
MINUTES
of the
DELIBERATIONS MEETING

held
9.00 am, Tuesday, 31 May 2022
11.00am, Wednesday 1 June 2022
9.00 am, Thursday 2 June 2022

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

- 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), Urban Growth Coordinator (J Deans), Environmental Policy Manager (B Johnson), Policy Planner (M Bengosi), Executive Assistant to the Mayor (R Scherer) and Executive Support Officer (G Drummond)
Nelson City Council – Group Manager Environmental Management (C Barton) Senior Analyst – Strategy and Environment (C Pawson)
- Part Attendance:** Tasman District Council – Strategic Policy Manager (D Fletcher), Senior Infrastructure Planning Advisor (D Bryant), Senior Infrastructure Planning Advisor – Water & Wastewater (K Arnold), Communications Officer (T O’Connell), Councillor Chris Hill, Graduate Community Policy Adviser (N Lindsay)
Nelson City Council – Councillors G Noonan and R Sanson
Barker and Associates – Cameron Wallace and Rachel Morgan
Sense Partners – Kirdan Lees

1 OPENING, WELCOME

Mayor Reese welcomed everyone to the meeting and invited Deputy Mayor Edgar to offer the opening karakia.

Mayor Reese invited the meeting participants to introduce themselves.

2 APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE

There were no apologies.

Ms Kara-France advised that she will leave the meeting briefly at 10.30 am.

3 REPORTS

3.1 Deliberations Hearing - Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy 2022-2052

Tasman District Council Group Manager – Service and Strategy, Susan Edwards introduced the report. She apologised that Nelson City Council, Senior Analyst – Strategy and Environment Process, Chris Pawson's name had been omitted as a co-author of the officer's report.

Ms Edwards summarised the consultation process to date and noted that 568 submissions had been received expressing a variety of views on a range of matters both for and against some of the proposals contained in the draft Future Development Strategy (FDS).

She reminded the elected members of the subcommittee's role which is to consider the views received and the advice provided by council officers and the consultants. Elected members should also be cognisant of what is required under the Resource Management Act and the Local Government Act before making their recommendations to the joint committee of both councils.

She added that the subcommittee needs to consider if it has a sufficient understanding of community views and preferences in order to make its decisions and recommendations to the joint committee, for example in terms of additional sites, sites to be amended or sites to be removed from the FDS. She noted that submissions are one input into the wider deliberations process. Ms Edwards noted that the final FDS is due to be signed off in August.

Responding to a question, Ms Edwards advised the subcommittee that it needs to consider the content, analysis and strength of each submission, rather than the numbers. The subcommittee should also look at the legal obligations and what both councils are trying to achieve for the community.

Tasman District Council, Urban Growth Coordinator, Jacqui Deans and Mr Pawson presented the report. Ms Deans advised that the deliberations would be managed through the key themes of the FDS.

Housing land capacity and uptake rate

Mr Pawson noted that the uptake rate is complex to determine and carries uncertainty. Staff had recommended a final uptake rate of 15% over 30 years. To give more reassurance to the chosen rate, the councils had engaged Sense Partners to provide some further assessment and commentary.

Kirdan Lees from Sense and Partners spoke about the uptake rate noting that it is not simple to find an appropriate rate. He said that by using existing work on uptake rates in other urban areas in New Zealand, 15% appeared to be a reasonable number for the joint Nelson-Tasman FDS.

Responding to a question about the options of intensification on both greenfield developments and on existing built areas, Mr Pawson clarified that intensification concentrates on options to demolish one dwelling, replacing it with more dwellings or backfilling sections. He added that the 15% uptake rate has only been applied to intensification of existing built areas. Ms Deans added that the consultation

summary of information document clearly explains intensification and this explanation can be included into the final FDS.

In response to submissions questioning the validity of the 15% uptake rate (i.e. 15% of suitable sites will be intensified over a 30 year period) used to inform capacity figures within the Draft FDS, sensitivity testing of various rates of uptake was undertaken to get an understanding of what this may mean for achievable (and realistic) capacity. Uptake rates of between 5% and 35% (at 5% intervals) were applied to FDS intensification and broader infill areas. In addition, the capacity within each intensification areas was tested against all Intensification Typologies proposed within the Draft FDS (i.e. all intensification areas would enable six storey residential development). This testing indicated that to achieve the required housing targets through intensification only, that between 30 to 35% of all sites where residential is enabled (e.g. residential zones and commercial centres) would be required to be redeveloped over the next 30-years. This intensification would also need to utilise development opportunities towards the theoretical maximum that has been assumed.

A further sensitivity test on varying intensification uptake by typology and location was undertaken as well as by decade. Under this testing, the majority of the increase would be expected to be realised in the third decade post 2042. As such, staff believe that the 15% uptake averaged over the 30-year duration of the FDS remains an appropriate measure on which to base capacity that could be realised by intensification areas in the FDS. If during regular monitoring, intensification uptake rates are tracking closer to these higher scenarios this would reduce the need to release/ enable greenfield sites also identified within the FDS.

Housing yield assumptions and different housing typologies were discussed. Barker and Associates consultant, Cameron Wallace noted that some of the sites in the FDS don't assume a range of housing typologies, while some do. He noted that the staff had assumed some relatively large lot sizes in some greenfield sites located away from urban areas, but in city centre areas, higher density housing was assumed.

Mr Pawson added that housing density is further considered at the next stage of the land development process, i.e., at the Plan change level.

