



Review of the State Coastal Policy – Development of Actively Mobile Landforms

Position Paper

Table of Content

1.0	Glossary	2
2.0	Introduction.....	2
3.0	Background.....	3
4.0	Summary of Issues	5
4.1	Outcome 1.4.2.....	5
4.2	Intent of Outcome 1.4.2	6
4.3	Actively Mobile Landforms	7
5.0	Recent changes to tools for identifying and managing coastal processes and hazards	7
5.1	Management requirements of Outcome 1.4.1.....	7
5.2	Tasmanian Planning Policies (TPPs)	8
5.3	State Planning Provisions (SPPs)	8
6.0	Proposed amendments to update the controls on actively mobile landforms	9
6.1	Coastal development generally	9
6.2	Updating Outcomes on coastal hazards to align better with other outcomes	10
6.3	A risk-based assessment for coastal development in areas of hazard	10
6.4	Considering ‘need’ and ‘benefit’ of use and development	11
6.5	Amendment to State Coastal Policy.....	12
7.0	Next Steps	13



Author:

State Planning Office

Publisher:

Department of Premier and Cabinet

Date:

September 2024

© Crown in Right of the State of Tasmania December 2019

State Planning Office, Department of Premier & Cabinet

GPO Box 123 HOBART TAS 7001

Phone: 1300 703 977

Email: stateplanning@dpac.tas.gov.au

1.0 Glossary

The following acronyms and abbreviations are used in this Position Paper:

RMPS	Resource Management and Planning System
SCP	State Coastal Policy 1996
TasCAT	Tasmanian Civil and Administrative Tribunal
SPPA	State Policies and Project Act 1993
Commission	Tasmanian Planning Commission
TPPs	Tasmanian Planning Policies
SPPs	State Planning Provisions
LIST	Land Information Systems Tasmania

2.0 Introduction

The *State Coastal Policy 1996* (SCP) is a critically important part of the State's Resource Management and Planning System (RMPS) and has served us well in protecting the coast and providing for sustainable development. Introduced almost 30 years ago the SCP has been amended twice to improve its operation.

In recent months the way that the SCP has been applied with respect to development on actively mobile landforms has come under question. This is not only a recent issue but has been the subject of a number of appeals against planning approvals and Supreme Court decisions.

In 2009 the SCP was amended to specifically allow some developments on actively mobile landforms where there is a need to minimise the need for engineering or remediation works to protect land property and human life. Outcome 1.4.1 of the SCP articulates those circumstances.

The recent approval of the Robbins Island windfarm by the Tasmanian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (TasCAT) has raised questions around the manner in which it applied the SCP in relation to Outcome 1.4.2 of the SCP. That Outcome prohibits all development on actively mobile land unless it is for a purpose provided for under Outcome 1.4.1. This in turn has prompted concerns that a number of developments on the coast, approved over many years, may not have been subject to the appropriate level of scrutiny under the SCP and as a consequence could be vulnerable to legal challenge.

The situation is compounded by there being no definitive description of an 'actively mobile landform' or any formally endorsed map of their location. The reality is that Tasmania has numerous developments which provide access, recreation, and help conserve areas of fragile environment that might be on actively mobile landforms. These range from boardwalks through the dunes, fencing, lookouts, boat launching facilities, bridges, jetties, and even golf courses.

While the original SCP provided for a blanket prohibition of development on these landforms, in 2009 it was acknowledged that this was too restrictive and was effectively limiting even the placement of infrastructure or works to protect life and property such as navigation signs, fencing and dredging.

The SCP Outcome 1.4.2 also required identification of areas where there is significant risk from coastal processes and hazards such as flooding, storms, erosion, landslip, sea level rise and other changes. With the introduction of the Tasmanian Planning Scheme across the State, there are now statewide maps of these hazards and detailed planning scheme provisions for assessment of development in these areas. Furthermore, the new Tasmanian Planning Policies (TPPs), which will soon come into effect, provide a more detailed set of policies to guide future land use in the coastal zone consistent with the SCP.

