
MINUTES
of the
SUBMISSIONS HEARING MEETING

held
9.00 am, Wednesday, 27 April 2022
9.00 am, Thursday, 28 April 2022
1.00 pm, Friday 29 April 2022
9.00 am, Tuesday 3 May 2022

at
Tasman Council Chamber, 189 Queen Street, Richmond
Topic: Future Development Strategy Hearings

- Present:** Nelson City Council – Mayor R Reese, Deputy Mayor J Edgar and Councillor B McGurk
Tasman District Council – Deputy Mayor S Bryant, Councillor K Maling and Councillor D Ogilvie
Iwi representative – Ina Kumeroa Kara-France
- In Attendance:** Tasman District Council – Group Manager – Service and Strategy (S Edwards), Environmental Policy Manager (B Johnson), Urban Growth Coordinator (J Deans), Policy Planner (M Bengosi), Executive Assistant to the Mayor (R Scherer), Executive Support Officer (A Brough),
Nelson City Council – Group Manager Environmental Management (C Barton) and Senior Analyst – Strategy and Environment (C Pawson), Administrator (T Johnson), Councillor G Noonan and Councillor R Sanson
- Part Attendance:** Tasman District Council – Executive Support Officer (G Drummond), Strategic Policy Manager (D Fletcher), Project Manager – Environmental Policy (A McKenzie), Senior Infrastructure Planning Adviser (D Bryant), Consent Planner – Subdivisions (B Wayman), Senior Infrastructure Planning Adviser – Water & Wastewater (K Arnold) and Communications Officer (T O’Connell)

1 OPENING, WELCOME

Group Manager - Service and Strategy, Susan Edwards welcomed everyone to the meeting and opened the meeting with a karakia. She advised the Hearing Panel that they are required to elect a Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson. The following was resolved:

Moved Cr B McGurk/Cr D Ogilvie

SH22-04-1

That the Joint Subcommittee elects Mayor Rachel Reese as the Chairperson and Deputy Mayor Stuart Bryant as the Deputy Chairperson for the Future Development Strategy Submission Hearings.

CARRIED

Chairperson, Mayor Reese welcomed everyone to the meeting and briefed the attendees on housekeeping matters including the timing allowed for each submitter to speak to their submission.

Nelson City Council Group Manager, Environmental Management, Clare Barton and Ms Edwards confirmed that all of the legislative requirements for the hearing had been met by both councils.

Chairperson, Mayor Reese welcomed Ina Kumeroa Kara-France, the Mātauranga Māori representative on the hearing panel. Ms Kara-France presented her pepeha.

The panel members and supporting staff in attendance introduced themselves to the Hearing Panel.

2 APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE

There were no apologies.

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Tasman District Council Deputy Mayor, Stuart Bryant noted that he owns land adjoining the proposed greenfields expansion at Wakefield (site T108). He did not believe this was a conflict of interest.

3 REPORTS

3.1 Draft Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy 2022-2052 Submissions Report

Tasman District Council Urban Growth Coordinator Jacqui Deans and Nelson City Council Senior Analyst – Strategy and Environment, Chris Pawson presented the report which was taken as read.

Moved Deputy Mayor Bryant/Mayor Reese

SH22-04-2

That the Future Development Strategy Subcommittee:

- 1. receives the Draft Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy 2022-2052 Submissions Report RSH22-04-2; and**
- 2. agrees to accept the late submissions from Peter Wilks (submitter #31815), Robert Wilks (submitter #31823), Paula Wilks (submitter #31836), Nic John and John Tuffery (submitter #31834), Ian Wishart (submitter #31835), Bradley Trott (#31851), Cameron Sims (#31852), Bev Armstrong (#31841) and Gaire Thompson (#31853); and**

3. receives the 558 submissions on the draft Future Development Strategy contained in Attachments 3–6 to this report.

CARRIED

4 HEARING OF SUBMISSIONS

Wednesday 27 April 2022

Mr Tony Haddon (31138) and Save the Maitai

Mr Haddon spoke on behalf of himself and the Save the Maitai group. He noted:

- That 182 submitters had requested that the proposed development in the Maitai Valley be removed from the Future Development Strategy (FDS).
- The public's previous requests regarding any development in the Maitai had not been accepted by Nelson City Council.
- The petition presented in 2020 is a living document with over 13,000 signatures. The group has still not had a response to the petition from Nelson City Council.
- The hazard overlays in the Maitai area.
- The Save the Maitai group is not a group of NIMBYs – the group is trying to protect the Maitai Valley.
- Mr Haddon asked the hearing panel to remove any land within the Maitai Valley from the FDS.

Mr Alvin Bartley (31112)

Mr Bartley did not appear.

Steve Cross (31363)

Mr Cross used a powerpoint presentation to present his submission. Mr Cross noted that:

- Tahunanui is ripe for development, but there is no vision for Tahunanui.
- There is not a need for such high density of development in Tahunanui and in his view it will destroy the area.
- There are major flaws with the key assumptions on the intensification uplift (uptake) factor in the FDS document.
- The uptake rate reduced from 30% to 15% and he questioned why this had occurred.
- Mr Cross suggested that the analysis used in the 2022 FDS does not stack up.
- He referred to the recommendations made by Sense Partners which, he believes, have not been appropriately applied in the FDS.
- He suggested that there is a huge disconnect between the housing and business capacity report with the FDS.
- The 15% uptake figure lacks any basis.

Paul Jonkers (31156)

Mr Jonkers expressed several concerns:

- Nelson City Council is promoting a housing strategy that goes against the climate emergency position of Nelson City Council.
- An increasing urban sprawl will result in a higher CO₂ footprint.
- Why would the Council build in an area that is accessed via a flood plain, ie the Maitai Valley.
- The proposed development in Kaka Valley will include elevated building platforms to alleviate flooding but that will shift the flooding issue downstream.
- Development threatens to degrade the Maitai River.
- Referred to the importance of the Maitai Valley to future generations.
- Time to make your lasting mark, great leadership is one that can change its mind. Now is the time.

Mr Donald Horn (31267)

Mr Horn concentrated his submission on the proposal to create a new settlement at Tasman. He noted that:

- The proposal in the vicinity of Tasman village will affect a large amount of residents who have had no opportunity to consider the impacts.
- There is no integration between land use, transport and growth in areas that are in close proximity to employment.
- There are no local services, employment or local public transport.
- Motueka soils are versatile and important for horticultural crops and these are even more important with climate change.
- The Tasman proposal does not meet the criteria for greenfield development.
- Motueka is facing sea level rise challenges.
- Intensification should be the major driver for population growth and there are many examples where intensification would be successful to maximise the use of space sympathetically.

Councillor McGurk left the meeting at 9.59 am.

Ms Elizabeth Dooley (31273)

- Ms Dooley spoke against the proposal to develop greenfield sites in the Maitai Valley.
- She suggested that once any greenfield development occurs in the Maitai Valley it will never end.

Councillor McGurk rejoined the meeting at 10.01 am.

- Ms Dooley said that the Maitai Valley is a place of safety and renewal.
- The Maitai Dam and the forestry plantation have been bad enough.
- She urged the Panel to keep the Maitai Valley as it is.

Ms Gretchen Holland (31395)

Ms Holland spoke about her concerns regarding the development of the Kaka Valley/Maitai area. She asked that representatives of both councils listen to her concerns and instruct staff to remove the Kaka Valley/Maitai Valley from the FDS.

Key concerns are:

- Noise from the extra cars resulting from the development. There is an agreement that logging trucks do not travel along the valley at certain times and they travel at 40km/hr. Will the people living in the new development also abide by those rules? Vehicles are an issue for the school and child safety.
- Water quality will be affected by the development. It will affect the swimming hole which is an important recreation area.
- Project Mahitahi (Nelson City Council) – Ms Holland suggested that Councillors need to revisit the information in this project.
- Maitai ecological restoration plan – iwi, Department of Conservation (DoC), Government and community groups are spending a lot of money on restoring the area which will be affected by the development.
- Investment in new open spaces will be needed to deal with intensification. If you take out Kaka Valley and Maitai Valley from the FDS then you won't need more open space areas.

The meeting adjourned at 10.21 am and resumed at 10.48 am.

Dr Elspeth Macdonald (31296)

Dr MacDonald spoke about:

- Housing intensification in Nelson, specifically in the Wood.
- Nelson is a high density zone, 40% site coverage, other areas are 30%, maximum of 44%.
- Battle axe blocks and private ways in the Wood are very intensive already with infill housing.
- Concern about developers buying up sections for development.
- Intensification is squared, more intensification on top of what is already in place.
- What happens to the liveability, the internal and exterior amenities and the quality of life for existing residents?
- Effect on sunshine and daylight to adjoining sites with intensification – casting shadows. What are the costs of losing sunshine if you proceed with growth and intensification in The Wood – quality of life, mental and physical wellbeing of existing residents. She noted that 2.4% of a properties value is lost for every hour of sun lost.

Mr Duncan MacNab (31298)

Mr McNab noted that:

- He favours intensification of housing in Nelson, and he favours Kaka Valley development.
- He also favours amalgamation of both councils, if not, both councils should work for the common good to make savings.
- The Lower Maitai is his playground – he is bothered by the emotive campaigns against development.
- Misleading information is being circulated. The anti Maitai Valley group is not proposing any solutions to the issues of growth, urban sprawl and transport clogging; Mr McNab referred to NIMBYism.

- Decisions about intensification are difficult and challenging. The councils are making the decisions on behalf of our children and grandchildren. He asked the councils to have courage and make good long term decisions.
- Housing intensification is critically important, we cannot afford to put housing on fertile land. If we do we will eventually be forced to import our fruit and vegetables. We need to eat locally and take food miles seriously.
- Any future land for housing should be low value land, Kaka Valley meets that requirement.
- We need to keep up with demand for new housing by intensification. Also people need to live close to their employment and we need to mitigate climate change issues. Kaka Valley meets those requirements.
- He encouraged the councils to continue improving cycling facilities.
- Being serious about the issues our planet faces won't be easy but they need to be addressed.

Mrs Barbara Robinson (31322)

Mrs Robinson referred to:

- The recent UN Secretary General – IPCC report – we live in a dire world.
- The FDS has a slightly modified business as usual approach, it is not looking into the future.
- Climate change issues, for example the damage done in Tarawhiti in recent months.
- The Insurance Council says we should put money aside to address the impact of climate change, eg repeat flooding events show we cannot just keep repairing flooded areas.
- Dynamic Adaptive Pathways Process – councils need to use these principles now.
- Mismatch between outcomes and green speak with the aims of the FDS.
- The National Policy Statement on Urban Development focuses on the need to address the effects of climate change.
- There is nothing about zero carbon emissions in the FDS.
- The FDS is not robust – it refers to a 30 year timeframe, we need to make structures last for at least 100 years, safe from sea level rise, flood and fire, with the potential for managed retreat.
- Greenfield and low density development is not efficient and encourages high emissions behaviour in terms of transport options.
- FDS does not meet the outcome of reducing emissions.
- Intensification needs to happen faster. Councils are responsible for promoting it.
- Scale of development proposed in the FDS does not meet our commitments to climate change.
- We need courageous government (both local and national) to act now to future-proof our region.

Jo Gould (31769)

Ms Gould has lived in central Nelson for over 30 years alongside the Maitai River. She spoke about:

- The value of the environment around the Maitai River with its heritage homes, leafy open space feeling and a safe neighbourhood.
- Integrating dedicating cycle routes into planning is critical. Also easy access to all to our parks and open spaces.
- Concerned about the potential impact of the Kaka Valley development on water quality in the Maitai Rivier. Councils need to look after our water quality, our special places and our environment.
- Intensification – agree with intensifying already built up areas especially in central urban areas, prefers that to greenfield development.
- The irreversible loss of productive soil from urban development.
- The detrimental effects of high rise residential housing. She does not support development of up to 6 storeys. Supports mixed use development in the Nelson and Richmond Central Business Districts (CBD).
- Urge you to consider core part of your thinking, what makes us special at the moment and how can we make it more special in the future.

In response to questions, Ms Gould suggested that the councils could consider places like Fairfield Park and Neale Park for residential development. She also noted her concerns that a proliferation of multi-storey buildings could be very impactful both on the character and the amenity value of current residential areas.