It was noted that the recommendations included at paragraph 3.3.3 in the Barker and Associates analysis report didn't appear to be reflected in the draft recommendation. It was agreed that the draft recommendation will be amended to reflect the Barker and Associates recommendations on additional explanations to be added to the FDS on uptake rates.

Responding to a question regarding housing typologies, Mr Pawson noted that the FDS can only include recommendations to the respective councils. It is up to the councils to make the necessary changes to their resource management plans.

The link between the FDS and the respective councils plan change proposals was discussed. It was suggested that to gain a 15% uptake, the FDS should provide a clear direction to both councils and to developers.

Ms Kara-France left the meeting at 10.00 am.

Mr Pawson advised that the current uptake rate for both councils had been examined and while the actual rate had been lower for Nelson City, staff assumed that uptake will increase as a result of future plan changes. It was noted that because of the size of the Nelson-Tasman region it would be a challenge to accelerate the uptake process.

Responding to a question, Ms Deans noted that there had been a greater implementation rate of intensification in Tasman largely due to the Tasman District Council's plan change in 2018 which

enabled more intensification to occur in Richmond.

The meeting adjourned at 10.25 am and resumed at 10.45 am

Greenfield/brownfield housing capacity split

The subcommittee discussed the greenfield/brownfield housing capacity split and the submissions received on that topic.

Ms Deans spoke to this topic. She noted that the consultation document included three questions seeking feedback on where submitters would like to see growth, did they prefer a balance and if they didn't like the balanced proposal, what did they propose.

This aspect of the FDS consultation had resulted in a strong response from submitters with 50% of submitters preferring more intensification and 34% less greenfield expansion. Also, building up rather than out is preferred but 21% of submitters want to see growth in Tasman's existing rural town. Ms Deans noted that while consultation on the FDS favours building up when we survey the community and ask them where they want to live, stand-alone dwellings are favoured and this mirrors national surveys where people prefer more privacy and more outdoor and garden space.

Kirdan Lees noted that the multi-criteria analysis resulted in a priority for intensification over other types of development and this is what the project team had sought to maximise.

It was agreed that the deliberations should recognise that the Nelson-Tasman region has a small number of developers who control a substantial amount of the land and often choose when to release land to the market to maximise their returns.

In response, Kirdan Lees agreed that this issue was not easy for the councils to manage.

The issue of affordable housing was discussed. It was suggested that both councils need to ensure they work alongside Kāinga Ora to enable the availability of more affordable housing in the region.

The option of zoning land for rural-residential housing was discussed. It was noted that rural-residential zoning provides a different housing choice and also frees up space in city centres for more housing intensification. It was noted that a significant proportion of people cannot afford to live in urban housing while rural-residential housing provides cheaper options.

Highly Productive Land

The subcommittee discussed the issue of protecting highly productive land and the submissions received on that topic.

Responding to a question, Ms Deans noted that the options for land development within the FDS avoid the use of highly productive land.

Tasman District Council Team Leader – Soils and Land Use, Mirka Langford explained that for the purpose of the FDS staff have used the land use capability (LUC) classification, which is consistently used by other councils in New Zealand.

Responding to a question, Ms Langford said that land used for gravel extraction is not classified as productive.

Multi-Criteria Analysis

It was noted that 22 sets of criteria were used to assess each site within the FDS. The subcommittee discussed the multi-criteria analysis used to assess the sites and was advised that the same staff had assessed the new sites proposed in submissions, as had been used to assess the draft FDS sites.

Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions Reduction

Senior Infrastructure Planning Advisor, Drew Bryant was in attendance for this item.

In response to a question regarding the Vehicle Kilometres Travelled (VKT) analysis, Mr Bryant advised that the changes within public transport services, the increasing investment in active transport and the growth in the use of electric vehicles were factors used in the calculations for GHG emissions.

He noted that data for travel in rural areas is more difficult to obtain but that generally rural-residential housing will result in a greater number of VKT, hence why the intensification and greenfield development sites result in less VKTs closer to existing urban areas.

FDS Outcomes

Mr Pawson noted that the process in developing the outcomes included in the FDS had been rigorous. As a result it was recommended that a clearer term to use is 'objectives', rather than 'outcomes'.

Responding to a question about a second recommended change from the Barkers & Associates report, Mr Pawson agreed that both changes would be incorporated in the final FDS.

Mr Pawson also agreed that the reference to land use transport should be stated as land use **and** transport in the final FDS.

The meeting adjourned at 12.33 pm. Mayor Reese offered the closing karakia.

Wednesday, 1 June 2022

The meeting resumed at 11.07 am

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), Urban Growth Coordinator (J Deans), Environmental Policy Manager (B Johnson), Policy Planner (M Bengosi), Executive Assistant to the Mayor (R Scherer) and Executive Support Officer (G Drummond)

Nelson City Council – Group Manager Environmental Management (C Barton), Senior Analyst – Strategy and Environment (C Pawson)

Part Attendance: Tasman District Council – Strategic Policy Manager (D Fletcher), Senior Infrastructure Planning Adviser (D Bryant), Senior Infrastructure Planning Adviser – Water & Wastewater (K Arnold), Communications Officer (T O'Connell), Councillor C Hill, Councillor C Mackenzie, Team Leader – Infrastructure Planning (W Woortman), Senior Policy Planner (D Worthy), Team Leader – Urban and Rural Policy (J Butler), Senior Resource Scientist – Hazards (G Stevens) and Project Manager – Environmental Policy (A McKenzie).