The Government considers that now these particular requirements of Outcome 1.4.1 have been addressed and management measures put in place through the Tasmanian Planning Scheme, the limited exemption provided in Outcome 1.4.2 should be reviewed to allow these more contemporary planning controls to be fully used.

The review will also consider whether guidance on what an actively mobile landform is and whether these can be spatially identified to provide certainty as to the application of the Outcome.

The purpose of this Position Paper is to review the specific provisions of the SCP to ensure they reflect the contemporary application of the principles for management of development in sensitive coastal environments.

3.0 Background

Tasmanian Sustainable Development Policies (known as State Policies) are statutory policies that sit at the top of the Tasmania's (RMPS). The RMPS comprises a suite of legislation which is linked by a common set of objectives. There are a range of statutory and non-statutory structures, processes and systems, and numerous Government and non-Government entities are involved within the RMPS. As well as land use planning, the

RMPS includes regulation around environmental protection, fishing, forestry, mining, marine farming and reserve management.

The State Policies and Project Act 1993 (SPPA) sets out the legislative framework for the making and operation on State Policies. State Policies must seek to further the RMPS objectives and promote the sustainable development of natural and physical resources by providing a consistent and co-ordinated policy framework that guide outcomes delivered through other statutory and non-statutory elements of the RMPS.

State Policies bind the Crown and a council, which means they must be considered by all Government entities when exercising decision-making powers and taking actions. State Policies may also expressly require a statutory authority or statutory office holder to undertake activities, perform functions or exercise powers. There are sanctions for a person who contravenes or fails to comply with the provisions of a State Policy.

The SPPA contains an explicit provision relating to the Tasmanian planning system. It requires that where there is an inconsistency between a State Policy and the provision of a planning scheme, the provision of the planning scheme is void to the extent of the inconsistency.

The Premier is the responsible Minister under the SPPA. The Minister can prepare a draft State Policy and give notice to the Tasmanian Planning Commission (the Commission) to prepare a report on the draft State Policy which also involves the public exhibition and receipt of representations on the draft State Policy. The Commission may hold hearings into the representations.

The Commission submits its report on the draft State Policy to the Minister who, having considered the report, may recommend to the Governor the making of the State Policy. Where the Governor accepts the Minister's recommendation and makes a State Policy, the Minister must table the State Policy in both Houses of Parliament. A State Policy does not become effective until it has been approved by both Houses of Parliament.

The SPPA provides for a parallel process where amendments are proposed to a Policy, unless the independent Commission advises that the amendment is such a minor nature that it can be made without following all of those steps. The Government considers that the nature of any amendments to the current Outcomes that change from a broad prohibition to a more contemporary risk and needs based assessment, while urgently needed to address the emerging uncertainty from recent cases, are likely to be substantial from a policy perspective and warrant the careful consideration of the Commission.

Currently there are three State Policies: the *State Coastal Policy 1996*, the *State Policy on Water Quality Management 1997* and the *State Policy on the Protection of Agricultural*

Land 2009. In addition, by function of the SPPA, all National Environmental Protection Measures are taken to be State Policies.

Over the last several years, the Tasmanian Government has been implementing a range of planning reforms to enhance the planning system. These include the preparation of the State Planning Provisions (SPPs) in 2017 and their progressive application as each local council has its Local Provisions Schedule approved by the Commission. A number of those SPPs are based on statewide codes that provide state of the art provisions to ensure development in specific hazard areas are avoided or managed to minimise or mitigate impacts. These codes are supported by statewide mapping of these hazards such as coastal erosion and inundation, and landslip.

Notwithstanding the development and approval of these contemporary and detailed planning mechanisms, the overriding nature of the SCP means that the planning scheme provisions repeat word for word the limited prohibition of Outcome 1.4.2. which ultimately limits the full application of the provisions in certain circumstances.

