

# COASTAL HAZARDS ADAPTATION STRATEGY

#### Phases 1 to 5

Grant Hinner, Program Coordinator Climate Change Adaptation

ETHOS

URBAN





AITHER







#### Outline

- Overview of Noosa
- Why do a CHAS?
- CHAS context
- Story so far (phase by phase)
- Lessons learnt
- What's next







Source: Noosa Council



Source: Noosa Council





#### Noosa – coastal area



Source: Noosa Council



Source: Noosa Council



Source: Noosa Council



Source: Noosa Council

# Noosa – indicative CHAS study area







- To improve Noosa Council and the community's understanding of current and future risks from coastal hazards and how they might change through time as a result of climate change;
- To consult with the community clearly and sensitively throughout key stages of the project so the community understands the implications and contributes to the decision making;
- To identify what actions are required to avoid, reduce or adapt to these risks to people, property, assets and the environment;
- To provide mapping and visual products and deliverables that are useful for a range of purposes across Council departments and functions and within the community (e.g. planning scheme, asset management, community awareness, disaster management and financial planning; and
- To provide direction for a coordinated approach for council and the community to adapt to climate change and coastal hazards.

#### What does the SPP July 2017 say?

State interest – natural hazards, risk and resilience states:

The risks associated with natural hazards, including the projected impacts of climate change, are avoided or mitigated to protect people and property and enhance the community's resilience to natural hazards



#### A history of coastal hazards in Noosa





Source: Noosa Library





Source: Noosa Library

Source: Noosa Library

#### A history of coastal hazards in Noosa



Source: Bureau of Meteorology

# A history of change





Source: Noosa Library





Source: Noosa Library

# **CHAS:** Governance & Timeline



#### CHAS – Project Timeline



#### Phase 1 – Stakeholder Engagement



Source: Noosa Council



Source: Noosa Council

# CHAP Stakeholder Engagement Strategy - Objectives

- Build awareness and educate stakeholders regarding coastal dynamics and hazards
- Understand community values (re. assets) and the tolerance for coastal hazard risks
- Empower all stakeholders to make informed decisions by providing information and mapping of expected hazard location and risks.
- Broaden community awareness of possible adaptation responses
  and understand their appetite for these
- Clarify roles and responsibilities
- Create a collaborative vision and action plan

# The 'Why'..



We need to understand how coastal hazard risks Noosa is <u>already subject to</u> will likely change in the decades to come, and then decide, together, how we ensure that Council and the community are appropriately prepared and that the values we associate with Noosa today are maintained into the future.

# The 'Why'...



It's about good governance and *proactive* risk management. This requires ensuring Council and the community are appropriately informed and have a plan.

#### Potential economic imperatives

- Costly damage to Council assets due to insufficient planning by Council
- Reduced economic activity due to damage (real or perceived) to local businesses and Noosa's iconic values (e.g. desirable tourism destination, investment attractiveness and place to live status)

#### Potential ecological imperatives:

- > Damage to local biodiversity values by promoting adaptive capacity of key habitats
- Diminishment of Noosa's ecologically sustainable reputation (e.g. UN Biosphere Reserve status)

#### Potential social imperatives

- > Threats to physical health and safety of local community
- > Mental anguish associated with damage to assets or loss of income
- > Undermining of social fabric in enclaves heavily affected

# Phase 2 – Scoping Study



# Phase 2 – Scoping Study

- Review of existing information relevant to Noosa
- Identify knowledge gaps
- Planning horizons of 2040, 2070, 2100
- Limitations of previous State mapping
- Previous 2100 work by Aurecon



#### Phase 3 – Coastal Hazards Assessment



# Phase 3 – Coastal Hazards Assessment

- Model for 2040, 2070 and 2100
- Permanent inundation from SLR
- Temporary inundation from Stormtide
- Storm erosion and shoreline recession
- 1% AEP events used
- 0.8m SLR applied
  (2100)



Source: Noosa Council

#### Phase 4 – Asset Prioritisation



Source: Noosa Council

# Example Assets Potentially Affected



Asset Class	Example Assets				
Private Commercial	Marine access assets; tourist hotspots; food and retail buildings.				
Private Residential (detached)	Multiple localities				
Public Recreation	Noosa Main Beach				
	Quota Park Foreshore Parkland				
	Gympie Terrace				
Essential Services	Stormwater network, energy networks				
Council	Noosa Administration Building				

# Phase 5 – Risk Analysis



#### Phase 5 – Risk Analysis

- Workshop 1 (PWG)
- Workshop 2 (PWG)



## Phase 5 – Risk Workshop #1

- Goal: use assets/locations representative of the broader coastal area to provide indicative impact determination
- Participants: Project Working Group
- Timeframe of the CHAS: Present Day to 2100
- Likelihood: scored by planning horizon
- Consequence: indicative scoring by participants
- Coincident flooding impacts unlikely. 'Gut feeling' but no statistical evidence.
- This is a starting point will need to be reviewed over time noting the risk of impact will change with increased certainty of likelihood and trajectory