Councillors G Noonan and R Sanson

Mayor Reese offered the opening karakia.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Drew Bryant spoke to this topic. He referred to supplementary information that had been provided to the subcommittee members and noted that generally vehicle kilometres travelled are higher in settlements further away from urban areas. He advised that in Tasman the exception is Motueka, where local employment opportunities indicate that locals do not need to travel as much.

Mr Bryant noted that the Council's updated household transport emissions analysis had been evaluated using the Ministry for the Environment's emissions reduction plan, guidance from the Ministry of Transport on what transport will be like in the future, electric vehicle projections and information from the Nelson-Tasman Regional Public Transport Plan. The updated analysis also modelled new recommended sites by officers.

In response to a question, Mr Bryant agreed that the anticipated increase in active transport will reduce the number of vehicle kilometres travelled in the region. He noted that the staff analysis of travel patterns had focused on people travelling to work and school using 2018 Census data. He added that people living in rural-residential housing zones are less likely to walk or cycle.

The issue of providing infrastructure to respond to the recommendations of the FDS was discussed. Mr Pawson noted that Nelson City Council is already considering intensification as part of its ongoing maintenance and renewals programme. Furthermore, the asset management plans include future-proofing that will provide infrastructure in response to growth.

Tasman District Council Strategic Policy Manager, Dwayne Fletcher confirmed that Tasman District Council is also planning ahead for infrastructure in proposed new areas of development. He noted that the FDS is a very important guide for both councils in their infrastructure planning.

The meeting adjourned at 12.04 pm and resumed at 12.15 pm.

Ms Kara-France left the meeting at 12.04 pm.

Building Heights

Mr Pawson noted that the issue of building heights had been raised by a lot of submitters, mostly in relation to Tahunanui and the Wood in Nelson City. These issues related to sunlight restrictions, loss of aesthetics and conflicts with the Tahunanui Structure Plan. He noted that there are some drawbacks with building houses above two-three storeys with requirements for additional infrastructure such as elevators and sprinkler systems and seismic requirements which add to building costs.

Ms Kara-France returned to the meeting at 12.23 pm.

The importance of neighbourhood plans and implementation plans was discussed and it was agreed by the Subcommittee that these should be included as a requirement in the FDS.

Natural Hazards

Mr Pawson noted that the natural hazards outlined in the FDS are mostly related to sea level rise in Tahunanui. Low lying areas such as the Wood and Tahunanui have not been included in the housing capacity figures in the draft FDS, as some form of climate change adaptation policy is required before these areas could be intensified. The eventual decisions relating to adaptation to sea level rise will be made as part of the Dynamic Adaptive Policy Pathways (DAPP) process underway in Nelson. This process is expected to be completed around the time that preparation of the next FDS will begin which will allow a more final decision on the inclusion of these areas and determine whether the capacity from these areas can be included.

Submissions were also received from residents in the Tahunanui Slump area regarding the inclusion of that area in the broad infill overlay of all the areas outside the specific FDS growth areas. These

submissions pointed out that the area was of particularly high risk of slope failure in relation to other areas and the effects on neighbouring properties had the potential to be severe. The current Nelson Resource Management Plan limits further development above what is already subdivided. Council officers recommended that the Tahunanui slump core area be removed from the pink and white infill area shown in the draft FDS document.

It was agreed that the information provided to the subcommittee regarding the Inter-Governmental Panel on Climate Change projections and the vehicle kilometres travelled analysis would be included as an addendum to the final FDS report.

Strategic Areas – Port Nelson and Nelson Airport

Mr Pawson noted that two submissions had been received regarding the strategic areas of Port Nelson and the Nelson Airport. One submitter suggested residential development should be allowed for on the land owned by Port Nelson. However, staff advice is that the port is a strategic asset providing core activity and the land and its use for port activities should not be compromised.

The submission from Nelson Airport Limited requested that the area denoted as N-102 Roto Street and that part of N-034, Tahunanui Drive West inside the 55dBA contour area, be removed from the FDS. Staff agreed with the concerns from Nelson Airport Limited and recommended removing these two areas from the FDS.

Responding to a question about the use of land for commercial purposes, Mr Pawson said that there is adequate land available in Nelson city for business activities. There is also sufficient land available overall for commercial purposes in Tasman district, however, there is not necessarily sufficient land available in all of the towns.

The meeting adjourned at 12.58 pm and resumed at 1.55 pm.

New sites and amended sites proposed for exclusions

Ms Deans noted that a significant number of submissions had addressed this topic. She advised that where a new site has scored as well as, or better than, previously assessed comparable sites for the FDS and the site aligns with the preferred spatial scenario, consideration has been given for the inclusion, and consequently the removal, of some sites in the draft FDS.

The subcommittee discussed the submissions requesting sites to be added, amended or deleted from the FDS and viewed the proposals on a map viewer.

The following changes were noted for Nelson City:

- Sites N115 and N116 to be added to the FDS.
- Site N-123 to be removed.
- Site N-102 to be removed.
- Part of site N-034 to be removed

The subcommittee discussed the proposed changes to sites in Tasman District:

- Agreed to add site T-198 – Falcon Ridge – this has been included as rural-residential zoned land as the terrain is not flat and there is no infrastructure provided. It was noted that any development in this area would require tanks for water supply and wastewater would be treated and disposed of on-site.
- Agreed to remove site T-054.

- Agreed to remove site T-200.
- Agreed to remove site T-032.
- Agreed to remove site T-028 (Pigeon Valley).
- Agreed to remove site T-041 (88 Valley Road).