Wendy Barker (31554)

Tony Stallard represented Mrs Barker. He noted:

- It is important that both councils have a permanent record of the hearing panel discussions so they can be referred to when the councils need to make decisions.
- The significance of the Maitai Valley must be preserved for the next generation(s).
- Concerned about greenfields development in the Maitai Valley.
- Ability to intensify with mixed use (business/residential) development in the inner city centre should be part of the FDS. Bulldoze Nelson city centre and start again. Take a bold approach.
- Look at ownership of the city centre and consider options to rezone land for housing. It will revitalise the city centre and there is the ability to intensify the area.
- If you want to build in the Maitai Valley, why not build on the Council-owned golf course.
- Mr Stallard referred to Tasman's Great Taste Trail as the great urban sprawl trail, the taste has gone out of it. In his recent experience, a significant number of food places were closed. The focus of the Trail is changing, the councils are allowing urban sprawl along it.
- Ad hoc planning, it is not robust, the councils haven't taken into account the required infrastructure. Need an integrated infrastructure plan.
- Any development of Maitai Valley will be a disaster. Its our playground.
- Be innovative in your thinking of how you proceed.

Mr Steve Richards (31276)

Mr Richards spoke about:

- His support to both councils for taking the opportunity to look to the future, although the 30 year timeframe is not long enough, he prefers multi-generational planning.
- The councils should not be looking at any development outside current urban areas.
- The FDS does not consider any climate change ramifications.
- The loss of productive land specifically with the secondary proposed greenfields development near Tasman village. He urged both councils to protect the productive land and to remove the secondary proposal from the FDS.
- His understanding is that the councils are required to provide a certain amount of land for development but he suggested that be achieved by intensifying current urban centres.
- The FDS proposal needs to concentrate on the impacts of climate change and sea level rise.

Mr Brian Hawthorne (31324)

Mr Hawthorne lives on the Moutere Highway and was previously a berryfruit and sheep farmer. He spoke about:

- His concerns for the use of horticultural land for housing, specifically in Braeburn (site T136) and near Tasman village.
- Any proposed development would bring transportation, traffic congestion, greenhouse gas emissions and climate change issues.
- There are no employment opportunities in the Tasman settlement so people will travel to Nelson to work.

He urged the hearing panel to decline any application for housing in Tasman and to lobby the New Zealand Transport Agency to improve Tasman's highways.

Dr Roger Frost (31423)

Dr Frost:

- Noted his support for the proposed residential development in Murchison.
- Expressed concern about the area marked for business development which may detract from the aesthetic value of the land.
- Suggested that a marginal strip of suitable land be excluded to allow for a buffer along State Highway 6 in Murchison.
- Suggested that industrial and business activity on main streets doesn't contribute to the natural landscape.
- Urged the councils to use the FDS as an opportunity to protect the outstanding natural landscapes around Murchison.

Mr David Bartle (31452)

Mr Bartle noted that he is a valuation consultant and former diplomat, living near Brightwater. Mr Bartle commented:

- He agrees with most of the proposed outcomes, and appreciates the work to help us make some hard choices.
- The FDS should also include risk management including long term effects on rates and identify who carries the consequences of those risks.

- Financial sustainability and full lifecycle costs should be considered.
- Who will pay for costs for development – some will require significant infrastructure costs. Who will pay for them?
- Favours housing intensification.
- The councils should work together to provide social housing / affordable housing.
- FDS should not encourage greenfield housing development, it should protect our agricultural land, and look to reduce CO₂ emissions.
- Need to consider the key risks and the long term effect on future ratepayers with what you are proposing especially in terms of the required infrastructure. There is a lack of infrastructure and community facilities outside the main centres.
- Focus on high quality intensification.
- The councils need to use Stats NZ figures to help them make any decisions, jobs need to be accessible to where people live.
- Urban regeneration can have many different forms but there are other areas where councils have struggled to meet social needs. He noted there is scope for both councils to collaborate on a new organisation for urban regeneration and social housing. We want to see everyone in our communities well housed.
- In terms of the financial risk of greenfield housing, he urged the councils to do more high level analysis and financial modelling based on what has been learnt from recent developments, where are the costs and who pays for them?

Ms Maree Sharland (31366)

Ms Sharland spoke about:

- Her opposition to greenfield housing in the Maitai Valley. Allowing house development in the Maitai will be the thin end of the wedge. The Maitai is synonymous with Nelson.
- The Council has no mandate to pursue urban sprawl into the valley.
- Councillors need to take a stand. Don't let developers dictate the use of land in Nelson.
- Let's create green belts that cannot be built on and protect them for future generations.
- Urban sprawl is a major threat to the planet.
- Look at successes and failures around the world.
- Let's create a liveable town.

The hearing adjourned at 12.29 pm and resumed at 1.25 pm.

Mr Joseph Blessing (31369) - Yes Aotearoa

- Mr Blessing asked the panel to make provision in the Future Development Strategy to enable community living.
- In his experience there is real value in having multiple houses on one piece of land – it works.
- Community living provides possibilities to have a common structure and is also more affordable for young people.

Alan Hart (31716)

Mr Hart did not appear.

Mr Vincent Riepen (31511)

Mr Riepen focused on the issue of healthy homes.

- He noted that 48% of New Zealand homes are insufficiently insulated.
- He expressed his concerns that the high-rise intensification housing proposed in the FDS will exacerbate current insulation and ventilation issues which are detrimental to people's health.

Ms Helen Black (31514)

Ms Black outlined her concerns about the proposed housing development in the Maitai Valley.

She spoke about:

- Growing up in Stockholm, Sweden where she lived in several high rise buildings – these buildings were close to parks and recreation areas.
- The footprint of housing compared with green areas needs to change in New Zealand.
- Ms Black highlighted the affordability of today's housing.
- Concerned about water quality, noise pollution and the impact of growth in traffic.
- Regular walking in green spaces enhances our mental health and reduces depression.
- Challenge the panel to ponder how much urban sprawl is acceptable, what can we do differently, are natural areas important to you? If so, how do you safeguard this land for the future?

Mr Bruce Gilkison - Zero Carbon Nelson Tasman - (31439)

Mr Gilkison spoke about the need to consider climate change in the FDS:

- Zero Carbon Nelson Tasman is focused on finding resolutions to the climate crisis.
- Concerned that FDS cannot achieve the outcomes proposed in terms of greenhouse gases and climate change.
- We need to play our part in meeting the Government's climate change strategy.
- The planning proposed in the FDS will increase climate change emissions.
- Should aim to get halfway to zero carbon emissions in the next decade.
- Climate change is not just an environmental issue, it's an "everything" issue.
- No mention of the value of trees in the FDS. They are almost the only means of offsetting our carbon emissions. They have a number of other benefits that help us in our daily lives. Trees should be one of the strategy's priorities. Tasman is losing more and more trees and its carbon emissions are growing.
- Prioritise highly productive land and also potentially productive land.
- We need intensification and options for smaller houses and properties.
- We need infrastructure that will last well into the next century.

Carsten Buschkuhle - Tasman Bay Estates (31524)

Mr Buschkuhle spoke about his proposed development in Tasman.

- He acknowledged the community's concerns about the development.
- Our plans are the start of a vision for a model village. Mr Buschkuhle and his team have presented to Tasman District Council and have commenced consultation with iwi.
- Mr Buschkuhle wants the opportunity to show the Tasman community his vision for a model village.
- The proposed development will offer core services to the Tasman community. Residents won't have to travel to Motueka or Māpua to get their provisions.

In response to questions, Mr Buschkuhle said he envisages that houses will be built on his proposed development site in 4-5 years. He confirmed that he had started consultation with iwi and mana whenua noting that a recent leadership change within Te Atiawa has stalled discussions.

He also confirmed that the proposed development will include a commercial/market centre in the middle of the settlement so people don't have to travel to get what they need.

Ian McComb - Small Time Developments (31549)

Mr McComb introduced himself as a civil/environmental engineer who has worked in local government. He noted that:

- He supports infill intensification but it appears it won't happen quickly. Needs to be facilitated earlier. Development is hampered by timing issues, planners need speed and certainty in the consent process.
- Councils' building consent teams need to process consents quickly. Need to start now, gear up the teams to be able to handle more infill housing.
- Councils' should provide a facilitator to help developers get on with the job.
- Ensure issues such as secondary flowpath mapping and traffic impact assessments are covered and then get the developers to pay for that work. They help councils make decisions without developers having to go into the detail for each development.
- The real costs to developers are the delays in getting consent.
- RMA constraints should be dealt with.
- Plug for collective housing and co-housing, papakainga concepts.
- *The meeting adjourned at 2.37 pm and resumed at 2.50 pm.*

Raine Oaklands Estate (31547)

Jane Hilson spoke to the submission.

- Intensification needs to be supported by greenfield development – need variability in the region.
- Question why the level of demand for the Saxton area (Oaklands Flats) is considered low in the FDS.
- The Raine family are also considering a business park which would include the current Oaklands Milk outlet.
- Ms Hilson provided a brief history of the Raine Farms and the Raine homestead which has been lived in since 1844. Oaklands Farm is the oldest in New Zealand. The historical value

of the site is very important to the Raine family. There are some highly protected trees and some parts of the land that the Raine family does not want to see subdivided.

- The Raine family want to ensure that the remaining 300 hectares of farmland is enhanced with more plantings which leaves an enduring intergenerational asset.
- Ms Hilson presented a concept plan for the proposed business park.

In response to a question, Ms Hilson suggested that the Raine land could sustain a multiple of housing stock options.

Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Jennifer Rose (31807)

Ms Rose outlined the two key roles of Kainga Ora as a public housing landlord and also as a leader and coordinator of urban development projects.

- Nelson-Tasman is a priority area for Kainga Ora to grow housing stocks.
- There is an increased demand for public housing.
- Ms Rose suggested that the wastewater capacity at Bell Island needs further upgrades but not sure if that can happen to coincide with FDS planning.
- Kainga Ora does not support the proposed development at Tasman because of significant cultural concerns, also the proposal does not represent compact form. Doesn't create sustainable communities, more reliance on cars and therefore greenhouse gases.
- Greenhouse gases – FDS proposal has a key role to play in greenhouse gas emissions.. Need to minimise people's use of cars. Kainga Ora supports the consolidation of growth along existing transport corridors.
- The FDS needs to include the capacity for schools within FDS growth areas.
- Kainga Ora generally supports the options of residential intensification and consolidation along growth and transport corridors – it was suggested that the Nayland South boundary could be expanded to include Seaview Road for intensification.
- Consolidation is preferred but Kainga Ora recognises that greenfield development may also be required to meet demand.
- Development constraints – supports development away from natural hazard areas, eg sea level rise. The FDS does not explain or address what the impacts of sea level risk may be on future housing.
- Highly productive land is another constraint that limits development in the region. Kainga Ora supports the retention of this land for productivity, not housing.
- Implementation strategy – no details when growth areas will be rolled out over next 30 years. Would be useful to have an indication of the proposed staging for growth areas.
- The FDS proposal should have a clearer and stronger focus on meeting the affordability issues.

Philip Osborne from Kainga Ora commented on the FDS from an economic perspective. He noted the imbalance in Tasman between brownfield and greenfield development. He said that history showed that housing demand should be focused on where people want to live. He also noted the issue of housing affordability in greenfield areas.

Kainga Ora staff agreed they were open to further discussions with Council staff.

Dr Patrick Conway (31651)

Mr Conway spoke about his concerns including:

- The FDS designates the Tahunanui slump area for residential infill development – there is a well documented history of land instability in that area.
- If infill housing was to go ahead, the Council would need to mitigate the land instability. There is also an issue of springs coming up on land in this area.
- His second main concern is about traffic impacts on Rocks Road especially more commercial traffic – as it will see a lot more gridlock and become dangerous. Supports an inland route.
- Also sea level rise and rock fall from the hills will impact Rocks Road. The FDS should consider reducing the traffic on Rocks Road.

Mr Paul Davey (31612)

Mr Davey is concerned about the intensification and proposed high rise buildings planned for Tahunanui and the lack of notice given to residents in the area about these plans.

- Who will benefit?
- He referred to sea level rise and earthquakes as major restraints against any such development.

Lucy Charlesworth (31623)

Ms Charlesworth feels very strongly about the Maitai River being protected.

