

## 2. REPORT OF THE YACHT CLUB RESERVE SUBCOMMITTEE - EROSION AT MONCK'S BAY



<b>Responsibility</b> Yacht Club Reserve Subcommittee	<b>Author</b> Julie Sadler
Corporate Plan Output: Estuary Protection	

The purpose of this report is to present the outcome of the investigations of the Yacht Club Reserve Subcommittee into the remedial works required to arrest the erosion occurring at Moncks Bay.

### BACKGROUND

Representatives of the Christchurch Yacht Club addressed the Committee at its meeting on 7 June 2000 and outlined their concerns regarding the serious erosion of the foreshore adjacent to the Yacht Club Reserve, Moncks Bay.

The deputation requested that urgent remedial work be undertaken to combat the effects of erosion to protect the reserve, car park and the yacht club's facilities.

Also before the Committee was a report from the Parks Manager describing the extent of the problem and the Council's responsibility in terms of undertaking remedial measures to protect the reserve.

The Committee appointed a subcommittee comprising Councillor Graham Condon (Chairman), Councillors David Buist, Erin Baker and Gail Sheriff to review previous staff reports on this issue and to determine the funding requirements for the investigatory work.

### SUMMARY OF ISSUES

The key points from an earlier report on this issue can be summarised as follows:

- The erosion appears to be the result of the narrowing of the flood tide channel caused by the advancement of the flood tide delta from the north towards the Moncks Bay side of the estuary.
- The Council does not have a legal responsibility to protect its land from the estuary. However, it may choose to do so as it has done to protect the sea wall of the car park which is situated east of the Christchurch Yacht Club licensed area.
- There are over 200 clubs or organisations that lease Council-owned land for various purposes. The Council does not have any responsibility for any of the improvements constructed upon this land by these clubs. If the Council decides to assist the club in replacing its facilities, it must be careful to do it in such a way so as not to create a precedent.
- If the Council decides to further assist the club with money, it will be necessary to find substitutions from within existing budgets.

- Environment Canterbury has stated to the club that in its opinion it does not foresee any responsibility for the erosion falling upon the Environment Canterbury, because the erosion is a natural process.

#### **SUBCOMMITTEE DELIBERATIONS**

Since its appointment, the subcommittee has met on two occasions. At its first meeting on 29 June 2000 members met onsite with representatives of the Christchurch Yacht Club to view the extent of the erosion problem and to explore possible solutions.

The Subcommittee requested City Design staff to report back on the remedial works required to arrest the erosion problem.

Two reports were presented to the Subcommittee at its second meeting on 1 September 2000. Both reports have been separately circulated to Councillors.

The first report deals with the erosion remedial works and estimates that it will cost in the order of \$115,000 to arrest the erosion of the reserve to protect the Yacht Club facilities and a further \$12,000 for protection works to the car park at the eastern end of the reserve.

The second report is concerned with the structures (launching ramp and jetties) owned by the Yacht Club. According to the report, the majority of these structures are at the end of their economic life and require replacement. It is estimated it will cost between \$65,000 and \$130,000 to replace these facilities, depending on the type of facilities provided.

The cost of preparing the above reports, including the field survey work was \$5,000.

In considering the staff reports, the Subcommittee noted that there are two issues to be addressed. The first, and most urgent, is the remedial action to be taken to protect the Council-owned reserve, car park and the facilities owned by the Christchurch Yacht Club. The second is the replacement of the launching ramps and jetty owned by the Yacht Club. This work is less urgent and options for funding this part of the project can be explored with the club once it has reached a decision on the type of facilities it proposes to install to replace the existing structures.

As the erosion remedial work is required largely to protect Council-owned assets, the Subcommittee considered that these costs should be borne by the Council.

Accordingly, the Subcommittee requested that discussions be held with the Water Services Manager as to an appropriate source of funds for this work.

The Water Services Manager reported:

*“Considering past responsibility for this area it will be appropriate for the bulk of the funding for this work to come from the Parks Unit’s capital works budget with a contribution from the Water Services Unit.*

*If the project is to be funded during the 2000-01 financial year then it will be through the substitution of other approved capital works.”*

## **CONCLUSION**

The members unanimously concluded that urgent action must be taken to deal with the erosion issues to protect the Council-owned reserve and car park, as well as the Yacht Club’s facilities.

A list of works proposed for substitution was tabled at the Committee meeting. The Committee referred the proposed project reallocations to the Yacht Club Reserve Subcommittee for consideration and recommendation to the Strategy and Resources Committee. The Council has delegated authority to the Strategy and Resources Committee to reallocate budgeted expenditure to a new project or activity.

- Recommendation:**
1. That the Council undertake the erosion control work to protect the Council reserve area, car park and yacht club facilities at an estimated cost of \$127,000.
  2. That the erosion control work be funded by substitution within the Parks and Water Services budgets, the exact substitutions to be reported to the Strategy and Resources Committee for approval.
  3. That ongoing discussions be held with the Christchurch Yacht Club as to the nature of their future facilities.
  4. That to implement 1 above:
    - (a) Public consultation and the resource consent application proceed as soon as possible, based on the design concept.
    - (b) The consent application be followed by completion of design and contract documentation.