The subcommittee asked that the resolution be amended to note in the final FDS document that these Pigeon Valley sites are likely to be considered in any future revision of the 2022 FDS, if additional housing land capacity is required.

Motueka

- Agreed to include site T-213 (near Mytton Heights).
- Agreed to include site T-205 (near Mytton Heights).
- Agreed to include site T-206 (Hickmott Place, Motueka).

Other sites

- Agreed to include site T-217 (Tapawera).
- Agreed to retain site T-181 (St Arnaud).
- Agreed to add site T-219 (St Arnaud).
- Agreed to a small extension to site T-001 (Jeffries Road, Brightwater).
- Agreed to amend orientation of site T-145 (Tākaka)
- Agreed to reduce scale of site T-195 but to include a small parcel of land (St Arnaud)

There was concern about lack of information of the Tasman District Council Plan Change process for Nelson Councillors that had been run in parallel with the FDS process and further information on the plan changes and consultation process was requested by the subcommittee. The subcommittee also requested information on the scope of potential changes it could make to the FDS as a result of submissions and further information and advice it received. It was agreed that this should be discussed in confidence.

3.2 Procedural motion to exclude the public

Moved Mayor Reese/Deputy Mayor Edgar

SH22-06-01

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:

Deliberations Hearing - Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy 2022-2052

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	s7(2)(g) – The withholding of the information is	s48(1)(a)

to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.	necessary to maintain legal professional privilege.	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.
--	---	--

CARRIED

The meeting resumed in open session at 4.05 pm.

Mayor Reese invited Ms Kara-France to offer the closing karakia.

The meeting adjourned at 4.08 pm.

Thursday 2, June 2022

The meeting resumed at 9.02 am.

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), Urban Growth Coordinator (J Deans), Environmental Policy Manager (B Johnson), Policy Planner (M Bengosi), Executive Assistant to the Mayor (R Scherer) and Executive Support Officer (G Drummond)

Nelson City Council – Senior Analyst – Strategy and Environment (C Pawson) and City Development Manager (G Teerling)

Part Attendance: Tasman District Council – Strategic Policy Manager (D Fletcher), Senior Infrastructure Planning Adviser (D Bryant), Senior Infrastructure Planning Advisor – Water & Wastewater (K Arnold), Environmental Policy Manager (B Johnson), Communications Officer (T O’Connell), Councillor C Hill, Councillor C Mackenzie, Councillor C Butler, Ecologist (M Moss) and Communications Officer (T O’Connell)

Nelson City Council – Councillors G Noonan and R Sanson

Mayor Reese welcomed everyone and invited Councillor McGurk to offer the opening karakia.

Proposal for a new community near Tasman

Ms Deans spoke to this section of the report and updated the subcommittee on correspondence received from Te Ātiawa during the consultation period. The subcommittee discussed the matter of the proposed community near Tasman and the submissions relating to it. The subcommittee agreed to:

- remove all three sites near Tasman village – T-166, T-167 and T-168.
- remove site T-136.
- exclude the new site T-202.

It was agreed that paragraph 13.25 in the officer’s report required clarification so that it was clear that sites T-136 and T-202 should not be included because of the high servicing costs for these sites.

The subcommittee agreed to move into confidential session to gain some further advice regarding Tasman District Council’s growth plan site change amendments.

3.3 Procedural motion to exclude the public

Moved Deputy Mayor Edgar/Councillor McGurk

SH22-06-02

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:

Deliberations Hearing - Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy 2022-2052

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)(g) – The withholding of the information is necessary to maintain legal professional privilege.	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.

CARRIED

The meeting resumed in open session at 9.16 am.

Site Specific Matters

Mr Pawson spoke to this topic. He noted the significant number of submissions that were opposed to any development in the Maitai Valley. He reminded the subcommittee that a private plan change is running in parallel and independent of the FDS process. He noted that the Maitai Valley proposal (site N-106) scored very well in the FDS primarily because of its close location to Nelson City.

The subcommittee discussed the Maitai Valley sites in the FDS and the submissions on them.

Responding to a question, Mr Pawson confirmed that there is a gap in the reserve land within the proposed area N-032, Orchard Flats that will enable access. He said the site scored well in the FDS matrix, at 82 out of 209 sites considered. He added that the site is not low-lying or flood prone and is currently used for forestry.

The subcommittee noted support for retaining sites N-106 and N-032 in the FDS.

Mr Pawson referred to a submission from Wakatū Incorporated regarding the Horoirangi site that they are proposing to develop within the wider Wakapuaka area. He said that the site proposed by Wakatū did not score well because it is both low-lying and highly productive land and staff advice was that this was better dealt with through a plan change process. The subcommittee discussed the officer's recommendation not to include this site in the FDS.

Ms Deans spoke to the Tasman site specific matters.

Site T-163, 42 Keoghan Road, Tākaka

Ms Deans noted that the proposed site T-163 at 42 Keoghan Road, Tākaka includes and is adjacent to a wetland area. The subcommittee expressed concern about the inclusion of this site in the FDS because of its coastal location, biodiversity values and the lack of any active transport links.

Tasman District Council Ecologist, Matt Moss confirmed that between 10-15% of the site is wetland and that the whole of the surrounding estuary is classified as wetland habitat. It was agreed that wetlands are much needed and are vital to the ecology of the area.

It was also noted that a significant portion of this site is located in the coastal environment area. The site scored 96 out of 209 sites.

The subcommittee indicated a preference to remove site T-163 from the FDS.

The adjacent site, T-220 was also discussed. It was noted that this had not been considered for inclusion in the draft FDS because of noise control factors from the Takaka aerodrome.