4.0 Summary of Issues

4.1 Outcome 1.4.2

Outcome 1.4.2 of the SCP provides that:

Development on actively mobile landforms such as frontal dunes will not be permitted except for works consistent with Outcome 1.4.1.

Outcome 1.4.1 states that:

Areas subject to significant risk from natural coastal processes and hazards such as flooding, storms, erosion, landslip, littoral drift, dune mobility and sea level rise will be identified and managed to minimise the need for engineering or remediation works to protect land, property and human life.

The effect of Outcome 1.4.2 is that it is a self-executing prohibition of development on 'actively mobile landforms' except for works involving the protection of land, property or human life.

The definition of 'development' is consistent across the RMPS and includes:

- construction, alteration or decoration of a building;
- demolition or removal of a building, structures or works;
- carrying out works;
- subdivision of land; and

- signs.

Additionally, 'works' is defined as *"includes any change to the natural or existing condition or topography of land including the removal, destruction or lopping of trees and the removal of vegetation or topsoil, but does not include forest practices..."*

This effectively means that the application of Outcome 1.4.2, consistent with these definitions, would result in any subdivision, structure, pathway, fence, jetty, sign or lopping of trees on an 'actively mobile landform' to be contrary to the SCP. Furthermore, and paradoxically, the removal of buildings, structures or works to seemingly comply with the Outcome is also considered development and therefore inconsistent with SCP.

In response to the issues discussed above, any amendment to the SCP should consider the impact of the development or works on the actively mobile landform and, consistent with Outcome 1.4.1, consider situations where it might be appropriate to undertake works or high impact development on actively mobile landforms.

4.2 Intent of Outcome 1.4.2

In order to understand the intent of Outcome 1.4.2 it is necessary to understand the structure of the SCP. There are 3 principles to guide SCP Outcomes, which are:

- 1) Natural and cultural values of the coast shall be protected.
- 2) The coast shall be used and developed in a sustainable manner.
- 3) Integrated management and protection of the coastal zone is a shared responsibility.

Each of the policy statements, referred to as 'Outcomes' in the SCP, falls under one of these guiding principles. Outcome 1.4.2 sits under the first principle. Each principle has a set of statements that help to contextualise the principle and subsequent Outcomes. Of relevance to Outcome 1.4.2, the first principle recognises:

- That the natural character of the coast is of special cultural value to Tasmanians and visitors;
- The dynamic, complex and interconnected nature of biological and physical processes on the coast;
- The susceptibility of the coast to the effects of natural events, including sea-level rise;

Outcome 1.4.2 sits under the subheading 'Coastal Hazards'. This implies that the intent of the prohibition of development on actively mobile landforms is in response to minimising risk to development from hazards.

Because the Outcome also sits under the principle of ‘protecting natural coastal values’, the intent of the Outcome is also a response to the protection of ‘actively mobile landforms’ as a natural coastal value and part of the dynamic physical processes of the coast.

Consequently any amendment to the SCP should reflect the need to avoid or mitigate hazards associated with ‘actively mobile landforms’ both to limit impacts from that mobility but also to protect the natural values of ‘actively mobile landforms’ and allow those natural processes to continue unless they pose an unacceptable risk.

4.3 Actively Mobile Landforms

The SCP does not define ‘actively mobile landforms’ and there is no single interpretation as to what constitutes one. Opinions range from all landforms which are subject to some movement over time, to only where the active mobility can be observed such as the tidal deposition or erosion of sand. Put simply, there is substantial doubt as to whether the term should be restricted to mobile dune systems or to any area of beach where the constant tidal and wave action creates shifting sands.