# Phase 5 – Consequence Scale (example)

Consequence	Society/Community	Environment	Economy (including Council Assets)				
Catastrophic	Widespread permanent impact to community's services wellbeing, or culture (e.g. >50% of community affected) or national loss, with no suitable alternative sites that exist	Widespread devastating/permanent impact to ecological character (e.g. entire habitat destruction) <u>Or</u> Loss of all local representation of nationally important species with recovery unlikely	Damage to property, infrastructure or local economy > \$ 20 million Asset(s) completely damaged and/or large scale engineering works required for reinstating. Significant disruption in business operation (virtually dysfunctional)				
Major	Major permanent or widespread medium term (somewhat reversible) disruption to community's services, wellbeing, or culture (e.g. up to 50% of community affected) or regional loss, with only a few suitable alternative sites that exist	Widespread semi-permanent impact to ecological character <u>Or</u> Loss of local representation of a national or regionally important species with recovery over years – decades	Damage to property, infrastructure or local economy > \$ 5 million - 20 million Extensive structural damage to the asset(s) requiring significant engineering stabilisation work. Major disruption in the asset's service Major disruption in business operation with significant loss of revenue and market reputation				
Moderate	Minor long term or major short term (mostly reversible) disruption to community's services, wellbeing, or culture (e.g. up to 25% of community affected) or sub-regional loss, with some suitable alternative sites available	Local environmental impacts or localised changes to ecological character <u>Or</u> Widespread impacts of a temporary nature to regionally or locally important species but with recovery likely over the short term	Damage to property, infrastructure or local economy > \$ 500,000 - \$5 million Moderate damage to some part of the structure of the asset(s) and require large engineering stabilisation work. Moderate disruption in the asset's service Considerable impact in business operation with loss of revenue				
Minor	Small to medium term (reversible) disruption to community's services, wellbeing, finances or culture (e.g. up to 10% of community affected) or local loss, with many suitable alternative sites available	Temporary environmental impacts at a local scale of a magnitude consistent with seasonal variation <u>Or</u> Impacts not affecting species of conservation significance or otherwise affecting local species with rapid recovery	Damage to property, infrastructure or local economy > \$ 50,000 to \$ 500,000 Limited damage to some part of the asset(s) and requi some small scale stabilisation work resulting in minor service disruption Minor impact in business operation as disruption most can be managed through standby or alternate options. However, some loss of revenue or cost involved				
Insignificant	Very small short term disruption to community's services, wellbeing, finances or culture (e.g. up to 5% of community affected) or neighbourhood level loss, with numerous alternative sites available	Minimal very short term, temporary effects on habitat or species with recovery assured.	Damage to property, infrastructure or local economy > \$ 50,000 Little disruption in service but no structural damage to the asset(s) Little to no impact in business operation.				

## Phase 5 – Workshop #2

- Objective: work through some potential risk mitigation options to assist consultants thinking
- Validate and illuminate what will fit with Noosa
- "The Noosa Way"
- Participants from PWG, split into groups
- Included discussion on what we've done in the past to mitigate risks

# Phase 5 – Existing defensive systems



# **Biodiversity Assessment**

- Impacts to Broad Vegetation Groups and Key/Iconic Species (flora and fauna)
- Assess adaptive capacity within:
  - CSIRO climate projections
  - Adjacent land use constraints
- Assess gaps in existing management & plans
- Recommendations



Source: Noosa Council



Source: Noosa Council

#### Phase 6 - Options Analysis



# Phase 6 - Aiming to end up with something like this...

Option	Option Type	Treats Erosion	Treats Recession	Treats Oceanic Inundation	Maintains Beach Amenity	Maintains Foreshore Habitat	Capital Cost	Recurrent Costs	Environmental or Social Impact	Community Acceptability	Reversible / Adaptable	Effectiveness over time	Legal <i>i</i> Approval Risk	Technical Viability	Score (Go = 1, Slow = 0, Stop = -1)	Recommended Asset Type &/or Other Comments
Planned Retreat O	ptions		1		1											
Accept Impacts	Accept loss of land or assets affected by a hazard event (i.e. once affected, the assets or land is not replaced). Allows beach to translocate landward, retaining a sandy beach over time, where geology allows for retreat.	~	~		1		G o	G o	S I O W	S I O W	S t p	S I V W	S I O W	G o	2	Only appropriate for undeveloped land. Costs and benefits of loss of habitat against maintaining beach amenity need to be considered.
Land Acquisition	High risk private properties are bought at market prices then demolished to become public land.	~	~	~	~	*	S t p	G o	G o	S t p	S – o ¥	Go	S t o P	G	1	If the option of retreat is to be considered broadly as part of the CHAS and long term adaptation planning, this option could be further investigated for Holloways Beach.
Buy Back / Lease Back	High risk private properties are bought at market prices, and then rented out until hazard impacts are imminent (years). When hazard is imminent, the property is demolished and land returned to the public.	~	~	~	~	~	S t P	Go	G o	S t P	% – o ¥	Go	S t p	G o	3	As above.

## Project status



# Lesson Learning Time



## What Now..

- Engagement campaign
  - Build awareness and support
  - Data re. tolerance and appetite
  - Collaboration
    CHAS drafting
- Inform Phases 5 8



Source: Noosa Council

#### Next Steps...



# MAR-APR

Socio-economic analysis

Final technical report (Phases 2 – 7)

#### In Future...



- Noosa River Management Plan
- Biodiversity/Environmental Management Plans
- Coastal management plan
- New planning scheme
- Disaster mgmt. planning
- Asset planning and maintenance program (Infra and community facilities)
- Financial planning



# THANK YOU