**COASTAL RATEPAYERS UNITED INC**

**Minutes of the Annual General Meeting**

**1pm, Saturday 13 November 2021**

**Citizen’s Hall, Ocean Road, Paraparaumu Beach**

1. **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS OF KEYNOTE SPEAKER, CHAIRMAN OF CAP – RT HON JAMES BOLGER ONZ**

Quentin Poole welcomed everyone to the meeting including Mr James Bolger.

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Christopher Ruthe.

1. **KEYNOTE SPEAKER – CHAIRMAN OF CAP – MR JAMES BOLGER**

Mr James Bolger acknowledged the Executive members and officers. He noted that Susie Mills, Waikanae Lawyer and Dr Martin Manning, climate change scientist had also joined him from CAP. Mr Bolger also acknowledged members of CRU who had also known about climate change and coastal hazards for some time.

The Coastal Adaption Panel would utilise good science, good planning and good law. Mr Bolger outlined the reason CAP was set up and noted that by the Council agreeing to establish the panel it was hoped to avoid the mistakes of the past.

There was value in collectively having discussions on climate issues and global warming and CAP were not alone in grappling with the issues. It was known that there were similar debates going on across the world.

Mr Bolger noted the role of CAP was to develop and recommend medium and long term options to the Council and also the costs and benefits to the Council. It was noted that this would be a complex journey for CAP and due to COVID the start of work of CAP had been delayed. CAP was at the beginning of their work and were collecting information and engaging with the community.

Mr Bolger talked about Tower Insurance’s approach to the risk associated with individual properties, coastal properties and increasing premiums. Need to take time to determine the change situation due to a changing climate. Mr Bolger also talked about the houses in Christchurch after the earthquake that had been built on reclaimed land.

Mr Bolger noted that all evidence points to the fact that the climate is going through a period of change and the world is seeking how best to respond. New Zealand is only starting to confront these difficult decisions.

Mr Bolger also noted that a review of coastal communities would bring about change. He was amazed at where people had built houses in recent years and it looked like they could have trouble in coming years.

The meeting was opened for questions:

* Chris Turver asked about the indifferent performance of KCDC in engaging with the community on central projects and how would CAP ensure the community would be regularly engaged with and communicated to. Mr Bolger noted that CAP did not have authority to speak on behalf of KCDC, but that CAP would seek to engage with the community and they would expect that KCDC would take seriously the necessity to engage.
* Jeff Ashby asked about a governance issue regarding having iwi members on CAP and how close was it before the iwi members would be appointed. It was noted that the issue had been raised with Council. Jeff Ashby also asked whether they felt they could proceed without knowing who the iwi were? Mr Bolger noted CAP were conscious of the fact that they were not a full team but they needed to begin the work
* Graham Yager, a Field Way resident asked about communication in terms of the Terms of Reference and whether people were able to make communications through their own channels or via KCDC? Mr Bolger said there were no limitations.
* Phillip Tortell who had lived in Kapiti for 25 years asked about public participation and community involvement and questioned the process that CAP would utilise to inform the public. He asked whether the Panel had resources to engage with the public, and resources to engage the necessary expertise to consider the issues that arise from submissions. Could it commission a social impact assessment of the issues? Mr Bolger noted CAP has no budget and are reliant upon Council staff for undertaking those decisions as funding would be from the Council.
* The Chair asked whether the expertise that is within Kapiti could be used. Mr Bolger felt that the panel represented the community expertise.
* Joanna Poole asked about public participation and involvement and being able to contribute.
* Katherine Moody felt that not doing a formal submission was a problem and asked whether the recommendations that CAP propose would be released to the public in draft. Mr Bolger stated that CAP had not discussed this but that this was unlikely to occur. CAP’s only mandate would be to release the recommendations to Council, and not in draft for consultation.
* The recommendations would be community-led as people on CAP are from the community.
* Katherine Moody said, the last time around, Council used the formula known as DAD, Decide, Announce, Defend. And this was Council’s downfall, and it appears that CAP might be following the same formula
* Warwick Wyatt noted that he was part of the submission in 2012 and asked if he had a submission to go to the Committee how would he do it and would he need to write to CAP via the Council.
* Jeff Ashby noted he had already made a submission to CAP through Council over a month ago but had not received a response from Council.
* Sue Smith addressed the elephant in the room, which was that since 2012 their experience was that there was no faith in the Council communication.
* Mr Bolger stated that submissions could be sent to Lindsay Craig at KCDC for the attention of CAP. They were gathering information
* The Panel did not have a secretary and that they would be willing to take submissions but that was it, and did not have the capacity to do a submissions process, that would be up to Council
* Warwick Wyatt raised concerns about stream management and Council’s responsibility or lack of that determine the flow of stream to which Mr Bolger answered, who would want to build there on the beach
* He further asked CRU if they expect Joan to pitch in with the administration
* Peter Katz noted that he had been heartened by Mr Bolger’s introduction and that CAP were open to submissions, however a clear process was needed. Not vetting of submissions rather than a vetted analysis. He sought assurance that each beach in Waikanae would be treated differently as they were distinctly different. His biggest concern was the process and interaction with Council. He believed in the idea of defence and retreat and that it was important and would seek assurance that the option of defence be looked at, at each different beach.
* Chris Mitchell said that he recommended that the flow of information need to be public if there is to be effective engagement
* Warwick Wyatt asked about accretion and the sea level rise and Professor Martin Manning spoke about accretion and sea level saying lea level was rising at a faster rate than accretion
* Paul Dunmore noted it was a shame that CAP had not asked for a budget as cost and benefits needed to be considered when making their recommendations. He asked what economic advice were CAP getting apart from the advice from Jacobs. Mr Bolger spoke about the Terms of Reference and noted that economics would be taken into account.
* It was recommended that the Panel give thought to a sliding structure to get the level of engagement required. Confidence that CAP can work collaboratively together.
* Quentin Poole noted that it had been proposed that all meetings of CAP be open to public, but Mr Bolger noted that he was not in favour of that and added, “not if I have anything to do with it”.
* Mr. Bolger compared the CAP process to Parliament where members can speak but people in the gallery can’t
* A comment was made that they had heard that CAP was based on good science. However he also noted that Patrick Moore, the founder of Greenpeace, directly opposed their point of view and that it was a matter of personal liberty and that people should be able to build where they want to and take responsibility. It was also noted that Section 72 notice had been deemed not legal but this had not been made public.
* Jeff Ashby noted that in terms of the science there were two names, both who were eminent scientists, Dr James Renwick and Dr Michael Manning, but unfortunately they were both at one end of the scientific continuum. He felt good science was to listen to the whole continuum.
* Jonny Best from the Community Board questioned the community engagement and collaboration with CRU and Council. What practically will CAP do to collaborate with CRU and get the Council to work collectively with them. Mr Bolger noted that it was up to CRU if they would be supportive or not
* John Smith asked whether the positions on CAP were voluntary positions or paid by Council. Mr Bolger noted the positions were paid by Council.
* Susie Mills noted that the Panel was made up of a diverse group and that there had already been some lively discussion. She did not want submissions received filtered and she had made a note of this.

