

Your Comment¹ on the Kōpū Marine Precinct

All sections of this form with an asterisk (*) are mandatory.

1. Contact Details

Please ensure that you have authority to comment on the application on behalf of those named on this form.

| | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|-------------|------------|
| Organisation name (if relevant) | Office of Hon. James Shaw | | |
| *First name | Maggie | | |
| *Last name | Fellowes | | |
| Postal address | | | |
| *Home phone / Mobile phone | | *Work phone | ██████████ |
| *Email (a valid email address enables us to communicate efficiently with you) | Maggie.fellowes@parliament.govt.nz | | |

2. *We will email you draft conditions of consent for your comment

| | | | |
|-----|--|--------------------------|--|
| Yes | I can receive emails and my email address is correct | <input type="checkbox"/> | I cannot receive emails and my postal address is correct |
|-----|--|--------------------------|--|

3. Please provide your comments on this application

¹ If you do not use this form to write your comment please attach this form with the personal details filled out to your comment.

Comments on Kōpū Marine Precinct: Minister of Climate Change

1. Both Options 1 and 2 for the proposed development are based on an approach to setting the height of structures that will result in occasional inundation during storm events (1 in 5 year storm event or greater), even at current sea levels. No allowance has been made for impacts arising from climate change such as sea level rise or higher storm surges, which are likely to increase inundation frequency, depth and area affected.
2. It is understood that:
 - a. this design approach has been adopted as a balance between:
 - i. the requirements for the proposed use of the facility and potential impacts of higher structures on existing floodbanks adjoining the proposed structures (as expressed in the Coastal Processes Assessment)
 - ii. the usability of the site and scale of the works as compared to the receiving environment (as expressed in the Assessment of Environmental Effects)
 - b. an adaptive management approach is to be adopted (secured by way of a condition), such that:
 - i. the design of the structures allows for future height increases, and
 - ii. a monitoring regime will be put in place that will, among other considerations, determine when those height increases should occur to address coastal hazards and ensure the continued viability of the facility.
3. It is further noted that the peer review of the Coastal Processes Assessment (CPA) for Option 1 identified the need to consider the inundation hazard in more detail, with a view to ensuring "*there is sufficient resilience built into the design so that adaptation doesn't become necessary in the short term*".
4. It is unclear the extent to which the identified issues were addressed in the CPA before submission of the application for Option 1, but it appears from the most recent peer review (submitted with Option 2) that there remains a lack of an explicit evaluation of the likely short-medium term impact of sea level rise on the proposed facilities.
5. Given the above, I suggest that as part of its assessment of both Options 1 and 2, the Panel consider whether:
 - a. the proposed adaptive management approach will provide sufficient resilience of the development in the short to medium term, or
 - b. the proposed adaptive management approach should be coupled with building an allowance for current and future inundation into the development from the start (ie, by requiring a higher design level for affected structures).



Hon. James Shaw

Minister of Climate Change

18/01/2022