Ambiguity regarding ‘actively mobile landforms’ casts doubt over the application of Outcome 1.4.2. This has been the subject of criticism and caused frustration in the assessment of developments. The issue has been identified and discussed at length by a leading Tasmanian coastal geomorphologist in a paper that can be accessed here: [The problem of the use of ambiguous terms in Tasmanian coastal planning policy document for defining appropriate coastal development zones](#)

In response to undefined terminology being used to spatially apply a Policy Outcome, any amendment to the SCP should consider if providing certainty as to what constitutes an actively mobile landform is sound and possible given the very nature of these is subject to change and movement. Consideration needs to be given to whether any mapping of these would become dated within a relatively short period of time such that there is a risk some developments could be approved without regard to the actual mobility of the land at the time of assessment.

5.0 Recent changes to tools for identifying and managing coastal processes and hazards

5.1 Management requirements of Outcome 1.4.1

Outcome 1.4.1 required that not only should there be the identification of areas of natural processes and hazards but that they should be appropriately managed to minimise the need for engineering or remediation works that would be required to protect land, property

and human life. This implies that any of these areas of hazard should avoid development that might require future protection intervention. That does not imply no development is allowed, it might be that early interventions will assist with minimising larger future interventions.

To achieve this there is a need for sophisticated assessment tools to determine the degree of risk to any development proposed from the processes and hazards themselves, and to consider the need for the development to be there as part of that risk assessment and what if any benefits might be associated with it.

Additionally, there is a need for more detailed policy guidance around the protection and sustainable development of coastal areas to ensure that the principles of the SCP are fully implemented across the complete planning system.

5.2 Tasmanian Planning Policies (TPPs)

The TPPs are a planning instrument made under the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*. Unlike a State Policy, the TPPs are not self-executing. The TPPs inform planning outcomes that are delivered through the Tasmanian Planning Scheme and Regional Land Use Strategies.

The Tasmanian Planning Commission (TPC) has independently assessed the TPPs as being consistent with State Policies. The Minister for Housing and Planning is reviewing the TPC's report and subsequent recommendations made by the State Planning Office. . The TPPs contain a variety policy positions in relation to their requirement to be consistent with the SCP which may help inform any SCP amendment.

The draft TPPs contain strategies that address coastal values, through the Environmental Values TPP, and coastal hazards, through the Environmental Hazards TPP. Those specific draft policies are contained in **Attachment 1** of this report. The TPPs are consistent with Outcome 1.4.3 (also in the Coastal Hazards section) which states:

Policies will be developed to respond to the potential effects of climate change (including sea-level rise) on use and development in the coastal zone.

5.3 State Planning Provisions (SPPs)

When the SCP was introduced in 1996, there were over 100 planning schemes operating across Tasmania with no consistency in the specific provisions around controlling development in coastal areas. The SPPA provides for State Policies to override any planning scheme where there is an inconsistency and for any required amendments to be made to those planning schemes.

Over the last 10 years Tasmania has been developing and applying very sophisticated planning controls backed up with statewide mapping of coastal hazards and natural processes. These planning controls put in place a process for firstly limiting certain forms of development to avoid risks and impacts and then assessment criteria for any development that might be allowed. This approach is consistent with best practice planning processes across Australia.

The State Planning Provisions approved in 2017 after the assessment by the Tasmanian Planning Commission contain a number of coastal and related planning controls including the Environmental Management Zone, the Port and Marine Zone, the Coastal Inundation and Erosion Codes; the Natural Assets Code with a coastal refugia area, the Landslip Code and others. Many of these are informed by and activated by up-to-date high resolution mapping and modelling of sea level rise and coastal vulnerability.

Notwithstanding the contemporary nature of these controls with a risk based and precautionary approach, the very specific wording of Outcome 1.4.2 of the SCP required the insertion of the overriding prohibition directly into each provision effectively limiting the intent of the application of the other provisions.

The introduction of both the TPPs and the almost complete implementation of the SPPs in every coastal council in Tasmania, means that the direction in Outcome 1.4.1 to identify and manage areas of natural coastal processes and hazard is ready to be delivered through the regional land use strategies, the planning scheme provisions and the contemporary mapping in the Local Provisions Schedules.

6.0 Proposed amendments to update the controls on actively mobile landforms

6.1 Coastal development generally

The SCP puts in place a range of policy outcomes controlling development in the coastal zone which is defined as one kilometre inland from high water mark. Only two of the 85 outcomes in the SCP refer directly to identifying and managing coastal hazards including actively mobile landforms. The others cover natural resources and ecosystems, cultural and historic resources, cultural heritage, coastal uses and development, marine farming, tourism, urban and residential development, transport, public access and safety, public land, recreation, shared responsibility for management, institutional arrangements, public participation and information, and the implementation, evaluation and review of the SCP.

The current proposal is only to amend the outcomes to provide greater clarity and a more contemporary approach to managing development on actively mobile landforms. The Government has no intention of amending any other part of the SCP which includes many other policy directions controlling development along the coast.

6.2 Updating Outcomes on coastal hazards to align better with other outcomes

Outcome 4.4 requires the effectiveness of the SCP to be monitored and assessed, and Outcome 4.5 seeks to ensure the policies and plans for the coast are responsive to changing needs. The SCP in Outcome 4.2 identifies the main vehicles for implementation of the SCP as land use planning controls, marine farming plans, and local council strategic plans. The recent advances in planning scheme mapping and controls provide for much improved implementation tools as envisaged in 1996 and supported by Outcome 3.3.5 which encourages support of research into coastal processes.

The process of seeking to amend the SCP to clarify the current case by case application of the controls on actively mobile land is itself consistent with Outcome 3.1.1 which seeks consistency in policy interpretation.

Many of the other outcomes set in place controls and directions for the location, growth and prevention of residential, tourism, transport, recreational and other uses. There are no proposals to change any of these. The current proposal is intended to clarify the restrictions and management of those uses where actively mobile land may be involved to ensure that other outcomes of the SCP around public access and safety, and management of natural and cultural values, are also delivered.

6.3 A risk-based assessment for coastal development in areas of hazard

The proposed amendment is to replace the limited exemption for some development on actively mobile landforms provided in Outcome 1.4.1 with a requirement that other planning instruments put in place assessments that determine the level of risk associated with development so as to better consider the impacts and any mitigation required. Risk based assessment is now standard practice for managing use and development in areas of natural hazard and forms the basis of all the hazard codes in the State Planning Provisions.

An outcome requiring proposals to be subject to impact assessment is also consistent with other parts of the SCP. For example in Outcome 2.1.2 which states:

Development proposals will be subject to environmental impact assessment as and where required by State legislation including the *Environmental Management and Pollution Control Act 1994*.

Outcome 2.5.4 states:

Marine structures will be designed, sited, constructed and managed in accordance with best practice environmental management and subject to environmental impact assessment having regard to statutory requirements.

Similarly, Outcome 2.3.2 states:

Tourism development proposals in the coastal zone will be subject to environmental impact assessment as required by State legislation including a water safety assessment to indicate the level and type of lifesaving facilities and personnel required to protect people.

The current operation of Outcomes 1.4.1 and 1.4.2 sits uncomfortably with the directions of these parts in restricting the ability to fully apply best practice environmental impact assessment.

6.4 Considering ‘need’ and ‘benefit’ of use and development

The SCP is predicated on the sustainable use of the coast not the complete prohibition of all development. The SCP sets out particular principles for a variety of uses including community infrastructure and recreational assets such as wharfs, jetties and boat ramps as well as the requirements to provide for safe use of the coast.

It follows that some use and development requires a coastal location and others may be considered a community benefit either in directly providing access and recreational opportunities or in allowing access between the sea and land for required infrastructure, transport and communications.

Given the broad interpretation, actively mobile land forms may include any area of the interface which is not a rocky foreshore, the proposed amendments seek to introduce a direction that assessments of any proposal where the land might be mobile should consider if it needs to be in that location and if so what benefits might warrant not relocating it to another part of the coast or avoiding it entirely. This is consistent with Outcome 2.1.6 which states:

In determining decisions on use and development in the coastal zone, priority will be given to those which are dependent on a coastal location for spatial, social, economic, cultural or environmental reasons.