Quentin Poole thanked Mr Bolger for the discussion and for attending the meeting.

1. **PREVIOUS AGM MINUTES**

The minutes of the 2020 AGM minutes were taken as read.

It was moved that the minutes of the 2020 AGM be accepted as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

**Moved:** Quentin Poole

**Seconded:** Michael Alexander *CARRIED*

1. **MATTERS ARISING FROM MINUTES**

There were no matters arising from the previous minutes.

1. **CHAIRPERSON’S ANNUAL REPORT**

Salima Padamsey presented her report and thanked members of the Committee and experts and advisors.

It was moved that the Chairperson’s Annual Report be accepted.

**Moved:** Salima Padamsey

**Seconded:** Quentin Poole *CARRIED*

The question was asked if anyone had confidence in the CAP committee. It was felt that the Mr Bolger’s answers were counter-productive and discussed the CRU’s submission to Jacobs on the methodology.

1. **TREASURER’S ANNUAL REPORT**

Michael Alexander presented the Treasurer’s Annual Report.

There had been several years of low outgoings, so CRU had spent some this year. A large proportion of spending had been to upgrade the CRU office and purchase a computer for the Chairperson. CRU had received donations of $1,530 and members had indicated their willingness to contribute further if required.

It was moved that the Treasurer’s Annual Report be accepted.

**Moved:** Michael Alexander

**Seconded:** Quentin Poole *CARRIED*

It was noted that the Executive Committee had passed a resolution to restore the subscription and recommended $30 per annum per member.

It was moved that the annual subscription of $30 per annum be reinstated.

**Moved:** Michael Alexander

**Seconded:** Graham Yager *CARRIED*

1. **ELECTIONS OF OFFICERS**

The following nominations had been received:

* Chairman – Salima Padamsey
* Secretary – no nomination received
* Treasurer – Michael Alexander
* Executive Members (4-8)
* Joanna Poole
* Andy McIntyre
* Quentin Poole

Salima Padamsey agreed to continue as chairperson. Quentin Poole congratulated her for a further year.

Michael Alexander was reappointed as Treasurer.

The Executive Members were confirmed and Quentin Poole asked for more support on the Executive.

1. **PRESENTATION**

Paul Dunmore was presented a life membership award and Paul thanked the committee for the award and the members for supporting and keeping the group going.

1. **GENERAL BUSINESS**

A number of people expressed disappointment with Mr Bolger’s presentation and several wondered if there was any point in trying to work with CAP

Vicky Cooper asked whether a submission be made to CAP to summarise their concerns, how they want their concerns dealt with and what the next steps were. Quentin Poole asked whether CRU still try to liaise with CAP .

It was proposed that a note be sent to CAP recording what CRU understand they have been told by CAP and copy to KCDC.

Joanna Poole felt that CAP maybe irrelevant and did CRU even need to engage with them. Warwick Wyatt felt the organisation should stand on its own and be prepared to go to Court.

Concerned was expressed about CRU not engaging with CAP and felt that CRU should be seen to be doing what they can to engage with CAP.

It was felt that CRU need to make it clear to neighbours etc the consequences of doing nothing.

The meeting discussed Jacobs report and the assumptions in their report.

Alison Harrison, who was new to CRU noted the biggest question was how to influence Council and CAP to get to what they want. CRU needed to have a strategy.

It was noted that the best strategy in the past was to engage Councillors and then they engaged staff.

The scientific controversy out of the debate was discussed and noted. It was felt CRU needed to concentrate their efforts in the areas that matter and that arguing the science was difficult.

A question was asked whether IPCC was good science and noted that people in New Zealand were using IPCC scenario that is unplausible.

It was noted that it was about preserving the beach and access to the beach for the community, not just beach-front owners and the need to engage in that way.

There was some further discussion on science, consequence and defence versus retreat.

1. **CLOSE OF MEETING**

The meeting closed at 3.10pm.