Other Tasman Sites

The subcommittee indicated support for:

- retaining sites T-105 and T-108.
- removing T-048, T-003 and part of site T-001 due to lack of landowner support.

Responding to a question, Ms Deans noted that site T-100, located near Snowden's Bush in Brightwater, is highly productive land and was not included for consideration in the FDS. The nearest site is T-102 which is good productive land and is part of an iwi landholding is being considered by the Government's infrastructure acceleration fund.

Māpua Sites

Ms Deans noted that site T-042 in Māpua had been amended to align with the Tasman growth plan change. However, there are iwi concerns about cultural heritage aspects in this area. Staff recommend that this site be deferred until discussions are concluded with iwi.

Environmental Policy Manager, Barry Johnson clarified that sites T-012 and T-125 in Māpua are not included in the FDS. He added that the growth plan change includes sites T-042 and parts of T-033 in Māpua.

Ms Edwards noted that site T-042 is quite hilly, and includes wetter areas on the lower flat.

Staging and Development

Mr Pawson spoke to this topic. He noted that some submitters had requested that full staging information be provided in the FDS. However, this is not recommended as there is some risk that staging very quickly becomes outdated or obsolete. Staff are recommending that the FDS include high level general principles that guide the implementation plan. These would be reviewed on an

annual basis to ensure the information is current and accurate. This is consistent with what has been recommended as option 3 in the Barkers and Associates report.

Ms Edwards referred to points 5 and 6 in the draft resolution which clarify the principles to be used in the preparation of the implementation plans along with the neighbourhood and structure plans. The subcommittee agreed the wording was correct in points 5 and 6 in the draft resolution.

Infrastructure

Mr Pawson spoke to this topic. He noted that several submitters had suggested that details of all the new infrastructure that would be required to support the proposed growth should be included in the FDS. Mr Pawson said that this would result in a very, very large document that would resemble an asset/activity management plan and was not recommended.

It was noted that several submitters had referred to a requirement for additional community infrastructure especially in brownfield areas where there is increased density but not necessarily land available for more reserves, schools, open spaces and community infrastructure.

In response, Ms Deans said that staff had held discussions with a number of external stakeholders including Waka Kotahi, the Ministry of Education, the Nelson Marlborough District Health Board, the Nelson Regional Sewerage Business Unit and Network Tasman who all recognise that infrastructure will be required for growth. The stakeholders are also led by the FDS and this will help them with their own growth plans. In terms of open space, that aspect will be dealt with through the neighbourhood plans.

Mr Pawson added that each area will have a neighbourhood plan that will allow improvements of existing parks and reserves so that their capacity can be improved. He also noted that the Streets for People initiative will also enable more community infrastructure.

It was agreed that further information about the neighbourhood plans should be included in the final FDS as this aspect is important to the community.

In response to a question about the status of neighbourhood plans, Ms Deans said that they would be developed alongside the structure plans.

Ms Deans also noted that neighbourhood plans will inform the rules that are included in the resource management plan changes or reviews which in turn will inform any resource consent applications.

Subcommittee Chairperson, Mayor Reese requested that Nelson City Council staff provide more information on how community infrastructure will be managed within the FDS sites.

It was agreed that all the associated documents and strategies that contribute to the FDS should be included as supplementary information to the final FDS document.

The subcommittee noted that the proposed resolutions would lead to inconsistencies with the Tasman District Council parking strategy and Nelson City Council's Tahunanui Structure Plan and Growth Strategy. The reasons for the inconsistencies were noted, along with the recommendations on how the inconsistencies will be addressed over time.

It was suggested that both councils need to better align their respective growth models. In response, Mr Pawson said that both councils are very aligned with the assumptions and inputs to the model. He added that the councils will complete their population projections jointly in future and this will be included in the final resolution.

It was agreed that a separate public transport map and accompanying commentary would be included in the final FDS.

The subcommittee then spent some time considering each part of the draft resolution.

The meeting adjourned at 11.07 am and resumed at 11.35 am.

Councillor McGurk left the meeting.

Mr Johnson used a powerpoint presentation to outline the Tasman District Council growth plan change which has been running in parallel with the 2022 FDS. He noted that Tasman District Council staff had carried out consultation on the growth plan change with landowners, developers, community associations, infrastructure providers, iwi, neighbouring property owners and other stakeholders. He referred to the proposed growth plan changes as follows:

- Brightwater – rezoning from Rural-1 to Rural-1 Deferred Residential is proposed. This would enable a mix of housing densities within this area.
- Wakefield – Rezone from Rural-2 and Rural-2 Deferred Rural-Residential to Rural Deferred Residential and retain area of existing Residential Zone. This would enable a mix of housing densities.
- Māpua – rezone from Rural-Residential and Rural-1 Deferred Rural-Residential to Rural-1 Deferred Residential and Rural-Residential Deferred Residential. The intention is to enable higher density housing. Mr Johnson noted that Tasman District Council had directed staff to take a step back and to take a wider look at land zoning in Māpua. The Council plans to refresh the Māpua structure plan in consultation the community. In response to a question, Mr Johnson confirmed that the Council will also work closely with the local iwi on the Māpua structure plan.
- Motueka – Mr Johnson noted that the proposed Motueka growth plan change is being slowed while the Council continues engagement with local landowners, including iwi.
- Murchison – Rezone to Rural-2 Deferred Residential . Mr Johnson advised that Council staff are working with local iwi, Ngāti Waewae on this aspect of the growth plan change.
- St Arnaud – conservation land in Massey Street is to be rezoned to Papakainga for Papakainga development.