6.5 Amendment to State Coastal Policy

The exact drafting of an amendment to the State Coastal Policy will be informed by the feedback received on this position paper. In general, it is proposed to replace the broad prohibition of development on actively mobile landforms in 1.4.2 with a requirement for consideration of the impacts on the environment and natural landform processes and the consideration of the need for the development to be located on that landform, and what benefits may result from that development proceeding.

An alternative may be to retain the exemption from this prohibition in 1.4.2 provided by Outcome 1.4.1 but to expand that to require the same assessment of impacts, locational needs and community benefits. However, it's considered that the first option is more appropriate at addressing the issues identified.

As a starting point for discussion and to assist with the consultation process, submissions are invited on the following proposed draft amendment to the SCP:

Delete Outcome 1.4.2 and replace with:

1.4.2 Development on actively mobile landforms will only be allowed for engineering or remediation works necessary to protect land, property and human life, unless it can be demonstrated that the development appropriately considers:

- a) protecting coastal values and natural coastal processes;*
- b) achieving and maintaining a tolerable level of risk; and*
- c) the benefits to the public and dependency on the particular location.*

Modifying Outcome 1.4.2 of the SCP to be a higher level policy statement also enables the various instruments that operate within the RMPS to implement an appropriate risk-based approach. This includes the TPPs, regional land use strategies and planning schemes.

There is also a need to provide greater clarification around 'actively mobile landforms' to assist with the application of the SCP. One option might be to use the [present dune mobility](#) layer of the Land Information System Tasmania (the LIST) to identify coastal 'actively mobile landforms'. This layer informed the preparation of the coastal erosion hazard bands that are implemented through the Tasmanian Planning Scheme.

Submissions are invited on how the SCP might define or use the existing mapping to provide greater certainty as to what constitutes 'actively mobile landforms' and therefore the application of the Outcome.

7.0 Next Steps

The Government invites comments in response to the issues raised and the intent of possible amendments. Following the consultation period, the submissions received will be reviewed and inform drafting of the actual amendments.

State Policies are made under the SPPA. Section 15A of the SPPA includes the provisions for amending a State Policy. The process involves a Ministerial direction to the Commission to determine whether the draft amendment is considered a significant change. Because the amendment involves replacing a self-executing prohibition, with an allowance to consider a broader range of developments than under Outcome 1.4.1, it is anticipated that the Commission will determine that the draft amendment will result in a significant change to the SCP. If this is the case, the Minister directs the Commission to prepare a report which also triggers the Commission to exhibit the draft amendment to the SCP.

During the exhibition, the Governor, in accordance with section 12 of the SPPA and on request from the Minister, may declare that the draft amendment is to be an Interim State Policy after being satisfied that it is necessary for the amended SCP to apply without delay. There is evidence that the current drafting of the SCP is ambiguous and creates perverse outcomes and is not in line with the evolution of risk-based planning controls for other natural hazards as found in the Tasmanian Planning Scheme.

A State Policy that comes into operation as an Interim State Policy ceases to operate:

- a) when the Governor gives notice in the Gazette of its termination;
- b) either House of Parliament passes a resolution disallowing it;
- c) is superseded by a State Policy made in accordance with section 11 of the SPP Act; or
- d) 12 months from the day it became operational.

Using section 12 of the SPPA would allow the amended provisions of the SCP to have a more immediate effect and be applicable to development applications while the Commission undertakes its assessment of the draft amendment.

Section 13 also enables the Commission to make amendments to a planning scheme to remove any inconsistency with a State Policy. The coming into effect of an amended SCP will inform any amendments that need to be made to the SPPs.

Attachment 1 – Extract from the draft TPPs

2.5 Coasts

2.5.1 Application

Applies to the Coastal Zone as defined in the State Coastal Policy 1996, which is to be taken as a reference to State waters and to all land to a distance of one kilometre inland from the high-water mark.