- She is concerned about the FDS development proposal as it will negatively impact the Maitai River.
- She referred to a quote from Councillor McGurk referring to the Maitai River as a “river for everybody, a river for New Zealand, and a strong sense of guardianship”.
- Any development in the Maitai Valley will cause an irreversible environmental tragedy that future generations will not thank the councils for.

Mr Daniel Levy (31628)

Mr Levy noted that he is totally opposed to any development in the Maitai Valley.

- He sees the importance of high level planning but he thinks it was very clear from watching the FDS webinar that river health and the recreational amenity values of the Maitai River hadn't been considered as part of the proposed development in the Maitai Valley.
- Mr Levy spoke about his own experience of growing up in Hong Kong. He suggested that planning that is done well does work. Country parks were included in the development of Hong Kong; they were seen as vital to the wellbeing of the residents. The Maitai Valley is our country park and therefore vital to the wellbeing of Nelson residents. We must retain it.
- Agrees we have a housing crisis but we also have a declared climate emergency. Emergency trumps the crisis. Need to put that in front of mind in your planning.
- Does not support any significant greenfield developments in Nelson.
- Must stop building on flood plains. Experts agree with this.

- Fully supports intensification on the city fringes and the CBD, especially with affordable housing – this solution provides so much potential.

Joy Shackleton (31631)

- Joy noted that she agrees with what Daniel Levy said.
- Joy's submission is specific to Tahunanui. She does not agree with the councils considering six-storey buildings.
- Referred to liquefaction and sea level rise issues which are known to residents.
- How can you be aware of those issues but still consider high rise buildings in Tahunanui.
- Also concerned that after infill housing in the 1980s, six storey buildings will mean current housing will lose the sun which will impact on residents mental health.
- Tahunanui Structure Plan not taken up by the Council.
- We are a seaside village, we are important to the tourist industry.

The meeting adjourned at 4.40 pm.

Thursday 28 April 2022

Present: Nelson City Council – Mayor R Reese, Deputy Mayor J Edgar and Councillor B McGurk

Tasman District Council – Deputy Mayor S Bryant, Councillor K Maling and Councillor D Ogilvie

Iwi representative – Ina Kumeroa Kara-France

In Attendance: Tasman District Council – Group Manager – Service and Strategy (S Edwards), Environmental Policy Manager (B Johnson), Urban Growth Coordinator (J Deans), Policy Planner (M Bengosi Project Manager – Environmental Policy (A McKenzie), Executive Assistant – Service and Strategy (T Fifield), Executive Support Officer (G Drummond), Infrastructure Planning Advisor (D Bryant), Senior Infrastructure Planning Advisor (K Arnold), Strategic Policy Manager (D Fletcher), Graduate Community Policy Advisor (N Lindsay), Infrastructure Planning Advisor (H Lane) and Councillor Hill

Nelson City Council - Strategy and Environment Senior Analyst (C Pawson), Group Manager Environmental Management (C Barton), Councillor Noonan and Councillor Sanson

Chairperson, Mayor Reese welcomed everyone to the meeting and opened proceedings with a karakia.

In response to a question, Ms Edwards said that the only avenue to challenge the decision by the Joint Committee is through a judicial review. The appeal would go to the High Court.

In response to a question about what the Joint Committee's grounds are to change decisions made as recommendations to them from the Subcommittee, Ms Edwards' view is that the Joint Councils could refer the matter back to the Subcommittee for reconsideration based on specific matters of concern or they could ask the Panel members on the Joint Committee why the decision was made and make a final decision.

It was agreed that once the hearings process is completed, staff are to schedule a pre-deliberations report session.

It was noted that Ms Kara-France no longer requires the Cultural Impact Assessment and information relevant to the Tasman Village proposal.

Ms Joni Tomsett (31569)

Ms Tomsett is a member of the Motueka Community Board but submitted on behalf of herself:

- IPCC report in regard to urban development – many development plans focus on risk reduction and urban expansion is compromising green infrastructure and ecosystem services;
 - FDS should focus more on protecting the environment;
 - supports intensifications specifically medium to high density in areas that are linked with active and public transport networks;
 - believes there is scope to be able to provide alternative housing solutions;
-

- doesn't support any development that is vulnerable to natural hazards.

In response to a question about a structure plan for the development of Motueka South, Ms Tomsett believes there should be ways to make it easier for iwi to develop housing for their people.

Mr Doug Hattersley (31405)

Mr Hatterlsey spoke about:

- the reduction of productive land and objects to only "highly productive land" being the cut off for land that won't be used for greenfield development but anything less than highly productive land could be developed for residential purposes;
- he referred to Selwyn District Council where commissioners rejected an application for rezoning near Rolleston because of the new government law for intensifying development, reducing emissions, easing pressure on productive land and where the development was against the principles of the RMA;
- in the potential new area, there are four fractured blocks of land that are semi joined or not joined at all and utilities will have to come from Motueka to service them;
- once the FDS goes through, it will be easier for the developers to get approval for a plan change;
- he supports the FDS for intensification but to include this potential area is inflaming the situation and ruining the FDS because everyone is concentrating on greenfield development of potential new areas in Rural 3 land.

In response to a question asking whether the current resource consent is valid or expired, Mr Hatterlsey's neighbour was told it is on hold but it hasn't been cancelled outright. Staff will clarify the status of the consents.

Mr Jon Taylor (31420)

Mr Taylor is a member of Tasman Area Community Association and is against the development at Tasman Village:

- he believes the process has been rushed;
- because it has gone into the FDS it has given more weight to the development;
- the submission period should have been longer as the Tasman Area Community Association only meet monthly;
- there will need to be new infrastructure put into the new development.

Staff noted the consultation period was 32 days.

In response to a question, to Mr Taylor's knowledge, the Tasman Area Community Association hasn't had engagement with the developer.

Mr Alan Eggers (31435) (with Mark Morris (Planner))

Mr Eggers spoke about a proposed multi titled development at Spring Grove which would have four titles, is in close proximity to the Domain and zoned Rural 1.

Mark Morris, a Senior Planner for Davis Ogilvie spoke about:

- some of the challenges of providing growth for Brightwater over the next 30 years particularly as it is susceptible to flooding, because of the productive soils and because of fragmentation of some of the areas that are rezoned for some of the development;

- a lot of the infrastructure is already developed;
- could have quite a large development within the site he is proposing at Spring Grove and there are 10 km of cycleway and walkways that could enhance the development.

In response to a question, the size of the lots are 2,500 m² but these could be amended.

In response to a question, Brightwater school is approximately 4 km from the proposed development.

Mr Matt Olaman (31461)

Mr Olaman said:

- there has already been widespread development in Pigeon Valley North and along Sharps Road;
- the proposed area for development could be extended with no negative impact to the area;
- commercial forestry doesn't start on his side of the road so development could continue as far as the sealed road goes;
- the sites would be highly desirable;
- if it was rezoned as proposed, it would be easier for him to subdivide and his children could have a block of land each.

In response to questions he advised:

- his property is 4.33 km from Wakefield township;
- he has never had an issue with water at his property even in dry summers;
- he doesn't believe there would need to be any roading upgrade due to increased traffic;
- Mr Olaman is thinking 1 ha sections for his children.

A morning tea adjournment was taken from 10.13 am to 10.47 am

Ms Jane Murray (31512) Nelson Marlborough Health

Ms Murray spoke on behalf of Nelson Marlborough Health:

- strongly support the proposed outcomes especially in regard to the urban form that reduces greenhouse emissions by integrating land use and transport;
- supports outcome 9 that Nelson Tasman is resilient to the risk of natural hazards. Note that Tasman has not had its assessment done on flooding etc and would like to see these assessments done;
- supports the outcome concerning the protection of highly productive land;
- would like to see inclusionary zoning included in any greenfield development;
- housing stock is important to the ageing population and there would be benefit in an increase in smaller, easy care properties close to amenities;
- support the primary proposal in regards to development along SH 6;
- encourage intensification rather than greenfield development and supports the 15-20 minute city approach.

In response to question, Ms Murray said sun and light into living rooms and outdoor living areas is essential. She noted the ability to step up the height of developments further away from boundaries to protect sun on neighbouring properties.

Cynthia McConville (31513) Golden Bay Branch Forest & Bird

Ms McConville spoke on behalf of Golden Bay Branch Forest & Bird and said she was responsible for the Golden Bay shorebirds protection campaign:

- the Branch objects to the proposal in the FDS to rezone land at 42 Keoghan Road (site T-163) to rural residential;
- the terraced area is surrounded by wetlands, rivers and streams supporting freshwater fish and native birds;
- they ask that the property be removed from the FDS – it's high biodiversity values make it unsuitable for housing development.

Mr Richard Clement (31530)

Mr Clement opposes the new town proposed at Tasman Village:

- a new town in an undeveloped area means no adverse impact on people because all residents will choose to live there, however, a secondary proposal would alter an existing community;
- residents in the area live there because they want to live in a rural environment;
- concerned with the Harakeke consent and loss of productive land, landscape transformation, re-zoning costs, potential flooding, and potential climate change impact;
- create a new town on bare land in Brightwater or Wakefield;
- instead of spending money on infrastructure for Tasman Village, use it to create intensified sustainable living and job creation initiatives in the SH 6 corridor.

Ms Charlotte Watkins (31586)

Ms Watkins said:

- the FDS doesn't address climate change and decarbonisation that we require for our region;
- would like to see what the FTE climate change positions of Nelson City and Tasman District councils are;
- public transport needs to be improved and would like a supermarket in Tahunanui;
- concerned at putting houses next to Snowdens Bush Scenic Reserve (T-102 site), and potential for household cats to kill native birds etc and that changes to stormwater will affect the hydrology of the site.

In response to a question about how we achieve the holistic approach to wellbeing, she believes that green spaces, the ability for people to grow food in their own gardens and people are warm in their homes is important.

Rebecca Hamid (31539) River Road Company Ltd

Ms Hamid spoke about:

- her concern that the FDS is focussed on economic development;

- Maori and iwi have a holistic view of life, both present and future, in which economics is only a small part;
- the plan is ad hoc to meet demand rather than being visionary about what we could achieve ie mixed land use development along Queen Street;
- concern about development of multiple villages with increasing traffic and how that has impacted on people's lives in the last 10 years;
- believes the plan has data which is faulty or not informative due to Covid;
- encourages the Panel to reconsider the draft strategy and make it forward looking with a vision and to consider all the elements which make our lives enjoyable.

In response to a question about balancing the need for housing against the desire to keep things as they are, Ms Hamid said leadership comes into that and taking measured steps.

Ms Melanie Drewery (31542)

Ms Drewery spoke about:

- the Tasman Village development needs to be planned very carefully;
- concerned there is no allowance for Māpua village to keep some of its character if they go ahead with so much development in the hills and she doesn't want to be landlocked;
- wants to be able to farm her place as a lifestyle block or, if that's not possible, it needs to be rezoned – it can't be Rural 1;
- understands there are iwi concern but she has looked at archaeological records and nothing has been found on her property;
- allowing businesses to pop up over Māpua will put too much on the village – the roads are narrow and parking is becoming more of an issue; and
- need to allow for a wetland corridor.

In response to a question, Ms Drewery doesn't believe there is enough commercial land in Māpua to support the population.

Tim Bayley (31723)

Mr Bayley said:

- the proposed number of dwellings in the FDS seems to be excessive;
- he screenshared maps (page 35 of the FDS) and considered that they were confusing and didn't believe they were correct (areas N-019 being a red zone and N-020 being a pink zone). He said N-019 has some of the best established trees and historic houses in Nelson and residents of Nile Street and Harper Street will not be pleased to loose their sun with six storeyed houses;
- error in the green area around the cathedral – only going down to Nile Street but it extends down to Selwyn Street and at a high density;
- errors in the number of dwellings in the area N-019 – staff are using the gross land area for the footprints;
- he believes the public needs to know which sites have been singled out for possible intensification;

- his property at 52 Domett Street would be included in the 189 available lots and he doesn't believe it should be used for infill;
- agrees with housing in the Nelson CBD above existing retail and doing a block of green apartments in Buxton Square, supports 5 or 6 storeyed houses to be built in the bottom of the hills, supports people to do small infills by adding tiny houses/granny flats on their properties without requiring subdivision.

Dominic Williams (31448)

Mr Williams is interested to know what the rating situation would be for their property. It was noted that the FDS does not rezone or subdivision land. Rezoning would need to happen through a subsequent plan change process and their land value is unlikely to change until any rezoning happens.

In response to a question, Mr Williams' preference is for his property to remain rural.

Mr Williams believes the consultation should have been longer.

Ms Sandy Armstrong (31730)

Ms Armstrong said the area around her property in Murchison is proposed to be rezoned from rural to residential and they moved there because it was rural and had beautiful surroundings.

She believes the community consultation hasn't been good.

It was noted that there will be a formal plan change out for consultation later in the year.

Ms Armstrong said the FDS lacks vision and to think of the environment and people's wellbeing.

A lunch adjournment was taken from 12.27 pm to 1.18 pm

Mr Martin Hudson (31134)

Mr Hudson a retired GP living in Motueka said:

- the FDS needs to look at the long term needs of the Nelson Tasman region;
- the housing crisis is hard particularly for young families;
- he strongly opposes the proposed development near Tasman Village because of the loss of agricultural land, building concrete produces a lot of CO₂ which would affect climate change, the rising population will affect the pressure on water resources and there are no public transport;
- new residents would be isolated and would need to use their cars as there are few employment opportunities close by;
- it would be expensive to provide infrastructure to this development.

In response to a question, Mr Hudson said the infrastructure isn't coping with the increased number of residents and the roads are very difficult.

Mr Jack Bauer

Mr Bauer explained the importance of the school for the St Arnaud community. He spoke about development in section T-181 through to Top House Road. He believes there needs to be more families in the area and if the lot sizes are 5000 m², it makes it more likely those properties will go to residents who will help support the school.

In response to a question, the houses are well away from the wetland.

In response to a question, T-181 is 5 km from the St Arnaud township.

Dr Lou Gallagher (31559) Māpua and Districts Community Association and Wildlife Corridors Subcommittee

Dr Gallagher formed the Wildlife Corridors Subcommittee in 2021. She spoke about:

- saltwater intrusion and flood control in areas around Māpua;
- sea level rise in Māpua and she presented a map of the Māpua Estuary;
- the group did a community survey and the natural environment is valued more highly than any other aspect of living in the Māpua /Tasman area;
- over 60% of residents are concerned about over development in this area.

In response to question, Dr Gallagher said the community would prefer higher density housing in already established areas.

Mrs Jean Gorman (31263)

Mrs Gorman said:

- there is too much growth in the region and FDS doesn't provide evidence about why we need growth;
- she doesn't agree that the plan reduces travel;
- need an integrated transport plan - a bus service to the airport would be good;
- the proposed maps show intensification in central Nelson in known areas of flooding;
- satellite towns with commuters is an outdated model;
- there is no large employment source in Wakefield and Wakefield is a long commute to town, the soils are great for horticulture and it needs new infrastructure.

Mr Matt Taylor (31271)

Mr Taylor said productive land is the issue and he would like to see that protected as much as possible.

In response to a question, he noted that the Council and irrigators have invested in the Waimea Community Dam so it makes sense to protect the alluvial soils around the Waimea Plains area.

Cr Edgar left the meeting at 2.07 pm

Mr Richard Osmaston (31293) Money Free Party NZ

Mr Osmaston spoke about:

- meeting the Strategy's outcomes and considers we don't come close to meeting them;
- his concern about the environmental impacts of development and considers the councils shouldn't be providing for growth;
- how will it reflect our climate responsibilities;
- we are not addressing the cost of living, unemployment and stress for people; and
- we need to look at a different economic system.

Cr Edgar returned to the meeting at 2.13 pm

Rob Ford speaking on behalf John and Karen Heslop (31316)

Mr Ford spoke on behalf of the Heslops in area T-114 (Eyles Road, Richmond):

- this area is highlighted as a potential high growth area, however, it is not viewed as a high priority in the FDS document;
- the area has potential for high rise development on the lower level;
- infrastructure will need to be provided to enable development of the land - 3 Waters may bring this timeline forward with the integration of both councils' infrastructure;
- the property has great green space development, good amenities and is central to Richmond.

In response to a questions, Mr Ford noted:

- if the capacity was higher, there would be higher density and more affordable housing in this development;
- a cost effective way to build is multi-unit developments;
- this land is zoned as deferred rural residential;
- it would take 10-20 years to develop the land with the current demand.

Dr Ann Briggs (31325)

Dr Briggs raised her concerns:

- about the design of the questionnaire and that the outcomes in the Strategy are actually aims but she's not sure the plan sets out how the aims will be achieved;
- outcome 11 on the questionnaire looks as if it is an afterthought as the existing natural environment is being used for development and doesn't appear to be protected, as only productive land is singled out as protected;
- outcome 8 regards climate change – only appears to deal with adaptation rather than mitigating emissions;
- the priority seems to be to release land for development with no control by the Council over the environmental impact of the development process and greenhouse gas emissions;
- outcome 7 – she suggests looking at the existing environment before development is thought of, conserve mature trees, make the developers demonstrate how they will retain the substantial vegetation;
- the FDS classifies wetlands and coastal margins as unproductive land is wetland when they should be identified as conservation land.

Steve Anderson (31343)

Mr Anderson said:

- he lives rurally in Ngātimoti and he would like to encourage the panel to allow easier subdivision on rural land. Motueka Valley Highway could provide a lot of housing opportunities for this demand;
- he doesn't see that intensive greenfield developments suited everybody and that larger pieces of land would help provide for some of the demand;
- there is a strong sense of community in Ngatimoti and in terms of housing, intensive housing does not have the same sense of community as rural areas;

In response to a question, Mr Anderson said there are a lot of people who work from home so that helps with the climate crisis and reducing travel.

In response to a question, there are a lot of properties like his that could be easily subdivided - it would enrich the community to have more families in the area.

Steve Richards (31386) Tasman Area Community Association

Mr Richards said the Association doesn't believe it is necessary for the secondary proposal to be included in the FDS. Some concerns are due to greenhouse gas emissions, stormwater, sewerage, community value and building a dormitory suburb.

In response to a question, it would be the Association's preference to intensify Nelson, Richmond, Brightwater and Wakefield rather than Motueka or Tasman.

Afternoon tea adjournment was taken from 2.25 pm to 3.17 pm

Mayor Reese vacated the chair at 3.17 pm and Deputy Mayor Bryant took the chair.

Timo Neubauer (31566), Jan Heijs (31494), William Samuels (31593), Magdalena Garbarczyk (31564) - Nelson Tasman 2050 (31540)

The Nelson Tasman 2050 group presented a Powerpoint:

- the group is advocating for better urban design and planning for Nelson Tasman;
- they consider that the Strategy won't deliver on the outcomes (which are aims not outcomes) in it;
- key areas of concern include procedural issues, legal, economic rationale; lack of overall vision for Nelson Tasman;
- their report has been peer-reviewed;
- Dr Andy Reisinger gave his views and outlined the urgent need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and the IPCC's latest summary for policymakers;
- if greenhouse gas reduction is the goal, then intensification is a must and there are concerns this is not achievable via the current proposal;
- the proposed FDS shows that basic property economic principles for achieving intensification are not understood – releasing large amounts of greenfield land, lowers land values;
- flawed methodology for growth predictions – the strategy should decide where it is best to grow not base it on historic trends;
- disproportional growth projected for Māpua, whereas Motueka isn't growing much;
- multi criteria analysis not fit for purpose (flawed methodology of site selection);
- they consider there has been an insufficient consultation process and that it has not been an unbiased process;
- an over-reliance on greenfield development prevents intensification, creates loss of productive land, and a lack of diverse housing options;
- lack of quality urban intensification proposed: bad examples of intensifications may build popular opposition to higher density living;
- quality intensification: community, density, diversity, accessibility, sustainability and affordability;

- the 2019 Nelson City and Tasman District Council intensification action plans were insufficient and didn't promote intensification;
- encourage more active council processes – establishment of a Nelson Tasman Urban Development Agency;
- recommend that the FDS be reconsidered to ensure a better future for the Nelson Tasman region.

Mr Williams said this is a 30 year strategy and public attitudes change quickly – we need to build up, not out. The Council could take the lead and show good examples.

In response to a question about limiting greenfields in existing town areas and how we manage that when we can't legally block landowners from progressing private plan changes, Mr Neubauer said that other councils are doing it so there must be a way.

In response to a question, there is a need to build smaller houses - we can dramatically reduce carbon and also use lower carbon materials.

Geoffrey (Jim) Vause (31515) - speaking with Annette LeCren (31148)

Mr Vause presented a Powerpoint:

- their submission is relevant for both the FDS and also the Mapua Growth Plan Change;
- concerned with the Rates Remission Policy;
- recommend Council change its terminology such that land used for primary industry is classed as greenfield;
- recommend the FDS and MGP provides for ratepayer and independent informed expert review of urban design;
- recommend in order to meet its outcomes 1, 7, 10, 11 in the FDS, the councils must provide in the FDS a methodology and timeline based on need criteria that will prioritise infill intensification above greenfield;
- recommend the FDS is revised to allow adaptability in actions based on a better understanding of the factors that influence housing demand over time.

Mr Jeff Santa Barbara (31457)

Mr Santa Barbara echoed Nelson Tasman 2050's submission and spoke about:

- as the co-owner and director of Trinity Hills, there is a demand for lower carbon housebuilds and smaller sections sizes in the rural environment;
- flagged T-17 (3 km south west of Motueka) is an excellent site for greenfield as it is not well suited for production.

Mr Santa Barbara clarified that a carrying capacity study refers to the natural resource capacity of a given piece of land.

In response to a question, even though T-17 is zoned rural 2, it would be better zoned as rural residential. He said it is reasonably close to schools and key employment centres.

Mr Steve Malcom (31674) (with Mark Morris, Planner)

Mayor Reese left the meeting at 4.34 pm

Mr Morris talked about:

- an area of land in Lower Moutere (Braeburn block) which is a contained basin and would be a great area for a new settlement;
- challenges of providing for growth in Motueka (coastal inundation, flooding hazard from Motueka River, highly productive land, heritage sites);
- advantages of the Braeburn site is its a blank slate site with very few existing residents making it easier to have a more planned development, close to proposed sewer water infrastructure with potential for transitional servicing, adjacent to major infrastructure routes, and in close proximity to schools;
- issue is the short term ability to put titles on the market;
- should be looking at rural residential blocks with a new set of rules in the Tasman area;
- the existing numbers for growth is short by at least 50% and Council should be doubling the area.

Mr Hamish Rush (31419) Aporo Orchards Ltd

Mr Rush spoke about:

- future growth is a huge challenge for the District;
- is concerned with the secondary proposal which neighbours his property and he doesn't support it;
- he supports the growth in logical areas ie Brightwater, Wakefield;

Cr Maling left the meeting at 4.48 pm

- already have a rural 3 zone which was set in 2004/2005 and thinks it is the appropriate zoning for some residential growth and should remain so for the foreseeable future.

Mrs Miriam Lynch (31117)

Mr Mike Lynch spoke on behalf of his wife and himself:

- his family moved from Christchurch and now reside in Braeburn Road, Lower Moutere and they love their rural lifestyle in Tasman;
- opposes T-136 which does not meet outcome 10 – that highly productive land is protected;
- a housing development on T-136 needs infrastructure which will be at a high cost resulting in expensive housing – there is no water supply or sewerage treatment, it is a catchment area which adds to the flooding of the Moutere River;
- T-136 doesn't meet Outcome 1 of the FDS - the support of reducing greenhouse emissions;
- the secondary proposal for site T-136 should be removed from the FDS and the Malcolm Consortium submission should not be considered.

Deputy Mayor Bryant thanked all submitters that were online today.

Deputy Mayor Edgar closed the meeting with a karakia

The meeting was adjourned at 4.59 pm

Friday 29 April 2022

Present: Nelson City Council – Mayor R Reese (via Zoom), Deputy Mayor J Edgar and Councillor B McGurk

Tasman District Council – Deputy Mayor S Bryant, Councillor K Maling and Councillor D Ogilvie

Iwi representative – Ina Kumeroa Kara-France

In Attendance: Tasman District Council – Group Manager Service and Strategy (S Edwards), Environmental Policy Manager (B Johnson), Urban Growth Coordinator (J Deans), Policy Planner (M Bengosi), Environmental Policy Administrator (N Armstrong) and Executive Support Officer (G Drummond)

Nelson City Council – Project Manager – Environmental Management (N Ching)

Apologies: Mayor Reese noted her apology from 2:45pm.