The meeting adjourned at 12.08 pm and resumed at 1.00 pm.

The subcommittee indicated support for proposed changes to boundaries of some FDS sites to align with the boundaries of the same sites in the Tasman District Council Growth Plan Change. These comprise sites T-05, T-042 (subject to further iwi consultation), T-107, T-37.

Mayor Reese welcome everyone back to the meeting and noted that officers had developed a new draft resolution relating to Neighbourhood Plans. The draft resolution was refined and supported.

The subcommittee discussed draft resolution 8 and noted that the wording “recommends to both councils that they explore the use of inclusionary zoning and consider plan provisions that make a range of section sizes mandatory” is challenging for both councils under the current RMA provisions. It was agreed that perhaps both councils should advocate to central government on this issue as part of the Resource Management reforms.

Note – the Hearing Panel Subcommittee moved the resolution in parts as items were discussed at the meeting. Collated resolutions follow.

That the Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy Subcommittee:

Moved Deputy Mayor Bryant/Councillor McGurk

SH22-05-7

1. receives the Deliberations Hearing - Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy 2022-2052 RSH22-05-8;

CARRIED

Moved Deputy Mayor Edgar/Councillor Maling

SH22-05-8

2. notes that the Future Development Strategy (FDS) Subcommittee has received all the written, verbal and late submissions on the draft FDS and supporting information;

CARRIED

3. recommends to the Joint Committee of the Nelson City and Tasman District Councils that the following changes be included in the final FDS 2022-2052 and that it instructs officers to amend the relevant documents to incorporate the following changes:

Moved Councillor Ogilvie/Councillor McGurk

SH22-05-9

Growth Projections

- 3.1.1 retains the high growth population projection for sensitivity testing in the FDS, to ensure the councils have identified sufficient capacity if the population continues to grow quickly;

CARRIED

Moved Councillor Maling/Councillor McGurk

SH22-05-10

Housing land capacity calculation and uptake rate for housing intensification

- 3.1.2 retains the 15% uptake rate from the draft FDS document in calculating the expected yield of dwellings from intensification;
- 3.1.3 amends the wording in section 7.1 (Proposal Overview) of the FDS to clarify that the rate of intensification assumed is not a target, and that the Councils will aim for a greater proportion of growth to be catered for by intensification;
- 3.1.4 requests staff to add clarification in the final FDS on intensification and greenfield development, noting that greenfield development will enable intensification and different housing typologies, and these typologies will be differentiated on the maps where applicable;
- 3.1.5 amends the table in section 16.3 of the FDS (Implementation - What we will do) to clarify that the quarterly monitoring and annual reporting will involve monitoring of the uptake rate of intensification;

CARRIED

Moved Deputy Mayor Edgar/Deputy Mayor Bryant

SH22-05-11

FDS Outcomes

3.1.6 directs officers to replace the term “outcomes” with the term “objectives” in the final FDS document;

3.1.7 adds further description on the purpose/role of the outcomes/objectives, including that they are aspirational, and implementing the FDS will require balancing and trade-offs between objectives;

CARRIED

Moved Councillor Ogilvie/Mayor Reese

SH22-05-12

Multi Criteria Analysis Framework

3.1.8 retains the Multi Criteria Analysis method used in the draft FDS and agrees that it represents a robust approach to the assessment of potential growth sites throughout the regions;

CARRIED

Moved Councillor Maling/Councillor McGurk

SH22-05-13

Greenhouse gas emissions reduction

3.1.9 includes in the FDS comment that there are conflicting demands between the climate change direction and the housing capacity direction provided by central government and that balancing these demands is challenging;

3.1.10 accepts the preliminary and supplementary analysis undertaken on modelling GHG emissions which will be included in the final technical report;

3.1.11 retains the draft FDS core spatial scenario of consolidated growth focused largely along State Highway 6 from Atawhai to Wakefield, but also including Māpua and Motueka and to meet the needs of Tasman rural towns;

3.1.12 adopts the core part of the draft proposal and accepts that the preliminary and supplementary analysis on modelling GHG emissions is appropriate for considering the competing demands of the climate change and housing capacity direction from central government;

3.1.13 requires that the FDS implementation plan (updated annually) closely monitors population growth trends and the proportion of intensification and greenfield areas that are enabled by rezoning and rule changes in Plan Changes across the regions;

CARRIED

Moved Councillor Maling/Deputy Mayor Edgar

SH22-05-14

Greenfield/brownfield housing capacity split

3.1.14 amends the greenfield/intensification split to that detailed in sections 12.22.1 and 12.22.2 of this report following the analysis and decision making at earlier stages of the FDS, the correction of minor errors and consideration of the submissions;

CARRIED

Moved Deputy Mayor Edgar/Councillor Ogilvie

SH22-05-15

Proposal for a new community near Tasman village

- 3.1.15 removes all three sites near Tasman village (T-166, T-167, T-168, Aporo Road, Marriages Road, Horton Road and Stagecoach Road) and Braeburn Road, Lower Moutere (T-136) from the draft FDS, and excludes new site T-202 (Hayden-Payne land, 583 Tasman View Road and adjoining block) in Lower Moutere proposed through submissions (the site references can be found on the GIS viewer on the Councils' FDS webpages and will be explained in the FDS);**