2.5.2 Objective

To promote the protection, conservation and management of natural coastal values.

2.5.3 Strategies

- 1. Protect natural coastal processes and coastal landforms from use and development that will prevent natural processes to continue to occur, including the landward transgression of sand dunes, wetlands, saltmarshes and other sensitive coastal habitats due to sea-level rise, unless engineering or remediation works are required to protect land, property, infrastructure and human life.*
- 2. Strengthen the resilience of coastal processes to climate change by reducing threats and protecting the natural coastal environment, such as wetlands, estuaries, marine-protected areas, intertidal areas, sand dunes, cliff tops, beaches, native vegetation, and other important habitats.*
- 3. Identify coastal areas that can support the sustainable use and development of recreation, tourism, boating infrastructure (such as jetties and wharfs), marine industries, ports and other land use that explicitly rely on a coastal location where the impact on the coastal values and coastal processes are minimal or can be appropriately managed.*
- 4. Support the location of use and development on the coast that:*
 - a) promotes the maintenance of biodiversity, ecological functions, natural coastal processes and coastal resources; and*
 - b) complements or enhances the coastal environment in terms of its landscape, amenity and cultural values.*

3.4 Coastal Hazards

3.4.1 Application

Applies to the Coastal Zone as defined in the State Coastal Policy 1996, which is to be taken as a reference to State waters and to all land to a distance of one kilometre inland from the high-water mark.

3.4.2 Coastal Hazards - Objective

To minimise the risks associated with coastal erosion and coastal inundation caused by climate change induced sea level rise by incorporating avoidance, mitigation and adaptation strategies into land use planning to reduce the harm to human life, property and infrastructure.

3.4.3 Strategies

- 1. Identify and map land that is subject to coastal erosion and coastal inundation, based on a projected sea level rise of not less than 0.8 metres by 2100 or the latest adopted State Government sea level rise measurements, that considers the effects of coastal processes, geology, topography, storm surges and tides on the rate and extent of coastal erosion and coastal inundation.*
- 2. Avoid designating land for purposes that provide for incompatible use and development to be located on land that exposes people, property and infrastructure to coastal hazards that cannot achieve and maintain a level of tolerable risk from coastal erosion or coastal inundation.*
- 3. Avoid incompatible use and development of land subject to coastal erosion or coastal inundation where a level of tolerable risk cannot be achieved and maintained, or that is not feasible or desirable to be located elsewhere, unless the use and development is:*
 - a) dependent on a coastal location;*
 - b) temporary, readily locatable or able to be abandoned;*
 - c) essential public infrastructure; or*
 - d) minor redevelopment or intensification of an existing use involving a building or structure that cannot be relocated or abandoned.*
- 4. Where incompatible use and development cannot avoid being located on land subject to coastal erosion or coastal inundation, hazard reduction and protection measures must be considered and, where appropriate, incorporated into the siting, design, construction and ongoing functioning of the use and development to reduce the level of risk to people, property and infrastructure to a level of tolerable risk.*
- 5. Promote strategic responses for existing settlements that are at risk of being impacted by coastal erosion or coastal inundation by considering the effectiveness and the social, environmental and economic viability of one, or a combination, of the following strategic responses:*

- a) *adaptation to changing conditions over time;*
 - b) *planned retreat; and*
 - c) *protective works.*
6. *Where possible, avoid use and development that will;*
- a) *increase the rate of coastal erosion or coastal inundation; or*
 - b) *increase the risk of exposing existing people, property or infrastructure to coastal erosion or coastal inundation, especially vulnerable and hazardous uses.*
7. *Encourage coastal defences that work with natural processes to protect human life, property and infrastructure or mitigate coastal erosion and coastal inundation risks where possible.*
8. *Facilitate the provision of engineered coastal defences to protect human life, property and infrastructure from coastal inundation and coastal erosion, where the social, environmental and economic considerations are included in the planning and decision-making process.*