Chair Deputy Mayor Bryant welcomed all to the meeting.

Councillor McGurk offered the opening karakia.

Olivia Neubauer (31605)

- Supports Nelson Tasman 2050 submission.
- Linkages between the FDS, its outcomes and actions to be considered and how its measured.
- Challenges both Councils to lead with climate mitigation measures.
- Outcome one needs to be broader. Look at how intensification will support the reduction of greenhouse gases.
- Need to have apartment and townhouse options in existing urban areas.

In response to questions, Ms Neubauer said central Nelson will need more green spaces to support people into intensified living. Need a designed concept where people want to live, not a concrete wonderland.

Sarah Whittle (31407)

- Consider terrace housing options, like the United Kingdom.
 - Compact living spaces to be walking and e-biking distances to amenities.
 - Compact living not to be restricted to retirement villages.
 - Greenfield developments are not suitable for all sectors of the population.
 - Richmond CBD to be included into the intensification area and developed first.
 - Be flexible about how we use car parking spaces.
 - Urban design, to meet needs not what developers want.
 - Have green spaces in town.
-

- Establish incentives for developers to build in town.
- Make the ugly spaces beautiful before turning the beautiful spaces ugly.

Mark Lile for CCKV and Bayview Nelson (31776)

Mark's the lead consultant for the private plan change request for CCKV and Bayview Nelson's land. A joint plan change involving 287 hectares of land. He noted:

- Issue of intensification vs greenfield in his submission is supported by the NPS UD. Not everyone wants to live in an apartment or can afford one.
- Intensification uptake is likely to be relatively slow and influenced by price, impacting intensification goals.
- People would love the opportunity to have a section to build their own house, not necessarily a townhouse or an apartment.
- Working with Ngāti Koata to provide a range of housing typology.

Deputy Mayor Edgar asked if an extension request was made as Mark's submission summary page said it was. Mark confirmed he wasn't requesting an extension. Deputy Mayor Edgar asked for this to be corrected in the official record, and Deputy Mayor Bryant asked Mark to check this and come back.

Mayor Reese said we've had submissions on our integrity of our economic analysis. She asked Mark, given his knowledge of the region, if he's interested in checking the evidential basis. It's not directly related to his submission but wanted to raise it with him in the hearing for transparency reasons. Mark said he is happy to help.

Mark Lile for Wakefield Developments (31750)

Mark Lile presented on behalf of Wakefield Developments.

- Wakefield Developments are developing land in Wakefield Village.
- Another piece of adjoining land for approximately 180 different lots.
- Looking to provide for a range of housing typologies, have addressed flooding risks, conducted a Cultural Impact Assessment and are working with Iwi.
- An opportunity to provide a community recreational area, which joins the cycleway and is amongst totara trees and a significant oak tree.
- Working with the Council reserves team to retain mature trees.

Climate change mitigation and adaptation was asked to be added to the subdivision consideration list. Mr Lile said the site is close to the centre and doesn't fully rely on vehicles. Storm water will be managed in an integrated way. Sea level rise is not an immediate threat to this area.

To answer a question on land productivity Mr Lile said it's been a grazing block and sheep farm for a long time. Working through a HAIL issue from that time. Not horticultural land, doesn't have the same horticultural values as the Waimea Plains.

Eleanor Greenhough (31767)

- Opposed to the loss of productive farmland for greenfield development, will lead to expensive food.
- Growth should be within existing areas, with existing infrastructure.

- Objects to T-136 and the proposal for the land at Braeburn road. Far from services, multimillion-dollar views so unaffordable housing. Will not meet FDS outcomes.
- Wetlands on her property are in the top 10% in the region. How can T-136 be developed without destroying the wetlands on her property?
- Has farmed on Moutere clay all her life, which is highly productive land. Her farm is a similar land to that of T-136.
- Problems when urban and rural areas intermingle.
- The lease of T-136 is Alliance Group's third biggest supplier of lambs in NZ.
- Tasman's Great Taste Trail goes along the edge of T-136, if this land is built on it will spoil the views. People bike the trail is to get away from urban areas.
- She asked the Council to scrap T-136 proposal and further proposal in the FDS.
- She believes there's cultural significance to the whole Moutere area. It's not just about the battlefield here.

Dr Bruno Lemke (31625)

- Parks and reserves in Ruby Bay, Mapua are too small. = Less than 2% public green space, doesn't compare to other cities.
- Rules state 5% needs to be set aside for public green space, resulting in a scattered approach that isn't conducive to nature. Wildlife doesn't do too well in a block surrounded by houses, as there are no corridors to move to.
- The 5% is focused on human activity for possibly five families per hectare. That 5% needs to increase with intensification and population rise.
- Developers purchase land, keep it as a farm for a few years to move the soil around (as you don't need a consent to do that). Then they put it up for a subdivision, which happened to the subdivision above Aranui park. Land purchased by a developer should be treated as a development not a farm.
- There's a recent subdivision along Seaton Valley Road, mean high-water mark shows a lot of the land is a wetland.

Steve Hayden (31641)

Mr Hayden's property borders the proposed expansion at T-136 in Braeburn Road. Concerned about the following:

- An increase in traffic on Taman View Road, which is a non-maintained road.
- Effects on the cycle trail if Tasman View Road becomes a major service road.
- Any new subdivision should include sustainable homes, cycleways, horse-riding areas.

In response to a question, Mr Hayden confirmed he can see both sides of the development argument. If he must choose, he will choose not to support the development.

John-Paul Pochin (31701)

- The benefits to terrace housing as available in the United Kingdom.
- Latest IPPC report is clear that we have environment issues and are not doing enough to address them.
- We cannot continue to expand, as we're stealing from future generations.

- He's worried how cities have been developed; areas that are not connected to the community and leaving a concrete building environmental to our children.
- We need good practices that encourages good social and environmental outcomes.
- We're focusing on car travel and commuting that way.
- The idea of competing towns is unhelpful, even between Nelson and Richmond our cities need to work together

Answering a question on the new public transport strategy coming out in 2023, Mr Pochin said it will help, yet we're playing catch up. We're still doing what we've always done, developing greenfields. Need to make radical changes, adding a few extra buses won't make things that different.

Tom Kennedy from Friends of the Maitai (31632)

- Main concern is maintaining river water quality, recreation opportunities, and biodiversity to be fostered.
- The 2017 aquatic sites of significance report identifies what's required to protect species in the river.
- FDS needs to consider amenities and historic value of the river.
- The need for huge infrastructure is a concern. Existing infrastructure in Milton and Neil streets already have a raw sewage problem in heavy rain. A further 1100 houses will require major infrastructure works.
- Support the intensification in the existing urban areas and improvement on existing infrastructure.
- With large, urbanised areas in the Maitai, it will be difficult to ensure that the river will remain healthy.
- Ask the Council to adopt the same long-term vision as the early city planners who set aside green spaces and strategically limit future development in the Maitai Valley.

To answer a question on his views for intensification planned for Milton and Neil Streets, Mr Kennedy said it will probably impact where he lives. Yet he sees it as the best way forward in terms of protecting existing amenities and greenspaces. Intensification can be done well and can be people friendly.

Jacquetta Bell (31633)

Ms Bell spoke with her granddaughter as her concerns are for the future generations.

- Developments with car commuting only options, won't make it a better place for our grandchildren to live.
- The FDS doesn't protect productive farmland, nor reduces carbon emissions or emissions from construction.
- The intensification uptake will be slow if the only option is buildings designed by developers motivated by profit. Suggested the Council look at affordable inner-city apartments to foster the sense of community and shared spaces.
- The petition to keep the Maitai rural has over 13,000 signatures.

- The FDS doesn't acknowledge the recreation value of the area or the river or protects the valued swimming holes.
- Development of housing in the Maitai Valley will result in a further decline in water quality.
- As we intensify in the city it is vital that we retain access to nature.
- Suggested establishing a working group to speed up the intensification process with imaginative green buildings. Saying she would eagerly move into a shared space for older people to free her three-bedroom home for a family

Brenda Wraight (31654)

- Opposed to intensification for Tahunanui, specifically five to six storey buildings on land currently housing a mixed community with diverse needs and prone to liquefaction. This is at odds to the Governments policy on housing statement for urban development.
- FDS does not address long term traffic and parking issues associated with more multi storey buildings.
- FDS doesn't reference the Ministry of Transport accessible streets strategy.
- She objects to the displacement of the residence, knowing they won't go into an apartment costing upwards of \$800k.
- This is a social inequitable proposal for Tahunanui and does not respect the housing needs of people who live here, including those who need affordable housing.
- Urges Council to adopt a moratorium on height preventing building above three stories.
- The FDS consultation document does not specifically mention Tahunanui, however several other documents do, and none are aligned.

In response to a question, Ms Wraight confirmed she had briefly seen the public transport plan for Nelson Tasman.

The hearing adjourned at 3:10pm and resumed at 3:27pm

Peter Taylor (31670)

- Supports inner city intensification, not greenfield developments.
- Increasing material and transportation costs for greenfield development, is not compatible with climate change.
- Extend incentives for people who own land in areas where buildings can go.
- Request for Kaka valley to be removed from the FDS.
- By keeping the Maitai underdeveloped with an intensification model, you'll be able to supply green space for those who choose to live in intensified areas.
- Greenspace development increases debt and traffic levels for future generations.

Deputy Mayor Edgar asked how you make intensified dwelling affordable, without them being social, it's not just about social housing or public housing. Peter said infrastructure costs for greenfield developments fall on the rate payers, the Maitai infrastructure required will be a burden. It's about where the Council can be effective. By maximising what's already there, minimises costs, combined with developer incentives for building more units it then becomes effective. Inner-city development regulations, make it difficult to convert commercial land to residential.

Deputy Mayor Edgar asked about affordability in terms of people getting into housing. Peter said the way forward is collaboration between different groups. The news recently reported that there is a collaboration project between agencies starting to work in this space.

Heather Wallace – Friends of Golden Bay (31669)

- Rural residential sites proposed for Golden Bay will take up a lot of productive land. Focus on more intensification.
- Requests Keoghan Road site be removed. Above the Onahau estuary, classified as high ecological value, of national significance in the Melville Schuckard report on birds, a Natural Outstanding Landscape. The site proposed drains towards the estuary, will result in negative impacts. This is a big estuary its flat and doesn't flush.
- Estuaries are important ecosystems; they store a carbon and host vulnerable species. These species are vulnerable to what housing brings, such as cats and rats.

In response to a question, Ms Wallace said it's the Keoghan Road development that is of concern for the development proposed in the Rangihaeata area.

Matthew Hay (31677)

Matthew is a co-director of Fineline architecture based in Nelson. He doesn't think the FDS should be accepted in its current form and noted:

- Does not reduce our carbon consumption.
- Agrees with the outcomes yet believes they're objectives.
- Suggested to establish a Nelson Tasman Urban Design Agency to present a vision of the future that the developers can actively participate in.
- FDS will create more commuter traffic heading in and out of Nelson and Richmond. Reliance on the car is not sustainable, will not meet the zero-carbon emissions target.
- Intensification needs to be close to all town centres, where there is demand for employment.
- To set development standards and not to convert highly valuable arable land into housing.
- Reduce the carbon impact of buildings with smaller building footprints and amenities within 20-minutes for cycling and walking.

Lindsay Wood (31705)

- Need to re-think the FDS, do not proceed with it as is.
- It's short on climate change responses and doesn't offer an effective strategy for this.
- We must plan for an energy challenged future. The FDS doesn't discuss energy or electricity, it disregards the NPS on renewable generation (see footnote on page 10). This is a mandatory document, one that plays a vital role to the wellbeing of NZ its people and environment.
- The FDS offers solutions to the wrong problems.

David Ayre (31708)

From Question 40 of the survey, he noted:

- Need to focus on limited medium growth, the world's population increase is 1% and falling. Need to re-build our towns and cities as intensified communities. Urban intensification will handle that degree of limited growth.
- The FDS hasn't acknowledged the magnitude of climate change issues or discussed the impacts of the same.
- The draft FDS references the zero-carbon act and makes no attempt on how to carry it out. Early FDS webinars said that *"we don't need to consider the zero-carbon act"*. Need to half our greenhouse gas emissions by 2030, that's a 7.5% reduction every year.
- If our population is increasing, then every target is therefore more difficult to meet. We're trying to learn how to be sustainable for the next thousands of years.
- Consider where Nelson airport will go and flooding in Nelson city, now. No discussion on civil engineering to cope with more frequent and serve storms, such as a retention dam in the Maitai Valley. These major land use issues should be considered and discussed with the community.

Suzanne O'Rourke, Fonterra (31715)

Suzanne O'Rourke and Robb Stephens from Fonterra, noted the following:

- Fonterra's interests relate to two manufacturing sites, in Brightwater and Takaka.
- Are seeking additional wording to the FDS for outcomes three and five. For development to happen in areas that avoid existing incompatible activities.
- The Takaka factory has a buffer of land that wraps around the site. The FDS identifies an area of T-139 that could be redeveloped for residential purposes of up to 50 lots.
- Fonterra uses that buffer land to service storm water disposal. If residential land is developed near the site, there needs to be consideration around where the stormwater is disposed.

Ms O'Rourke's technology dropped out and Mr Stephens confirmed those were the main points relating to their submission. They will come back with an answer to the question if both sites plan to remain the same size.

Trevor Chang (31722)

Trevor thanked the panel for the opportunity to express his views. He has lived in Tahunanui for over 70 years and noted:

- The local and national decisions made for the Tahunanui area and often without discussion or consultation with affected parties.
- New housing needs to be prioritised especially for young families.
- Removing all on street parking is not best for the area, and destructive for the commercial, medical and private aspects of the community.
- The high-density residential plan for Tahunanui does not align with the inundation plan.
- An opportunity exists to make this area available for high density low value housing, with its alternative transport links to the CBD.
- Any structural damage to the Waimea dam could endanger lives in Brightwater.
- The 2004 construction plan commissioned by the Council has not been enacted.
- If we have six storey units, we will see a sewerage and stormwater problems.

Yachel Upson (31624)

- There is a level of vulnerability around the human aspects of the decisions processes.
- There is a focus on consumerism, rather than experiential activities:
- This model appears to overlook demographic and social economic factors.
- Research has shown that 15-minute cities show how far people are typically willing to go. Suggested adhering to the best-known models and to be careful about the inputs on the scope and calculations we make.
- Cities that focus on mental, physical and cultural health are inclusive by their nature.
- Need to address advertising of consultation and would like to see permanent billboards with this information on it.

Ray Hellyer (31733)

Mr Hellyer did not appear.

Questions for Council officers:

Cr Ogilvie:

- *Can farmers move soil without a consent?*

Mr Johnson (Tasman District Council Environmental Policy Manager) confirmed that removing or filling in a wetland is a prohibited activity. If its dry land and doesn't have wetland vegetation, soil can be moved under the TRMP permitted activity rules. Yet the land spoken about seemed to be a wetland.

Answering another question, Mr Johnson confirmed that wetlands don't need to be mapped or identified as a wetland, it depends on the composition of plant species. The definition is, if it has more than 50% wetland species and intermittently wet then it's classified as a wetland.

Deputy Mayor Edgar:

- *From Dr Lemke's submission (31625) and others.*
 1. *Would like to see an overlay map of where the Mapua wetland sits in relation to the FDS map and what the ecological values of the wetland are.*
 2. *Are there areas we need to look at for wildlife corridors? A few submissions have talked about these and not just in Mapua.*
 3. *For levels of parks and reserves, the question is around amenity for intensification, when its 5% of the value of the development. Wondering if there is different metrics used for more intensified areas? Whether we need to consider how that's done?*
- *From the Fonterra submission*
 1. *Are there land use compatibility issues?*

Have we assessed sensitivity for land use compatibility as part of our assessments? Does this leave any orphan sites i.e., small cut off areas that aren't viable as they're too small to be productive?

- *Would like clarification, did we say that “we don’t need to consider the carbon-zero act” as mentioned by David Ayre.*
- *A submitter on the levels of parks and reserves, the question is around amenity for intensification he was talking about 5%, when its 5% of the value of the development. Wondering if there is different metrics used for more intensified areas? Whether we need to consider how that’s done?*
- *Regarding sunlight, comment on whether the rules are currently meet within our RMPs or if rule changes will be required.*
- *Mark Lile mentioned affordability of intensified options, he mentioned they don’t become cheaper because of height, our current deliveries of multi-story dwellings are high end, if intensifications is there to support affordability, what are the conditions that support that.*

Questions from Thursday’s submissions from Nelson Tasman 2050

- *Submitter 31457: Mentioned that Council’s should complete a carrying capacity study, is that a piece of work we have done or is it something we need to do?*
- *Mix use on Queen Street. There was discussion several years ago, of the mix use of development around the South side of Queen Street, is interested to know why that wasn’t re-considered.*
- *The Urban Regeneration Agency might be considered outside the scope, it could be progressed between the two Councils as part of the Joint Committee. Doesn’t expect staff to do the research but wants to know the process to look at it as an option and if the Joint Committee would authorise funding to look at it.*
- *Outcome five, with the phrase ‘net demand’ being the incorrect metric, would like some consideration on that.*
- *Question 15 in the survey talked about intensification happening slowly over time, submitter 31459 mentioned this.*
- *Submitter 31316 mentioned T114 having higher capacity, to be looked at.*
- *Submitter 31457 mentioned site T17 also having higher capacity then what’s identified.*

Councillor McGurk

- *Would like commentary on incentives and disincentives on our DC’s, policies, in that area. On our regulatory process and fees and charges and incentivising the behaviours that we want to see.*
- *Re soil capacity and productivity for T136, which keeps coming up, reinforcing it’s an issue for many.*
- *From Dr Lemke’s submission on 5% would like the rules clarified around the Mapua Ruby Bay area with that.*
- *Tom Kennedy from save the Maitai talked about the huge amount of infrastructure required in the Nile and Milton Street areas to support that. Would like a report on what’s been planned on the infrastructure upgrades and summarise where we are at with it and confirm if the infrastructure talked about has the capacity to handle it.*
- *The CCTO for development can we have reference to the Auckland model and how that worked. Panuku and provide a summary on how big it is.*

- *Mr Lindsay Wood referred to the building research association, NZ brands standards for emission reduction and would like reference to that.*

Cr Mailing

- *Is the Rangihaeta Head area in our proposed in our ONL*

Deputy Mayor Bryant

From Thursday's hearing 28 April

- *Two submitters talked about rural residential, both are not currently in the FDS, is that something we can do? For the one in Spring Grove what are the infrastructure requirements?*
- *T136 Mr Malcom, could we have more information on what is proposed. An adjoining neighbour spoke on the effects it would have on people in the area if a subdivision would go ahead.*
- *Further to the Malcom submission to a further 1500 hectares could be available for subdivision would we want to consider that?*
- *The rate of uptake seems to vary upon whose submitting. Can we have clarity on the likely uptake across the different zones.*
- *Would like to know the effect Council charges have on development. What is the percentage of cost on development (an average cross the two districts) and if it can be used as a tool to slow development as some are advocating?*

Ms Kara-France offered the closing karakia and the hearing was adjourned at 4.58pm.

Tuesday 3 May 2022

Present: Nelson City Council – Mayor R Reese, Deputy Mayor J Edgar and Councillor B McGurk

Tasman District Council – Deputy Mayor S Bryant, Councillor K Maling and Councillor D Ogilvie

Iwi representative – Ina Kumeroa Kara-France

In Attendance: Tasman District Council – Group Manager – Service and Strategy (S Edwards), Environmental Policy Manager (B Johnson), Urban Growth Coordinator (J Deans), Policy Planner (M Bengosi), Project Manager – Environmental Policy (A McKenzie), Executive Support Officer (A Brough), Environmental Policy Administrator (N Armstrong) and Executive Support Officer (G Drummond)

Nelson City Council – Councillor R Sanson, Councillor G Noonan, Strategy and Environment Senior Analyst (C Pawson), Group Manager Environmental Management (C Barton), Senior Governance Advisor (M Macfarlane),

Chairperson, Mayor Reese welcomed everyone to the meeting and opened the meeting with a karakia.

The meeting adjourned at 09.09am and resumed at 09.11am.

Cynthia McConville (31455)

Ms McConville raised an objection to the proposed development at 42 Campia Road. While Golden Bay needs affordable housing, Rangihaeata is not a suitable location for affordable housing. She outlined her reasons for this view:

- Out of context with most of other properties in the area.
- There is a potential risk to wildlife from the proposed development.
- Challenges with grey and black water as well as roading.
- T163 should be removed from the FDS.

The meeting adjourned at 09.16 and resumed at 09.40am.

**Daniel Hames Port Tarakohe Services Limited (31826) also speaking for Joan Butts (31714)
Port Tarakohe Services Limited**

Mr Hames, Director of Port Tarakohe Services Limited, spoke about Port Tarakohe development.

- Requested that the master plan for the port and surrounding land be included in the FDS. Growth is constantly underestimated by the Council.
- Big part of the FDS is to have housing and work nearby. An 82 hectare abandoned concrete site has been redeveloped and is infrastructure ready. Port Tarakohe has far less useable land.
- Significant and increasing development of sea farming, which needs ever expanding land use for storage. Council is expecting a five per cent increase in mussel farms. Land operations will need to grow accordingly.
- Need to utilise all the land on their site to allow for growth. Request approval for the two business areas currently zoned for industrial.

In response to questions, the quarry works under existing use rights and they are putting together a longer term plan for it now. The quarry won't go any further towards Pōhara. Longer term they are looking to move the quarry on the site. Through appropriate health and safety it can all work in with aquaculture development on site. All the rock in Golden Bay is coming out of that quarry, essential works continue as the only other option is quarrying miles away with all the implications.

Mrs Sonja Antonia Lamers and Mr Tony Aldridge for Wakefield Homes (31609)

Mrs Lamers and Mr Aldridge spoke about the need to provide housing suitable to meet the housing requirements in Wakefield.

- Need to be more creative and build smaller more affordable housing that fits with needs of the community.
- Did an extensive survey in 2020, which found a need for more rental homes and retirement accommodation. Too many big houses are being built in new subdivisions. 447 households are currently on the waiting list for suitable housing.
- Development plans could include inclusionary zones to allow this type of building. Queenstown used this approach to develop more. Habitat for Humanity has a similar approach.
- The Council needs to give clearer direction to developers.

- Need to assess what impact any increase in housing has on infrastructure and land. Need to focus on urban intensification, not sprawl.
- There is the issue of convergence of heavy traffic through the Wakefield area. Have had discussions with local Police and have some viable alternatives proposed.
- Have a responsibility to future generations to get this right, sadly we have dropped the ball in recent years.

In response to question, they clarified that F on the map could be used for light industrial or commercial by changing the roading infrastructure.

The meeting adjourned at 10.15am and resumed at 10.49am

Robin Whalley (31351)

Mr Whalley raised the following concerns,

- The FDS feedback form suggests pre-ordained answers.
- He has funding available for projects but hasn't invested in Nelson for last 10 years largely due to regulatory challenges.
- Need to have a bigger picture long term view. What will the world look like in 2050? What businesses won't exist anymore and what new businesses will be in place? Should obsolete buildings be used for housing? If so, need to reassess and potentially rezone these areas.
- Use of Port Nelson a good example of a totally underutilised asset, largely being used for container storage.
- Rapid rate of change not being addressed by regulations.

In response to questions, Port Nelson should be developed with a blend of mixed use housing. The development of this area could reduce noise issues coming from the container storage. This could be developed from a variety of funding sources such as a joint venture between council and private parties. There is no shortage of capital, just a shortage of potential opportunities.

When comparing Nelson/Tasman with the regulatory picture in other cities, it is far more complex and expensive to develop here. The interface between the Council and private industry needs to be reassessed to remove barriers to development in Nelson that aren't in places like Whakatane.

Chris and Gill Knight (31746)

Mr Knight raised concerns for the Tahunanui area.

- Primary concern is the six-storey blocks with no carparks proposed in FDS. Noted the government reforms in the RMA space and wondered if the FDS is trying to get ahead of central government.
- Tahunanui already has issues with flooding, traffic volumes and lack of parking and is at risk for earthquake, liquefaction, slips and coastal erosion. Before plans for more intensification progress these existing issues need to be resolved. Any development needs to be looked at with a climate change lens.
- Tahunanui is a destination and is one of Nelson's key assets, don't want this ruined with development. If any multistorey buildings are to be built, Council needs to consider where they can best be built.
- Need to think seriously about what decisions are made now and the cost to the whole city.

- Focus on environment impacts rather than development opportunity.

In response to question, they confirmed housing stock in Tahunanui is suitable for existing needs. They noted that in their view the land isn't suitable for the development of multi-storey buildings, as you don't need to dig down far to hit sand or even water. Also Council would need to look at rerouting traffic flows as they are already a major problem.

Mrs Alison Pickford (31211)

Mrs Pickford raised the following concerns:

- The Strategy needs to be future focused and not be business focused.
- Environmental impacts round the world all showing increasing environmental change for the worse, need to consider multiple challenges like moving access corridors further back from the shoreline, hunger will be more of a risk in the future due to sea stock depletion and the need to consider innovative approaches like overseas such as sponge cities.
- Long term predictions suggest the climate will be hotter and there will be water shortages.
- The collapse of forest is already visible in the back country.
- The Council needs to focus on environmental protection by reducing private transport and providing cheap and effective public transport, having council driven composted collection, planting more trees, and restoring and developing wetlands.

Michael Mokhtar and Mark Morris (31687)

Mr Mokhtar and Mr Morris came to voice support for Mr Mokhtar's property, T194, being included in the FDS. They noted:

- The land is in close proximity to Wakefield, has access to transport and supporting infrastructure, is in proximity to Tasman's Great Taste Trail and has no known stability issues. The land is currently zoned as rural 1 land but the land hasn't been productive.
- The subdivision complies with the FDS requirements - noting that section size will need to be reassessed to allow smaller sections to meet the demand for smaller sized houses in Wakefield.

In answer to questions, they unsure of how many lots could be on the 8.9 hectare section, they have not completed an assessment yet but approximately fifty lots could be created. In regards to connecting to the existing wastewater line, it is near capacity so an upgrade may be required as a Long Term Plan project. As there is another development underway this will need to be a priority for the LTP. They have had discussions with Homes for Wakefield and are open to undertaking a project with them developing smaller housing.

Ali Howard (31790)

Ms Howard commended the panel on sitting through days of hearings to enable democracy. She noted:

- She supports having a strategy for urban development. The focus needs to be on community and meeting the demand for housing. Projections show the only age group projected to grow in future in Nelson is over 65.
- She doesn't support development outside urban areas, particularly the two proposed in the Maitai. Thousands of people have told the Council in a variety of ways that they don't want the Maitai developed. There is still no recognition of the public's opinion.

- She commends the Council on declaring a climate emergency. Reducing greenhouse gases is of importance. Nelson City Council's submission to central government suggests more needs to be done urgently. Future development needs to consider carbon emissions from the business case stage and onwards.
- The need to exhaust all other options before considering any greenfield development, noting brownfield can be developed quicker and more efficiently.

In response to questions, she doesn't support greenfields development in Berryfields, there are plots in town which could be developed. This development doesn't help house prices.

Mark Morris, on behalf of Richmond Baptist Church (31614)

Mr Morris voiced support for T112, which is the church's land for intensification.

- Approximately two thirds of the land is undeveloped field. The Church would like to see land developed for safe and affordable housing down to a 200 sized plot in discussion with Habitat Nelson.
- Under the FDS criteria, the land is near shops, biking trails and schools, has access to sewer and stormwater and is above flooding level.
- The planned residential development would have a buffer of a commercial development before the bypass. A roading link would be required between Arbor-Lee and Champion roads for access to the site.

In response to questions, the church needs to be zoned as commercial to allow suitable activities. If there is any development of the existing site it would be in the gravel area. Development in the commercial area would need to have height restrictions due to the powerlines. It could potentially be used for commercial storage or depots. The proposed road would bypass the aquatic centre, so wouldn't impact on the aquatic centre activities.

Peter Olorenshaw (31791) – NELSUST

Mr Olorenshaw raised concerns over carbon dioxide issues,

- Need to consider certain topographies - for example no consideration of float homes, redesigning existing dwellings into smaller multiple dwellings, the building of tiny homes which would be relocatable if environmental impacts require.
- Speed of intensification underestimated –suggest intensification is needed at twice the projected rate. New dwelling yield could produce 29,700 new dwellings. 455 new residences could be created by utilising the car dealerships in Nelson city land.
- The demand study is dubious - asking what people want rather than what need.
- Covid has shown that while most people work from home some of the time, they will still need to work in urban areas and their kids will need to go to schools.
- We need to build in rather than out.

In response to questions, car yards and car parks leads people to seeing the city as car focused, rather than people focused. He considers these areas should be used as mixed use residential. Whatever the mechanism is, there's the opportunity for redevelopment. If tiny homes are mobile, potential environmental issues like flooding are less relevant as the houses can be moved. They could also be grouped to create attractive villages/suburbs.

Mr Colin Garnett (31388)

Mr Garnett raised concerns mainly related to Tasman area,

- A lot of highly productive land is being used. Questioned some of the assessments done, T115 had a land use capability of one yet it ends up in the FDS as a four. 19 hectares of T120 should be a zero but somehow gets a score to enable development. Berryfields should have a soil classification of zero yet has a four. Brings the whole assessment into question. Development appears to be sidestepping the assessments and houses are just appearing everywhere.
- Rural three is a misnomer. It was meant to be 25 per cent developed but this isn't happening and most consents are non-compliant. Need to change rural three to rural residential as it is giving the big developers opportunity to do as they like.
- Why aren't Rough Island and Rabbit Island not being looked at? There's a lot of room there for development.

It was noted that Rough and Rabbit Islands are Crown land which the Tasman District Council administers on the Crown's behalf. In response to questions, Mr Garnett clarified that to enable the rural three settings, wastewater issues could be offset by composting toilets or septic tanks.

Debbie Bidlake, Martin O'Connell and Sue Brown Federated Farms New Zealand (31820)

Ms Bidlake discussed:

- The need to protect what's left of highly productive land.
- Should be building in and up not out. The NPS for highly productive land will support this approach and is not the same as the FDS direction.

Mr O'Connell discussed:

- More intensification in places like Wakefield, Murchison and Tapawera. With all the hops development, housing for staff is needed. Development needs to use existing infrastructure.
- Once houses go next to agriculture, there are bound to be reverse sensitivity tensions that lead to complaints.
- Make use of what areas are already developed. Needs to be plan and council led, not developer led.

Ms Brown discussed:

- Tasman has made it simpler for second dwellings to be on a property, such as tiny homes. Why is this not done in Nelson?
- Need to think about some more creative alternative options, leasing land and parking tiny mobile homes on it.

In response to questions, they clarified that in Golden Bay there have been a lot of remote workers, since Covid the number has increased in terms of people living in Golden Bay and working remotely. Murchison, Tapawera, Wakefield are all full, there is a huge demand for labour and housing.

The meeting adjourned at 12.40 pm and resumed at 1.22 pm

Gary Clark (31595)

Mr Clark raised concerns around his land, T125.

- The 2019 FDS assessment supported commercial zoning, but the previous owner didn't want to change zoning. Now Mr Clark wants to change zoning, and he has struggled to get engagement from Tasman District Council.
- He has now been told the land has flooding and inundation concerns and that iwi have concerns over rezoning, but in 2019 none of these issues appeared. He hadn't heard of any issues with iwi until he was advised by the Council. He noted that the land has been heavily modified so he is unsure what the concerns are.
- There isn't a lot of commercial land in Māpua and what there is isn't on suitable land. T125 is one of few suitable sites suitable for intensification.

In response to questions, Mr Clark is unsure what issues iwi have to date. He noted that he has tried to engage but hasn't been able to progress the matter. He thinks it might be about the water take on the property. He considers that development of his land is an opportunity to provide more employment in the Māpua area, and it is an opportunity to provide currently missing services like a supermarket and medical centre. He would aim to develop seven hectares of the 11 available into commercial, depending on need. The site would tie in with other nearby commercial operators. Only recently purchased the last block of land so he hasn't had the opportunity to engage with local community groups.

Joe Roberts (31662)

Mr Roberts submission relates to a piece of land owned next to proposed T102.

- Subdivision is already underway in T102 and he would like to develop his land at the same time. He needs a decision as there is the potential to connect to subdivision infrastructure.
- Will yield at least 40 sections, that could be available very quickly. Almost shovel ready.
- There is some land with potential flood risk, but this could be mitigated.

Andrew Spittal, Spittal Properties Limited (31809)

Mr Spittal raised concerns around two greenfield developments near existing urban areas.

- Developments should to connect to existing communities and the councils need to make sure there is enough land to keep building houses to meet demand.
- There are 560 sections in his current development, 75 percent have already sold. Starting to run out of land if we are going to meet demand. His last release of land sold in five minutes.
- Can't see intensification meeting needs. The FDS has identified a lot of good sites.

David and Vicki James (31541)

Mr James raised concerns for Tahunanui:

- Proposed six-storey buildings are not suitable for the area, if they must be built, they need to back onto banks.
- There are already issues with parking and traffic and stormwater failing now. The latest sea level rise report hasn't been covered in the FDS. The council needs to address these existing issues before adding more to pressure on the systems.
- He proposes that any new developments need to either be owner occupied or have a minimum lease term of three years to make sure that they provide accommodation for locals.
- Need to stop building on the most fertile land.

In response to a question, preference would be maximum three-storey buildings with parking on site and owner occupied.

Chris Fryberg (31685)

Mr Fryberg referred to flaws in the secondary proposal of the FDS:

- According to the draft FDS there are 3200 proposed dwellings in T168 and T166, but these are already consents for Aporo Valley - it's a rural-residential valley. There will be radical consequences on amenity value.
- Page 69 of the FDS states that these new sites are one community but that is misleading as they are 11 kilometres apart by road, they are on different roads, and residents children will attend different schools.
- T168 is already affected by coastal inundation, which is only likely to get worse.
- Appears a lot of disadvantages for the sites being left out of the FDS.
- There are 300 landowners in T166, T167 and T168, yet in FDS says there are a handful of owners.
- No mention is made of the previous objections raised. T167 has already been through a consent hearing, the outcome was to keep the amenity value.
- Page 70 has a table in colour which shows outcomes against scenarios, option seven has poorer outcomes than option six. There is no employment in these areas, the kids need to be sent to schools, this will generate more greenhouse gases.

Joanna Santa Barbara (31636) – Nelson Tasman Climate Forum

Ms Santa Barbara raised the following concerns:

- Greenfield development has the highest climate change impact, particularly by generating carbon emissions. The FDS needs to focus on cutting carbon emissions by half. So, the councils need to target a seven per cent reduction per year.
- The recently release report on sea level rise means considerable replanning will be needed.
- Tasman can't afford the sprawl, is already amongst the worst in the world with carbon emissions according to Stats NZ. Amongst the worst car users. We can't afford that reputation.
- Sprawl development is an ongoing burden on the Council. Instead, money needs to be focused on good public transport.
- Greenfield development will further put pressure on the Council's resources.
- She has expertise in energy saving and happy to share this with the Council.

Hayden Taylor spoke for Mrs Rowena Smith - Ngāti Apa ki te Rā Tō Charitable Trust (31552)

Mr Taylor and Mrs Smith provided some clarification around their submission.

- There was some confusion with the Council around the land area and potential zoning. Clarification was provided to Council staff.
- Clarification on site T195, referred to a large piece of land that is owned by the Crown. It has been part of a land swap agreement with Ngāti Apa. It's a 2000 square metre piece of land not the larger piece of land which is owned by the Crown and administered by Department of Conservation. The comments refers to the bottom red corner of the site.

- The residential zone and papakāinga zoning would be a good fit.

The meeting adjourned at 2.47pm and resumed 2.51pm.

In response to questions, they propose this lot is used as papakāinga zoning. There might be a marae for sleeping/community hall. There wouldn't be a large development and it would be sympathetic to the land. Acknowledged mana whenua for the considerations around the community centre and wider community.

The meeting adjourned at 3.02pm and returned at 3:20pm

Mr Gaire Thompson (31853)

Mr Thompson spoke to his report noting:

- There is too much development on good horticulture land by Richmond. Should build on the hills (e.g. land between Nelson and Richmond). Benefits of building on hills are: cheaper, down-hill drainage (less infrastructure required), fewer issues with multi-storey buildings restricting views and sunlight (supports healthy homes).
- Relocatable buildings in coastal areas (e.g. Mapua) should be allowed. Infrastructure is already there.
- He doesn't support intensification of Mapua, as it will destroy the town's character.
- He supports development of the ex-forestry block on the coastal side of the Moutere highway.
- He doesn't support three storey buildings proposed by Government for Nelson. Shade and blocking view are issues.
- He opposes eight storey blocks for social housing in Nelson CBD area.
- Development on Walters Bluff is a good option (terrace style), close to town, gets the sun.
- Need to protect horticultural land, to feed people and export food.

In response to questions Mr Thompson stated that he is currently putting five apartments on top of what was a single storey building, but inner-city intensification is expensive and difficult. He is opposed to development along SH6 Wakefield due to potential of speed limits reducing, which will increase travel times.

Jackie McNae (31819), on behalf of Ahimia Ltd (R & S Griffin and M & L Griffin)

Ms McNae spoke on behalf of Ahimia Ltd noting that they:

- Support development of N-100, as it will create great recreational links and won't impact established neighbourhoods. Two small accommodation units being established here as a pilot project for smaller homes. Site should support mixed density development, with three storey buildings in some areas.
- Want T-114 amended to include Ahimia land above Angelus Ave (Special Housing Areas), over 7ha, currently Rural Res. Consent for mixed housing development has been obtained. Working through geo-tech issues.
- Support the Upper area at 218 Champion Road. 170 ha, provides recreational (mount bike park) and environmental values. Need planning provisions to support commercial activity here.

Jackie McNae (31803) on behalf of S & D King

- Supports T-17. Some physical constraints on the site, but where possible, they want to subdivided to 500sqm lot sizes. Developers are working on a development proposal, and are waiting for zone change to finalise the development.

In response to a question, Ms McNae advised that they did not think a Plan Change for this site was the right process (due to scale and timing).

Jackie McNae (31821) on behalf of Bill and Erica Lynch

Ms McNae spoken on behalf of Bill and Erica Lynch, noting:

- They support T-033 being included in the FDS. The land once supported an orchard, but became difficult to run in an urban environment with cross boundary issues. They have a vision of mixed density, a level of high and medium density around the lake and lower density around the steeper slopes. The site is inland, elevated and adjacent to existing residential zone.
- The site employment opportunities here (e.g. small café and childcare facility).
- Tasman District Council needs to update compact density rules in the TRMP. The rules currently cause issues around micromanagement and prescription.

Jackie McNae (31814) on behalf of Pharmalink and New Zealand Hops

Ms McNae spoke on behalf of Pharmalink and New Zealand Hops noting:

- They are landowners on Appleby State Highway, requesting to re-zone their properties to rural industrial zone (currently mainly rural 1). Critical industries for the region. Zoning correction would match what is already consented on site.
- Without rezoning, they will have to continue to apply for resource consents for their activities.

In response to questions, Ms McNae confirmed they want both properties zoned rural industrial.

Jackie McNae (31811) on behalf of Mahau and Dayson Nominees

Ms McNae spoke with Barry Thompson and Michael Thompson.

- The joint submission, supported T-117 and T-178 being used for business growth. Would like sites to be added to the Richmond South Plan Change.
- There is a need for more business land. They are committed to redevelop T-117 and T-178 once rezoned.
- Mr Thompson's current development plans: development for Trinder Engineering, including a small office block, already have resource consent to use a residential property as an office space, Brown estate would like to develop their landholding around and including Three Brothers Corner.

In response to questions Ms McNae advised that once rezoned they intend to develop (for business) the property along the frontage of Gladstone Road. Access points off Gladstone Road with back exit near the railway reserve. They want traffic diverted through Poutama Street.

Jackie McNae (31806) on behalf of Project & Ventures Ltd and on behalf of Richmond Pohara Holdings Ltd (31813)

Graeme Dick spoke for Projects and Ventures:

- He requested a meeting over his proposal for land development in the Braeburn and Mahana area.
- He considers the FDS should be amended to look at growth needs with a high growth methodology. Currently it will not achieve what is necessary to gain adequate supply and demand balance.
- He supports intensification for a range of housing densities.
- Growth elements should be available in all settlements. Limited supply increases unaffordability.
- He questioned why Hira was removed from FDS as a potential development site.

Ms McNae spoke for Richmond Pohara Holdings Ltd:

- They support growth for Golden Bay.
- Half of the property is a Special Housing Area (SHA), with resource consent for 73 residential allotments.
- Not in the FDS due to iwi raising concerns over cultural heritage, being a site of significance, the risk of flooding and having a possible wetland.
- They want elevated areas (owned and quarried by Golden Bay Cement) to be identified as a residential area. Happy for lower areas to be left out, to work with iwi on their concerns for those area and monitor flood mitigation issues.

The meeting adjourned at 4:40pm and resumed at 5:55pm

Jackie McNae (31804) on behalf of McCliskie and Marr

- Wants their property in Golden Hills Road included in the FDS for rural residential. Would like this to then be included for rezoning in the Tasman Environment Plan (TEP). The McCliskie property is 11.5ha and the Marr property is 13ha. Currently rural 1 closed, where subdivision is prohibited.
- Original owner planted a vineyard which was unsuccessful. The land has some level of productivity, but it is not as good as the Waimea Plains. The Marr's removed the vineyard.

Joanna Hopkinson (31754)

Ms Hopkinson noted:

- She supports re-zoning land in Murchison, as it will allow for needed growth. Current zoning has stopped natural growth. Noted that if she hadn't developed a motel into residential housing, six professionals would have had to leave.
- Conversation with staff and landowners suggest Murchison FDS numbers are optimistic. Concerned number of sites will be reduced (e.g only a few sites will actually be rezoned and developed). She questioned what the realistic yield is for Murchison.
- Ms Hopkinson questioned differing information on Murchison and other rural towns growth. Webinar referenced a study which indicated Murchison would not grow. FDS states Murchison is experiencing growth pressures. Wants to see the referenced study.

Nic John and Jo Tuffery (31834) (late submission)

- Does not want Nelson/Tasman to become a Tier 1 environment under NPSUD.

- FDS should consider protecting cultural and heritage areas. NPS allows FDS to be tailored to do this. The Councils lack a Strategy or capability in the heritage space.
- Changes to the RMA to exclude people from the process, won't allow for best outcomes. Council signed up to the Urban Design Panel, which mentions the need to incorporate a wide range of stakeholders at a regional and neighbourhood level.
- FDS needs to be measured. Make it easy for people to understand and respond to the change that will come out of it.
- Community should be at the centre of the FDS. Focus on building communities and what the community wants to achieve as a region. FDS leaves development of urban environment to developers.

In response to questions, Mr John explained that we need to respect the values of the Tier 2 environment (greenspaces, not becoming a mini large city with high rise buildings). Need to create an environment that balances intensification with things our community values (e.g walkable city, maintain heritage and cultural values).

David Lucas (31777)

Mr Lucas commented on:

- The need to retain Nelson's small provincial city values (including the connection with nature and maintain heritage values). Inner city buildings should be multiple storeys. He objects to three storey townhouses elsewhere.
- The need to improve the FDS provisions to encourage inner-city apartments on the first and second floor of inner-city shops. Look to renovate more large historic homes into multiple dwellings.
- The need to include retirement village numbers in Nelson building statistics.

Julie Sherratt (31779)

- Wants further sites in Takaka to be included in the FDS. Small pockets of rural land between areas of housing, not far from Takaka (e.g Dodson Road). Pockets still zoned highly productive, but due to proximity to houses and size, they are no longer used for farming e.g., Dodson Road.
- Dodson Road is above the flood plain, inland from the coast, available sewerage system infrastructure here, next to a sealed bike path, within 2-3kms to amenities. People want to live here.

In response to questions, Ms Sherratt clarified that the Dodson Road area she was referring to is between the highway and Dodson Road. She does not know if the current landowners will be supportive of developing here, but they should have the ability to do so.

Ben Williams (31808) on behalf of Radio New Zealand Ltd

Mr Williams did not appear.

Kerensa Johnston (31700) on behalf of Wakatū and NRAIT

Iain Sheves commented:

- He is unclear on how Tasman Village sites will be serviced. There is no funding in the LTP.
- They would not support water sourced from Motueka river (transfer of water between catchments), on cultural and environmental grounds. Inconsistent with tikanga and the Treaty of Waitangi. Expensive and impracticable.

- Focus should be on sustainable developments that align with the carrying capacity of the proposed area.
- Only support intensification where budgets for infrastructure are in place, and where shared outdoors areas are provided.
- The market, getting building permission, and the typology of multi-storey residential projects makes them challenging to deliver in the region at an affordable level. Main issue is cost of land development.
- Need to detail in the FDS how to address the effect of infill housing on reduced private outdoor space and availability of existing reserves.
- They would like an agreed framework with Waka Kotahi for support and resourcing to deal with increased loading on the trunk roading corridor.
- The FDS focuses employment and commercial activities towards Richmond. He questioned what the economic future of Nelsons CBD is.
- FDS needs to acknowledge the de-carbonisation focus in the traffic sector.
- The FDS should avoid sprawl and maintain character by utilising greenbelt zones around greenfield development.
- They don't support low density rural development. It is inefficient and diminishes rural character.
- Little coordination between the Infrastructure Acceleration Fund (IAF) and FDS (eg. Horiorangi (IAF proposal supported by the Council but site rejected from FDS) and 100 Bryant Road Brightwater (included in the FDS but the Council did not support IAF proposal)). The Councils need to improve coordination between policy and infrastructure teams.
- Seeks the inclusion of Horiorangi in the FDS.

In response to questions, Mr Sheves noted that it is difficult to create empty space within developments when going from low density to medium/high density. The Councils need to give developers information on what open spaces should look like. Greenbelts around greenfield developments will create greenspace and promote intensification.

Mr Paul McIntosh - (31684) – Māpua and Districts Community Association

Mr McIntosh spoke on behalf of the Māpua and Districts Community Association covering the following topics:

- The pace and number of changes in Māpua is overwhelming.
- Need continued community communication (including providing updated plans). Improve co-ordination and effectiveness of the communications.
- Ensure the balance of increased development and reserves/amenities is right.
- Need more clarification on Māpua growth predications. They would like to see the basis of the information for the people coming to live in Māpua and working from home.
- Focus on working with the environment rather than against it (e.g. wetlands instead of artificial detention ponds).

In response to questions, Mr McIntosh advised that he did not think there are concerns around insufficient commercial land for business in the area. People do not want to consolidate

commercial activity around the town centre. They are not anti-growth. Need more information on active transport networks.

Susan Drew (31571)

Ms Drew commented:

- She is opposed to development in the Maitai. Protect it for future generations.
- Questioned why is development planned for in the low lying areas of Orchard Flat.
- Concerned about wildlife and environmental effects of development on the area.
- Need to protect highly productive land.
- Urbanise our city centres instead.

In response to a question, Ms Drew advised that she walks along Orchard flats (up to Kaka Valley) on a regular basis.

Mayor Reese thanked the staff for all their mahi and dedication to the work involved with the FDS.

A general discussion was held and covered the following points.

- Any questions the panel have will be emailed to Council staff.
- Concern about whether staff will be able to address the hearing questions in time to meet the deliberations report deadline.
- Ms Kara-France requested the panel move into confidential session at 7:38pm.

Moved Cr Maling/Cr McGurk

SH22-04-2

That the public be excluded from the following part(s) of the proceedings of this meeting. The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution follows.

This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by section 6 or section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public, as follows:

CARRIED

Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Particular interest(s) protected (where applicable)	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.	s7(2)(c)(i) The withholding of the information is necessary to protect information which is subject to an obligation of confidence or which any person has been or could be compelled to provide under the authority of any enactment, where the making available of	s48(1)(a) The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.

	the information would be likely to prejudice the supply of similar information or information from the same source and it is in the public interest that such information should continue to be supplied.	
--	--	--

The meeting resumed in public session at 7.48pm.

Ms Kara-France offered the closing karakia.

The hearing concluded at 7:50pm

Date Confirmed:

Chair:

Unconfirmed