traffic Engineer Krystle Anderson - Engagement Advisor
Approved By	David Griffiths - Head of Strategic Policy & Resilience John Higgins - General Manager Strategy, Planning & Regulatory Services

Additional feedback received from Wharf Road residents on the Draft Adaptation Plan for Whakaraupō Lyttelton Harbour and Koukourarata Port Levy, February 2025

Please note: this document contains additional feedback following an additional meeting with Wharf Road residents on 15 February 2025. For all submissions provided on the draft Plan, see 31 January 2025 Council agenda or letstalk.ccc.govt.nz/SLR-lh

Original submitter ID	Additional feedback	Name
29930	Hi Krystle, Please find sharefile link to recording of meeting: [REDACTED] Our additional comments are below: • Preferred pathway is to Flood proof and protect Wharf Road by raising the road (the 500m section at head of the bay). As per the Mayor’s calculations, this can be done incrementally and cost effectively by using local resources. • Alternative options are to Move (relocate) the road (the 500m section at head of bay), or Close Wharf Road, with closure being the last resort. • However, if after investigations of alternative options are deemed unworkable and Closure of the road eventuates, residents are to be consulted and Closure would only occur when a feasible alternate access route is provided, for the users of Wharf Road. • Definition of Closure to be amended as per submissions/presentation at hearing, so it’s clear it remains open to residents and users. • Residents do not support a private road as the road should remain open for the community i.e. for mahinga kai. • Residents understand there may be RMA/resource consent issues with regard to proposed works on the road and/or mitigation works, however, provisions should be made in the District Plan via Proposed Plan Change 12 – Coastal Hazards, to enable for works required to flood protect and/or mitigation measures to occur for Council assets (identified in the CHAP) as either a permitted or controlled activity. Plan Change 12 can provide a pathway for the works required to flood proof and protect Wharf Road. Kind regards, Lloyds Scully Solicitor	Lloyds Scully on behalf of the Wharf Road residents group
29479	Good evening Krystle, Thanks for the opportunity to provide further feedback on Wharf Road. Here are my key points, keeping in mind long-term access, environmental impact, and cost-effective solutions. Keeping Wharf Road as a Public Asset • With more residents, visitors, and ongoing tourism, it’s important to keep Wharf Road open as a key public asset. • This ensures continued access for fishing and gathering Kaimoana from the rocky shore. Current State of Maintenance • Wharf road currently receives a lower level of service, grading is not optimal, roadside not trimmed • In recent events where there have been dropouts the repair job has been done really well • Culverts not maintained, residents often have to clean them out when they get blocked when there is rain events coinciding with tides Bridge Weight Limitations • Truck weight distribution matters—larger trucks with more axles may actually be safer on smaller bridges than heavier trucks with less axles. Flood-Proofing & Coastal Protection • Raising the start of Wharf Road should be a priority, and we’d like to be part of the next budget planning discussions. • Past solutions, like using manuka sticks as tidal breaks, helped create a healthy foreshore with little environmental impact. • Increase the size of the culverts and insert a mechanism that allows them to be easily cleared • Small-scale trials in isolated spots could cause issues elsewhere—if we go ahead with things like planting, it makes sense to do it across the whole foreshore, not just Wharf Road. Alternative Road Considerations • Building a new road to bypass the first 400–500 meters would be far more disruptive and costly than maintaining and adapting the current road. • A smarter approach is to monitor and mitigate now with changes that keep the road viable for another 150 years. Looking forward to the next update of summarised feedback before the Hearings Panel. Let me know if you need anything else. Kind Regards, Annabel Barnett	Annabel Barnett

Additional feedback received from Wharf Road residents on the Draft Adaptation Plan for Whakaraupō Lyttelton Harbour and Koukourarata Port Levy, February 2025

Please note: this document contains additional feedback following an additional meeting with Wharf Road residents on 15 February 2025. For all submissions provided on the draft Plan, see 31 January 2025 Council agenda or letstalk.ccc.govt.nz/SLR-lh

