8. SANDY BAY BEACH RENOURISHMENT PROPOSAL

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, Jane Parfitt, DDI 941-8656
Officer responsible:	Manager, Transport and Greenspace
Author:	Rodney Chambers, Coastal Area Head Ranger

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. To provide information as requested by the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Board about the feasibility of and the requirements for renourishment of Sandy Bay beach at Governors Bay.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Sandy Bay beach at Governors Bay is small picturesque local beach which experiences a slow rate of sand loss through natural erosion. The beach was previously renourished, possibly up to fifteen years ago, with imported sand. The local community has now requested that this sand be replenished to improve recreational amenity value by recreating a high tide sandy beach, as well as reducing further beach and foreshore erosion. A Coastal Permit from Environment Canterbury (ECan) is required for the placement of this sand.

3. This report supports sand renourishment as the most appropriate option to achieve the desired community outcomes and provides the information necessary to go forward and obtain the required permits from ECan under the RMA 1991. Consultation with the local community, the Department of Conservation and the local runanga will be required. Approximately 1800 cubic metres of sand will need to be transported to the site, at a cost of up to $45,000. This volume should give the beach up to twenty years of sand residual.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

4. No budgetary allocation is in place. Cost estimates are $45,000 for transport, purchase of sand and placement. The community has already applied for the Coastal Permit. The cost could be reduced to $33,000 if the sand can be sourced for free. The local community has indicated they are willing to also contribute towards transport costs.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2006-16 LTCCP budgets?

5. No. As there is currently no budget for this project funding would need to come from either the community or various contributors including the Community Board Discretionary Fund. The Board could seek to have this included in the 2009/19 LTCCP.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

6. Sandy Bay is within the Coastal Marine Area and is designated an 'Area of Significant Natural Value' under the Regional Coastal Environment Plan (RCEP), managed by Environment Canterbury, therefore a Coastal Permit is required. There are no resource consent requirements from Christchurch City Council.

Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?

7. The activity is deemed to be non-complying under the rules of the RCEP but does meets the criteria for granting non-complying activities.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

8. Not specifically mentioned, but this project aligns with Encouraging Healthy and Active Life styles.

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?

9. No.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

10. Strategic Direction – Strong Communities:

    (a) Encourage healthy and active lifestyles by
    - providing parks, public buildings and other facilities that are accessible, safe, welcoming and enjoyable to use;
    - Providing and supporting sport, recreation and leisure activities;

    (b) Encourage residents to enjoy living in the City and to have fun, by:
    - Providing and supporting sport, recreation and leisure activities;
    - Providing a variety of safe, accessible and welcoming local parks, open spaces and waterways.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

11. Yes see above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

12. Consultation will be needed when applying for Coastal Permit, which will involve the local community, the Department of Conservation and the local runanga.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board:

(a) Agree that staff work with the local community to source funds for this project.

(b) Agree to support an application for a Coastal Permit to undertake the beach renourishment works at Sandy Bay.

BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)

13. Prior to amalgamation, and probably the enactment of the RMA (1991), Sandy Bay beach was replenished by the local community with imported sand after experiencing natural sand loss. Today, some ten to fifteen years after this renourishment, a small residual of sandy beach is left and wave action is now eroding the bank(road reserve) behind the foreshore.

14 Following an enquiry by the Governors Bay Residents' Association and a consequent request from the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board on 26 September 2006, a report has been prepared on the feasibility and requirements of sand renourishment (beach replenishment) for Sandy Bay (Governors Bay). Five thousand five hundred dollars was allocated for this purpose from the Transport and Greenspace Unit's existing 'Coast Care Development' budget.

15. Derek Todd of DTec Consulting Ltd has prepared a report which considers a range of options for beach management at Sandy Bay. The report supports the sand renourishment option as achieving improved recreational amenity value, as well as the reduction of beach erosion.

16. Sandy Bay is considered to be a major recreational asset by local Governors Bay residents but does not have the same high metropolitan use as nearby beaches such as Corsair Bay. The bay has narrow sealed road access with limited parking on site. The process of sand replenishment will see significant truck movements and may impact on local residents.

THE OBJECTIVES

17. To improve/repair recreational amenity value by recreating a wider high tide beach, as well as reduce beach and foreshore erosion, with minimal environmental impact.

THE OPTIONS

18. The options are as follows:

    (a) Sand renourishment
    (b) Bank toe protection
    (c) Groynes
    (d) Beach Drainage
    (e) Offshore Wave Trip
    (f) Bank Stability
    (g) Stormwater control

THE PREFERRED OPTION

19. Sand Renourishment is the only option that achieves both the recreational, amenity and erosion protection objectives, with minimal environmental impact. To undertake the project up to 1800m^3 of sand will be required to be sourced, purchased, transported and placed on the site. This will cost approximately $45,000.

20. The report by DTEC Consulting provides sufficient information to meet the requirements for obtaining a coastal permit from ECan.

ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS

The Preferred Option

21. Sand Renourishment achieves both the recreational, amenity and erosion protection objectives, with minimal environmental impact. To undertake the project up to 1800m^3 of sand will be required to be sourced, purchased, transported and placed on the site. This will cost approximately $45,000.

	Benefits (current and future)	**Costs (current and future)**
Social	Meets community aspirations for recreational facility	Nil
Cultural		
Environmental	Improved foreshore protection and erosion buffering	
Economic	Improved amenity will support visitor attraction	$45,000

Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:

This project has a primary alignment with A City for recreation fun and creativity. It also benefits coastal protection - so aligns with a city of people who value and protect the natural environment

Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:

There is no budget allocated to this project.

Effects on Maori:

Nil. Continuation of management

Consistency with existing Council policies:

Ongoing Coastal Management practises.

Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:

Strong local community support. Wider consultation will be needed.

Other relevant matters:

A Coastal permit should be applied for 35 years to allow for tops ups at estimated 10 year intervals.

Maintain the Status Quo (if not preferred option)

22. Beach loses all sand completely and foreshore toe erosion continues with threat to road access/amenity area behind the beach.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social		Community aspirations unmet for sandy all tide beach
Cultural		
Environmental		Continued coastal erosion and loss of beach erosion buffering capability
Economic		Cost of repairing/protecting road behind foreshore may be more costly in future.

Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:

To allow continued erosion does not align with a city of people who value and protect the natural environment, or provide a recreational resource

Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:

Effects on Maori:

Consistency with existing Council policies:

Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:

Other relevant matters:

At Least one Other Option (or an explanation of why another option has not been considered)

23. Bank Toe Protection using rock revetment or gabion baskets

	Benefits (current and future)	**Costs (current and future)**
Social		Community aspirations unmet for 'sandy' all tide beach
Cultural		
Environmental	Provides erosion resistant material in front of toe	Does not raise beach profile and produce increased erosion buffering capacity elevation of the beach by providing an all tide (sandy) beach.
Economic		Cost of bank toe protection will most likely be more costly than renourishment.

Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:

Bank toe protection does not raise beach profile and produce increased elevation of the beach or produce the improved amenity values by providing an all tide (sandy) beach.

Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:

Effects on Maori:

Consistency with existing Council policies:

Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:

Other relevant matters: