

---

**MINUTES**  
of the  
**SUBMISSIONS HEARING MEETING**  
**Māpua Masterplan**  
held  
**9.30 am - Wednesday, 26 March 2025**  
at  
**Tasman Council Chamber, 189 Queen Street, Richmond**

---

The [video recording](#) of this meeting is available on the Council's YouTube channel

**Present:** **Councillor** K Maling (Chair), Mayor T King, Deputy Mayor S Bryant, Councillors C Butler, G Daikee, B Dowler, J Ellis, C Hill, M Kininmonth, C Mackenzie, B Maru, D Shallcrass and T Walker

**In Attendance:** Group Manager – Service and Strategy (J Ridd), Strategic Policy Manager (D Fletcher), Principal Planner – Environmental Policy (A McKenzie), Governance Officer (R Grover) and Governance Support Officer (Mairéad Calder)

**Absent:** Councillor M Greening

**1 OPENING, WELCOME**

The Chair opened the meeting and Councillor Mackenzie offered the opening Karakia.

**2 APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

**Moved Councillor Dowler/Deputy Mayor Bryant**  
**SH25-03-1**

**That the apologies be accepted from Mayor King for lateness.**  
**CARRIED**

**3 REPORTS**

### **3.1 Draft Māpua Masterplan Submissions Hearing**

Principal Planner – Environmental Policy, Anna McKenzie, presented the report.

#### **Moved Councillor Ellis/Councillor Kininmonth SH25-03-2**

#### **That the Māpua Masterplan Submissions Hearing**

- 1. receives the Draft Māpua Masterplan Submissions Hearing Report RSH25-03-1; and**
- 2. accepts and considers all submissions received on the draft Māpua Masterplan during the submission period of 1 November 2024 to 16 February 2025; and**
- 3. accepts and considers the following late submissions received on the draft Māpua Masterplan:**
  - 3.1 17 February 2025 - Ridgeview Developments Ltd**
  - 3.2 18 February 2025 - Trevor Marshall on behalf of the Māpua Boat Ramp Community Trust**
  - 3.3 20 February 2025 - Jesse Loader on behalf of the Tamaha Sea Scouts; and**
- 4. declines to accept any late submissions on the draft Māpua Masterplan received after 21 February 2025.**

#### **CARRIED**

Attachment 1 Gary Clark & Lynette Graham - presentation submission #34626

Attachment 2 Vincent Revell and Nelson Tasman 2050 - presentation submissions #34708 and #34679

Attachment 3 Jan Heijs - presentation submission #34601

Attachment 4 Jackie McNae - Staig & Smith Ltd - Bill & Erica Lynch - tabled documents #34678

Attachment 5 Bruce Struthers - presentation submission #34707

Attachment 6 Bruce Struthers - tabled documents #34707

Attachment 7 Trevor Marshall - Mapua Boat Ramp Community Trust - presentation submission #34702

Attachment 8 Mapua Boat Ramp Community Trust - tabled documents #34702

Attachment 9 Waimea Inlet Forum Working Group - presentation submission #34626

Attachment 10 Melanie Drewery - speaker notes #34596

Attachment 11 Henk Vermeer - speaker notes #34569

Attachment 12 Elspeth Collier - Waimea Inlet Forum Working Group - tabled documents #34626

## **4 HEARING OF SUBMISSIONS**

### **4.1 Submitter: Mike Emanuel spoke to submission 34573**

#### **Points highlighted:**

- The format of the submission form was subjective, he felt it was not fair to ask the public what he should be doing with his property
- He disagreed with the changing of the zoning. The property would only be used for residential, so he would expect it to stay as rural residential or residential

- He disagreed with road widening for walkway and cycleway placement and noted the environmental impacts on birds
- He did not want any development on his property.

There were no questions.

- 4.2 **Submitter:** Gary Clark (via Zoom) & Lynette Graham, provided a PowerPoint presentation and spoke to submission 34626

There were no questions.

- 4.3 **Submitter:** Clare Kininmonth spoke to submission 34631

**Points highlighted:**

- Her concerns were:
  - climate change and possible storm damage to Seaton Valley Stream
  - the number of 200 - 300 m<sup>2</sup> and 450m<sup>2</sup> sections that would fit into a residential property
  - the level of recontouring of land that would be required
  - the hillside development in a major catchment area
- She supported infill housing as part of a well planned development with varying section sizes to accommodate the needs of a mixed community
- A retention pond should be the responsibility of the developer
- Tourist operations were at their peak at the Wharf
- What was going to operate out of the newly zoned land.

There were no questions.

- 4.5 **Submitter:** Vincent Revell provided a PowerPoint presentation (combined for submissions 34708 and 34679) and Vincent Revell and Timo Neubauer, on behalf of Nelson Tasman 2050, spoke to submission 34679

**Points highlighted:**

- Intensification as a key strategy for vibrant and sustainable communities, whilst preserving rural land
- Engagement did not go far enough regarding intensification
- Mapua was not the right place for this development, which did not comply with many of the objectives of the Future Development Strategy
- This would equate to a negative rates revenue for the Council
- The business model was fundamentally wrong
- All new housing should be medium density or mixed use as a minimum
- Spatial design guidelines to give clear guidance and rules to developers.

**Questions and Responses:**

- Market forces – had Nelson Tasman 2050 thought about leading as a group or being a starter or done any research in this area – they were conveying research that had been done by others. Council needed to look at operational long term costs, rather than only initial capital investment.

- Assuming boats went up and down the channels, would that prohibit boating – You could build boardwalks with bridges with a raised part in the middle that boats could travel through.

4.6 **Submitter:** Jan Heijts provided a PowerPoint presentation and spoke to submission 34601  
There were no questions.

4.7 **Submitter:** Rob Ford, on behalf of Andy & Jane Brown, spoke to submission 34636

**Points highlighted:**

- 120 Hicks Road - concerns regarding proposed future commercial zoning. There was currently a stream running through there and soil testing in that area which showed that pavement design in that area would be extremely expensive for commercial development
- 175 Mapua Drive – the hazard overlay inundation area would come right up to the water
- Commercial zone locations were not suitable and would be a high cost
- A large detention area would be better value than multiple detention ponds, there was a high cost for Council maintenance with lots of these.
- Areas should be looked at more closely and cost effectively with regard to legislation as to what could be built
- The coastal feel and atmosphere should be retained, what would the foreshore look like in 100 – 150 years.

**Questions and Responses:**

- What might a coastal feel look like in terms of a development – Mapua was sitting within a coastal environment zone, yet Council was trying to commercialise it like Richmond. They shouldn't be developing a high density subdivision 200 metres from the foreshore. There was a need to look at the longer-term picture.

4.8 **Submitter:** Jackie McNae - Staig & Smith Ltd, and Mr Bill Lynch tabled supporting information and spoke to submission 34678

**Points highlighted:**

- General support for the plan
- They requested that it reflect the delineation of the plan that had been tabled, this was a property dominated by contour and any development opportunities needed to work with that contour
- They sought to work with the areas that they had identified for medium density, mixed density and standard density
- The main areas were clusters 10 and 11, which they saw as medium density for apartment style development, minimising levels of earthworks, with large green spaces surrounding and standard density in the rear corner
- The vision for this land fitted with feedback from the previous speakers, with a range of housing typology and the possibility of multi-generational living
- In the high level layout shown, cluster 12 at the foot of the lake, was envisaged as an area that could be a shared office/workspace

- Mr Lynch referred to his Queensland residence, where multi-generational living had become very popular with families and provided flexibility for a whole-of-lifetime experience.

There were no questions.

- 4.9 **Submitter:** Bruce Struthers presented a PowerPoint presentation, tabled supporting information, and spoke to submission 34707

**Points highlighted:**

- Nature events are challenging to navigate - Mr Struthers presented a comparison between Mapua and Pacific Palisades, California, highlighting similarities in natural hazards and the importance of considering these factors in development
- Expressed concerns about housing demand and the potential for development to negatively impact the area's character
- Run off from orchards burdening storm water treatment
- All four environmental plan changes need to be completed first and development within Māpua should be frozen until a real housing supply deficit presents itself.

There were no questions.

Mayor King joined the meeting (Zoom) at 10.30am.

- 4.10 **Submitter:** Marion Satherley spoke to submission 34687

**Points highlighted:**

- Supported the concept of the Māpua Masterplan but raised concerns around the loss of unique character, community engagement, and housing options
- Supportive of intensification in Māpua village only
- Protecting Māpua including the Māpua boatramp, part of Māpua's unique identity
- Support variations of housing options (other than Greenfield developments) to enable low income households to become home owners
- Concerned about community engagement – letters were sent to land owners - she was not contacted
- Ensuring future planning serves residents
- Transportation concerns
- Climate change impacts.

There were no questions.

- 4.11 **Submitter:** Colin Walker (34694) – did not attend.

- 4.12 **Submitter:** Trevor Marshall, on behalf of Mapua Boat Ramp Community Trust, presented a PowerPoint presentation, tabled supporting information, and spoke to submission 34702

- The Trust requested use of land at site 14 and 16 and requested that this land become a green space (recreational land), proposing a community facility be built at Kite Park for marine groups. He noted that the Trust would fundraise for the building and asked only for use of the land through a gift or lease from the Council

- He requested that the Council zone the area for recreational use to allow for the proposed building.
- Clarifying the land use at Franz's Kite Park from open space to recreational land use – He suggested the use of the Council's special rate levy to cover cost of the new proposed facility development. It was advised the rate is still currently being paid in relation to the remediation.

**Questions and Responses:**

- Have you got a date for when your consent is going to be determined for the proposed building? – around the middle of April 2025.

4.13 **Submitter:** Carsten Buschkuehle on behalf of Tasman Bay Estates Ltd, spoke to submission 34691

**Points highlighted:**

- Supported housing options that included smaller land lots and small scale houses to cater to a wide range of the community
- Noted the rental shortage and felt existing rentals were rundown.

**Questions and Responses:**

- I wanted to understand the Polygon that represented your land, what numbers Horton Road and Marriages Road? - Numbers are difficult, it's from Marriages Road, when you drive into Marriages Road and to the right hand side all the way over to Horton Road.

The meeting was adjourned at 10.55am and reconvened at 11.08am.

4.14 **Submitter:** Melanie Drewery spoke to submission 34596

**Points highlighted:**

- 300% rates increase
- Democracy and property owner rights
- Developer benefits outweighed community benefits
- Concerned about the rezoning of land and the potential impact on properties
- Seaton Valley – walkway/cycleway land concerns
- Concerned about the accuracy of the draft Māpua Masterplan and the potential for land acquisition
- Lack of consultation with landowners and the decision to progress with Option 1A despite consultation feedback
- Noted the need for infrastructure to accommodate population growth.

There were no questions.

4.15 **Submitter:** Henk Vermeer spoke to submission 34569

**Points highlighted:**

- Opposed that part of 179 Mapua Drive is marked as a wetland

- He was concerned around stormwater management and was opposed to a shared pathway drainage through farmed property on Seaton Valley Road
- Seaton Valley residents were opposed to land zone being changed to commercial
- Required land testing to confirm suitability for commercial use
- Local knowledge and consultation
- Infrastructure to be in place to accommodate for population growth
- Poor roading conditions

There were no questions.

4.16 **Submitter:** Elspeth Collier, on behalf of Waimea/Waimeha Inlet Forum Working Group, presented a PowerPoint presentation and spoke to submission 34629

**Points highlighted:**

- Ecological importance of Māpua and surrounding areas located in a dynamic part of the Waimea estuary
- The presence of significant natural areas and the importance of the Māpua embayment for various bird species, including at-risk and declining populations
- She was concerned about human activities impacting wildlife, especially dogs disturbing nesting areas of variable oyster catchers
- Suggested the inclusion of a new walkway in the Māpua Masterplan that would avoid nesting and feeding areas
- Supported the proposal to reclassify Franz's Kite Park as an open space - so long as it remained grassed and available for birds to continue foraging there.

**Questions and Responses:**

- What percentage of the population of pied oyster catchers reside in the Mapua area? and do you have the figure? – noted in her original submission, those figures came from David Melville – around 3% of the world's population are in Tasman Bay.

4.17 **Submitter:** Jim Vause spoke to submission 34690

**Points highlighted:**

- Community wellbeing
- Lack of community and iwi engagement
- Meetings put on by the MDCA
- He noted that the draft Māpua Masterplan lacked details about the process of information and knowledge from the consultation and how issues were outweighed and considered
- Development and transport increases and carbon footprint reduction
- Energy supply, electrical supply and key infrastructure defined by the Treasury – internet (fibre capability is lacking in Māpua)
- Social assets and community need
- Elderly care and primary health care had not been factored into the plan
- Environmental impacts.

There were no questions.

- 4.18 **Submitter:** Jesse Loader and Amanda Brett, on behalf of Tamaha Sea Scouts, spoke to submission 34703

**Points highlighted:**

- Tamaha Sea Scouts works with the boatshed on the wharf and the need for a hall and green space, separated from the wharf area
- boatshed location impacts, noting that the group (Sea Scouts) were at risk of becoming 'Land Scouts' if they were based a certain distance from the wharf, and expressed their opposition to the boatshed being moved further from the waterfront
- The group had a long waitlist for new members.

**Questions and Responses:**

- How long was the wait list? – 18 youth are on the waitlist and more leaders/volunteers to address the waiting list were required.

- 4.19 **Submitter:** Tim Kelly and Belinda Crisp, Nelson Tasman Cycle Trails Trust, spoke to submission 34614

**Points highlighted:**

- Great taste trail usage
- Māpua to Rabbit Island (hourly) Ferry connection high cost and vessel life span concerns
- Māpua Masterplan process was about facilitated growth in the Māpua area, they noted growth in the region was forecasted at 60% over the next 30 years
- Supported proactive planning and internal and external connectivity improvement.
- Policy decisions

**Questions and Responses:**

- The cycle bridge you talked about, we have looked at this for other forums and the cost is large, do you think that cyclists would contribute to costs and pay a toll? – I would happily pay a toll to use a facility but we are not quite sure how you would enforce that toll.
- Has the Trust considered a land-based link around the edge of the estuary and any research or debate been undertaken around that option? – this was considered in the Great Taste Trail Business Plan in 2011 and the result was that the cost was similar to building the bridge and would not be of benefit or utilised.

- 4.20 **Submitter:** Lesley McIntyre spoke to submission 34623

**Points highlighted:**

- Future commercial development growth
- Seaton Valley proposed wetland area and effected land owners being compensated fairly by developers
- Noted housing resource was there (Tasman and New Zealand wide) which was presently used for short-term lets (Airbnb, short-term rentals) and more availability for New Zealanders would mean less housing required.

There were no questions.



The meeting was adjourned at 12.05pm and reconvened at 12.48pm.

4.21 **Submitter:** Andrew Clayton (34639) Andrew & Rebecca Clayton – did not attend.

4.22 **Submitter:** Helen Lane, Māpua Tennis Club (including committee), spoke to submission 34663

**Points highlighted:**

- Ongoing support to Māpua Tennis Club from Council was acknowledged, she noted resurfacing of courts three and four and new lights were installed which had generated more court use in particular from youths
- Hoping for support from council to have courts one and two resurfaced in the future
- Picnic tables were needed outside the courts and that there were no seating areas currently for children or parents
- E gate sticking issues, seeking support from the Council
- Pickleball courts demand for the future
- The need for a power supply socket that would be used for the sweeper and ball machine
- Consideration of other courts at a different location in the long term
- 100 year anniversary was coming up and the Club organised a celebration and would reach out to councillors and staff for the 2026 celebration.

**Questions and Responses:**

- Golden Bay Rec Park - painted to accommodate multiple sports and an asphalt service were available.
- Is the Club an incorporated society – we raised issues as a committee and agreed it is not a priority at this time.

4.23 **Submitter:** David and Priscilla Young (34688) – did not attend.

4.24 **Submitter:** Bruce Gilkison spoke to submission 34666

**Points highlighted:**

- The Māpua Masterplan was intended to plan for the next 30 years through to 2055, by that time New Zealand would be required to be netzero carbon for at least five years by then and concerns around commute to Richmond
- Great Taste Trail and concerns around the Ferry limiting the use of the trail
- Supported increased bus frequencies
- Supported the implementation of a safe cycle trail from Māpua Drive to Redwood Road
- Community resilience – low reliance on fuel and livestock

There were no questions.

4.25 **Submitter:** Rene Kampman spoke to submission 34680

**Points highlighted:**

- Opposed amalgamation of Waterfront Park into Kite park (turning into a single reserve) as Kite Park was under stress from competing uses
- Kite Park is used for active recreation – dog walking, kids on motorbikes, golf and the waterfront park is used for passive recreation – viewing, dining, people gathering
- Supported affordable housing for the community
- Kite Park rezoned land – referenced Queenstown Lakes Housing Community Trust and low to moderate income housing
- Supported the Cultural Heritage Management Plan and noted the binary decision if it was to become cultural under the Cultural Heritage Management Plan, which would mean boating would finish at Grossi Point.

**Questions and Responses:**

- Grossi Point Cultural Heritage Management plan, is that for all of Grossi point or just part of it? – unsure, but they should do one for the whole crossing including Waterfront Park and Kite Park.

4.26 **Submitter:** Dr Chris Van Staden (via Zoom) spoke to submission 34634

**Points highlighted:**

- Resident of Māpua – expressed concerned about the village feel of Māpua and how future planned developments would impact this
- Supported the preservation of the old parts of Māpua Village
- Traffic volumes had increased in Hicks Road, noted support of lower speed limits on this road
- Tree planting needed to increase and replace removed trees on roadsides and in parks.

**Questions and Responses:**

- What was your interpretation of the village feel? – people being able to walk to the wharf rather than drive, pedestrian and cycle friendly and family friendly/inclusive with trees and low traffic.

4.27 **Submitter:** Phillip Percy (planner), on behalf of Andrew and Susan Talley, (via Zoom) and spoke to submission 34692

**Points highlighted:**

- Felt that the Māpua Masterplan should be declined in its current form and needed more constraints and analysis
- The flood and stormwater modelling didn't accommodate for sea level rise
- Environmental planning, Plan change 85 and natural hazards

**Questions and Responses:**

- In para 41 of the submission it states for example, Mapua had issues with drinking water, water quality, quantity and available capacity for new homes. I thought that there wasn't a quality issue with respect to Mapua drinking water, are you able to provide any more information on that point? – that was advice received from Mr and Mrs Talley's engineering consultant and I haven't got the specific detail on the quality side of things

and certainly some challenges around upgrading and extending infrastructure supply development in that area, in terms of specifically relating to quality.

- You talk about the plan being an integrated approach and you know this plan sets out to inform future changes and zoning infrastructure for the area. -Comparisons to other masterplans, is there less information, could the details your clients wished to see be coming in the next stages of the process? – I think from my experience across the country I've seen examples where Master Planning has been done, where that evidence development has occurred very early on. I think the logic I support is that if you're going to be doing integrated planning, then, understanding what those constraints might do to key parts of your integrated development is essential. Otherwise, when those later processes come through and the information's found, it creates problems. Then your whole masterplan potentially gets unstitched. I've been involved in processes from a submission point of view where that work has been not done well.

#### 4.28 **Submitter:** Sonja Mitchell (via Zoom) spoke to submission 34709

##### **Points highlighted:**

- Opposed the draft Māpua Masterplan and noted it should be paused to allow progression of a new draft that meaningfully responds to the feedback received and properly reflects the principles identified
- Opposed to a new greenfield development
- Opposed amalgamation of the two parks – Kite Park and Māpua Waterfront Park
- Concerned around increased power boating activity in Waimea estuary - negatively affecting bird life and fish breeding grounds, as well as disturbing people's peaceful enjoyment of the estuary
- The plan would benefit from better public transparency around Māpua's contaminated hail sights
- Would like to see the masterplan better support and preferably enhance the Waimea Inlet Strategy and Action Plan
- The Māpua Masterplan accommodates a resource consent for a large boat ramp on Mapua Waterfront Park and a boat trailer park at Kite Park application - Despite that resource consent not yet having been granted.

There were no questions.

**Action:** Anna Mackenzie to contact Network Tasman to confirm there is adequate power supply for future growth in Māpua.

**Action:** Anna Mackenzie to report back to the panel in relation to growth forecasts (where the information came from) and government changes around RMA requirements and how the Māpua Masterplan fits into this.

**Action:** Anna Mackenzie to report back to the panel on alternative dog walking facilities, how we drew a polygon the location and why (impacts of this).

**Action:** Anne Mackenzie to report back to the panel in relation to inconsistencies with the development manual and to get this error clarified. HAIL sites data (different approach to Nelson – cut off when you get to Tasman).

**Action:** Anna Mackenzie to email Councillor Daikee about flooring models and commercial land – Stafford drive, Seaton Valley, Māpua Drive - interested to know if there is one for Option B around the outside.

- Action:** Anna Mackenzie to provide further information to the panel on the catchment management plan – what is being worked on currently including completeness and management of sea level rise and stormwater
- Action:** Anna Mackenzie to report back to Councillor Kininmonth in relation to 12 Seaton Valley Road – Forest was not on the Masterplan.
- Actions:** Anna Mackenzie to explore the Queenstown Lakes model for affordable housing (inform how and where).
- Actions:** John Ridd to update members on the Resource Management Act reforms following the public release of the blueprint and confirm what it could mean for us as a region and an overview of where it could lead us.

Councillor Butler offered the closing karakia.

## **5 CONFIDENTIAL SESSION**

Nil

The meeting concluded at 1.52pm.

Confirmed as a correct record of proceedings by resolution on Enter date .