29936	Hi Krystle, thank you all for coming on Saturday we really appreciated hearing from you and allowing us to give some feedback. We just have a couple of points we would like to add; 1. Andrew mentioned to us going forward to think of other options instead of using the road for stock movements. We would be very happy to show him our main access points and topography that would make this very difficult. Also having to have access through 3 properties to do so. Bear in mind also that stock have been using this route for 150 years and the road has not changed. 2. Everyone on Wharf Road occupies a title or titles of land as a result of earlier sub division. This will continue to occur, as population growth and land use change. This needs to be factored in to the future planning of Wharf road, Port levy had 15 farms when I came here in 1989, and now there are 5, with many lifestyle blocks and people either working from home or commuting to work. I don't see this trend changing, and our side of the bay probably has the most opportunity for this to occur. It is something we hope to explore going forward. 3. Our land because of it's inclusion in an area of out standing natural landscape means we have very few options for our farming operation, and our children see a future offering more recreational or tourist opportunities as something they would like to look at as they take over more of the business. So again access remains vital for that. Thank you for listening. Kind regards Clare and Richard Barnett.	Clare and Richard Barnett
29934 & 29935	Hi Krystle, Thank you to you, Tom and Andrew for coming out to the meeting in Port Levy on 15 February. From my point of view it was a very productive meeting. As requested, here are comments from myself and my mother Carolyn Craw following the discussion about adaptation options for Wharf Road within the CHAP. Our comments are as follows: • Tom indicated that the staff recommendation is now not to only have a recommendation of long-term closure for Wharf Road. Instead, this remains as an option (as is the same for Governors Bay / Teddington Roads and other roads in the area) but there are also two further options to be included in the plan. Firstly there is the option of flood proofing / raising the road. The second option is to allow provision for the road to be relocated inland in the future. We would like the opportunity for the group's lawyer Lloyd's Scully to review and finalise the wording about this. However, in principle, we are very happy with what is suggested. • Our preference is that the existing road's life is extended by way of flood proofing and raising the surface. As discussed, this can be achieved by using local rock and materials. Also, instead of taking away fill from slips etc out of the bay, this could be incrementally used to build up the seaward side of the road • From an operational point of view and as per the Mayor's comments at the hearing, there should be a way to build up the height of the existing Wharf Road using locally sourced material and not at a huge cost. The Mayor estimated around \$600,000.00. This should be investigated further. • We would like discussions with Council staff and potentially expert advice from a city council botanist about what would be the best type of vegetation to plant to maintain the integrity of the bank. Also, investigation about how this could be funded noting that residents can do the planting. • We do not want a private road. In summary, measures need to be put in place in the CHAP so that there are further options rather than just recommending road closure which by itself is unpalatable. Also, I'm not going to get the recording of the meeting typed up, but I have it saved here on my computer. Unfortunately, it is too big to email, and I don't know how to get around that! I am copying this email to Lloyds Scully. Thanks again for meeting with us and hearing our concerns. John Craw and Carolyn Craw	John Craw and Carolyn Craw

Additional feedback received from Wharf Road residents on the Draft Adaptation Plan for Whakaraupō Lyttelton Harbour and Koukourarata Port Levy, February 2025

Please note: this document contains additional feedback following an additional meeting with Wharf Road residents on 15 February 2025. For all submissions provided on the draft Plan, see 31 January 2025 Council agenda or letstalk.ccc.govt.nz/SLR-lh

29488	Hi Krystle Thanks for Saturdays meeting He is my thought for Wharf Road works There seems to be a real reluctance to engage in any form of foreshore protection because of the consents required to do this work. Given the extent of this work required across the country my feeling is that over time all Councils with coastlines will be looking for broader global consents for this sort of work to be permitted and there will be a nationwide movement towards this away from our current position of over regulated paralysis. However in anticipation of no one being able to organise some foreshore protection in the short term you will see my suggestion is to trench alongside the road edge within the Council owned road corridor and provide rock protection that will armour the road edge from both the sea and landward floods. It will also form a foundation for lifting the road carriageway. This is all within the mandate of road works provided for already under the Local Govt Act. The biggest concern to residents in the immediate short term is that a big storm with high tides and flooding causes damage to the carriageway through erosion by sea and flood waters that is really costly to fix and this in same way becomes the beginning of a lower level of service to repairs and maintaining the road. Pre-emptive work now would likely be cheaper than potential repair work and provide protection against multiple storm events Service level comments (my thoughts) 1. In the immediate foreseeable future the only time the road is likely to have water on it that impedes vehicles is during high tide under storm surge and under flood conditions. Locals to Wharf road are able to self manage their use for these few short hours. All resident road users have 4WD vehicles that can cope with minor safe depths of localised flooding or they can just stay home. 2. Over time if the frequency becomes greater that there is water in the carriageway then this could be advertised by signage as a warning of the potential water (for the benefit of non local road users) 3. If the road has to be built up in low lying sections, or protected from slipping then single lane stretches with a passing bay would be acceptable as long as there is sight lines along the narrow portion 4. Over further time restricting the use of the road to residents only during darkness hours and eventually to residents only in total if the carriage way service level drops significantly could be acceptable as an alternative to closure many thanks Peter	Peter Newton
29952	Attention Krystle Anderson As requested, feedback from the meeting on the 15th February- Wharf Road, Port Levy 1. We request the council to commit to: Providing and maintaining continued road access to the public and Wharf Road residents. 2. To the future, our preferred option A. To increase the carriageway height above MHW as required or necessary, to provide safe vehicle access along Wharf Road to present day standard. These materials, including hardfill/rock required be sourced in the bay, by way of widening of some narrow sections of existing roads. e.g. Upper Pa Road eastern side. All of Fernlea Point, narrow portions of Wharf Road to identify a few, all of which are close by and within the road reserve. 3. That the CCC recommence the program of repairs and maintenance to the inland drainage ditches and rock armor of low-lying sections of Wharf Road to their original condition / standard. By committing to the above, will provide adequate protection against any seaward incursion and inland flooding in the foreseeable future. The road at present being 1.5 meters average above MHW. 4. To be included into The Coastal Hazard Plan. That any statutory provisions required to achieve the above be actioned immediately. 5. Option B. To explore moving the roadway inland. (in my view not an option, cost being eyewatering per meter compared to the above.) I trust the above being in order and content relevant. Regards Philip and Jane Helps.	Philip and Jane Helps