CARRIED

Moved Councillor Ogilvie/Councillor McGurk

SH22-05-16

Infrastructure

- 3.1.16 retains the draft FDS approach of not including detailed infrastructure information or site sequencing information and instead leaving this information to its more appropriate locations in the infrastructure strategies, activity/asset management plans, long term plans and development contribution policies of both Councils;
Moved Ogilvie/McGurk CARRIED**

CARRIED

Moved Deputy Mayor Bryant/Councillor McGurk

SH22-05-17

Building Heights

- 3.1.17 retains the indicative building number of storey recommendations in the draft FDS, noting that they will be subject to further analysis in any future plan change processes;**

CARRIED

Moved Mayor Reese/Deputy Mayor Edgar

SH22-05-18

Natural Hazards – The Wood and Tahunanui

- 3.1.18 removes the Tahunanui slump area from the pink and white coloured infill area shown on the FDS maps noting that the draft FDS approach to natural hazards remains otherwise unchanged;**
- 3.1.19 retains the FDS areas in the suburbs of The Wood and Tahunanui in the FDS subject to the outcomes of the climate adaptation Dynamic Adaptive Policy Pathways process underway currently;**

- 3.1.20 differentiates the FDS areas in 3.1.19 above with different colour or overlay in the FDS maps, in order to highlight that they have not been included in the housing capacity numbers in the FDS;

CARRIED

Moved Councillor Dowler/Deputy Mayor Bryant

SH22-05-19

Strategic areas – Nelson airport

- 3.1.21 removes area N-102 (Roto Street and surrounds) and part of N-034 (Tahunanui Drive West) inside the 55dBA airport noise contour in response to concerns from the Nelson Airport management regarding noise sensitivity and in recognition of the strategic importance of the airport to the regions (the site references can be found on the GIS viewer on the Councils' FDS webpages and will be explained in the FDS);

Strategic areas – Port Nelson

- 3.1.22 retains no FDS development areas for the Port Nelson land in recognition of the strategic importance of the Port to the regions;

CARRIED

Moved Deputy Mayor Edgar/Councillor McGurk

SH22-05-20

Nelson City Council FDS sites

- 3.1.23 expands both areas N-011 (Saxton) and N-112 (Orphanage West) by adding two additional areas called N-115 (Saxton Extension) and N-116 (Orphanage West Extension) while leaving the area N-011 as a single residential greenfield expansion area with any other land use to be considered as part of a plan change or resource consent application;

CARRIED

Moved Deputy Mayor Bryant/Councillor Maling

SH22-05-21

Tasman District Council FDS sites

- 3.1.24 adds site T-198 (Falcon Ridge, Higgins Road, Brightwater, rural residential) and removes site T-54 (Teapot Valley, Brightwater, rural residential);
- 3.1.25 removes sites T-028 (Pigeon Valley Road, Wakefield, residential) and T-032 (Pigeon Valley Road, Wakefield, rural residential) and agrees not to add site T-200 (Pigeon Valley Road, Wakefield), noting in the final FDS document that these sites are likely to be considered in any future revision of the 2022 FDS, if additional housing land capacity is required;
- 3.1.26 adds sites T-205 (14 Waiwhero Road, Motueka Valley, rural residential) and T-213 (319 Motueka Valley Highway, rural residential) to existing FDS site T-17 (either side of Mytton Heights, Motueka);

- 3.1.27 adds site T-206 (Hickmott Place car park, Motueka, mixed use);
- 3.1.28 adds site T-217 (1 Main Road, Tapawera, residential);
- 3.1.29 adds site T-219 (3177 Korere Tophouse Road, St Arnaud, rural residential) to adjoin the existing FDS site T-181 (3103 Korere Tophouse Road, St Arnaud, rural residential), noting that the full extent of these sites should not be developed, in order to robustly protect the wetlands and the high value ecology of these sites, and to improve their environmental outcomes;
- 3.1.30 changes the boundary of FDS site T-01 (Jeffries Road, Brightwater, residential) to include the whole of the landowner's property (106 Jeffries Road) but also to remove a small southern portion (75 Jeffries Road), where the landowner is not supportive;
- 3.1.31 excludes site T-003 (Shannee Hills, Brightwater, residential) as the landowner is not supportive;
- 3.1.32 excludes site T-48 (Rototai Road, Tākaka, residential) as the landowner is not supportive;
- 3.1.33 reduces the size of FDS site T-37 (Fairfax Street, Murchison, residential);
- 3.1.34 amends the orientation of site T-145 (Page Road, Tākaka, Light industrial);
- 3.1.35 reduces the overall scale of site T-195 but includes a small parcel of land (Massey Street, St Arnaud, papakāinga);
- 3.1.36 extends the boundary of site T-05 (Wanderers Avenue, Brightwater, residential) to align with the Growth Plan Change boundary following further evaluation and to allow for an esplanade reserve;
- 3.1.37 extends site T-42 (Stafford Drive, Māpua, residential) to the south-west corner of site to align with the Growth Plan Change, subject to the outcome of further consultation with iwi;
- 3.1.38 excludes a small parcel of land in the south-east of site T-107 (Edward Street, Wakefield) following further evaluation for the Growth Plan Change;

CARRIED

Moved Councillor Ogilvie/Councillor Maling

SH22-05-22

- 3.1.39 removes site T-41 (88 Valley Road, Wakefield, residential);
- 3.1.40 removes site T-54 (Teapot Valley, Brightwater, rural residential);
- 3.1.41 removes site T-163 (42 Keogh Road, Tākaka, rural residential); and
(note: the site references can be found on the GIS viewer on the Councils' FDS webpages and will be explained in the FDS); and

CARRIED

Moved Councillor Ogilvie/Deputy Mayor Edgar

SH22-05-23

Understanding of views and preferences of the community and persons affected by decisions:

4. agrees that the FDS Subcommittee has an accurate understanding of the community's opinion on the new sites proposed for inclusion in and the sites proposed to be amended or deleted from the FDS in 3.1.23 to 3.1.41 above, either through general submissions and the hearings and/or subsequent limited further consultation; and

CARRIED

Moved Councillor Maling/Deputy Mayor Bryant

SH22-05-24

Other matters raised by the FDS Subcommittee:

5. notes that staff will prepare principles to guide the staging and rollout of development areas for inclusion in the final FDS and that these principles will be used in the preparation of the implementation plans; and
6. notes that infrastructure providers will be consulted during the preparation of implementation plans referred to in 5 above and that the implementation plans will include preparation of neighbourhood and structure plans;

CARRIED

Moved Mayor Reese/Councillor Maling

SH22-05-25

7. agrees that this deliberations report, the attachments and the supplementary officer advice provided in response to questions from the Subcommittee, provide the information required by the Subcommittee to make fully informed recommendations to the Joint Committee of the Nelson City and Tasman District Councils on the final FDS; and

CARRIED

Moved Deputy Mayor Edgar/Councillor Maling

SH22-05-26

8. recommends to both councils that they explore the use of inclusionary zoning and consider plan provisions that make a range of section sizes mandatory, while retaining flexibility over housing typologies built, in housing plan changes and/or plan reviews;

CARRIED

Moved Deputy Mayor Bryant/Deputy Mayor Edgar

SH22-05-27

9. directs officers to start making the changes resulting from the resolutions in this report and any other minor changes, editorial corrections and other changes as reflected in the minutes required to complete the final FDS and its attachments pending the policy decisions from the Joint Committee; and

CARRIED

Moved Councillor Maling/Deputy Mayor Bryant

SH22-05-28

10. acknowledges that there have been a number of requests and proposals in submissions that have not been addressed by specific decisions as a result of this report and agrees not to make any changes in response to those submissions which have not been outlined in the earlier parts to this resolution; and
11. notes that submitters will each receive a response to their request; and

CARRIED

Moved Deputy Mayor Edgar/Councillor Ogilvie

SH22-05-29

12. notes, in accordance with section 80 of the Local Government Act 2002, that the Joint Sub-committee's Future Development Strategy recommendations to the Joint Committee of the Tasman District and Nelson City Councils, contain inconsistencies with the existing policy in the following council strategies and plans:

- a. Tasman District Council's *Richmond and Motueka Town Centre Parking Strategy 2018* (the Parking Strategy). The inconsistency arises due to the Future Development Strategy identifying the carpark at Hickmott Place, Motueka for use as mixed use commercial and residential purposes, which is consistent with the zoning of the land, but is not consistent with the Parking Strategy which retains its use as a carpark. The reason for the inconsistency is to enable sufficient supply of housing to meet demand within Motueka township and the wider Tasman and Nelson regions in accordance with the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development to respond to growth. The Tasman District Council will consider amending the Parking Strategy when it is next reviewed; and
- b. Nelson City Council's *Tahunanui Structure Plan 2004* (the Structure Plan). The inconsistency arises due to the Future Development Strategy proposing increases to the levels of residential intensification and increases to the heights for housing developments in the Tahunanui area, which are inconsistent with the intensities and heights of development in the Structure Plan. The reason for the inconsistency is to enable sufficient supply of housing to meet demand within the wider Tasman and Nelson regions in accordance with the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development to respond to growth. The Nelson City Council will consider replacing the Structure Plan when it prepares the neighbourhood plan for the Tahunanui area or when a plan change is prepared; and
- c. Nelson City Council's *Nelson Urban Growth Strategy 2004* (Growth Strategy). The inconsistency arises due to the Growth Strategy containing out of date growth projections which are inconsistent with the projections contained in the Future Development Strategy. The reason for the inconsistency is to enable sufficient supply of housing to meet demand within the wider Tasman and Nelson regions in accordance with the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development to respond to growth. The Nelson City Council is not proposing to update the Growth Strategy, as the document will be replaced by the new Future Development Strategy; and

CARRIED

Moved Deputy Mayor Edgar/Mayor Reese

SH22-05-30

13. recommends to both councils that they give consideration to how to support the FDS intensification goals through land aggregation including working with Kāinga Ora; and

CARRIED

Moved Councillor Maling/Deputy Mayor Edgar

SH22-05-31

14. recommends to both councils that there is alignment of their Growth Strategies in terms of modelling and timing; and

CARRIED

Moved Deputy Mayor Bryant/Councillor Ogilvie

SH22-05-32

15. recommends to the Joint Committee that the implementation of the FDS is a standing item on their agenda; and

CARRIED

Moved Deputy Mayor Edgar/Mayor Reese

SH22-05-33

Neighbourhood Plans

16. notes the importance of neighbourhood plans for the successful implementation of the Future Development Strategy; and
17. recommends that officers report back, as a priority, to Nelson City Council on the options for preparing neighbourhood plans to feed into the Nelson Housing Plan Change process; and
18. recommends to Nelson City Council that it provides additional resources to enable the neighbourhood plans to be completed; and
19. notes that Tasman District Council is undertaking structure planning for its key neighbourhood areas as part of its plan change and plan review processes.

CARRIED

4 HEARING OF SUBMISSIONS

Nil

5 CLOSE

In closing the meeting, Chairperson, Mayor Reese acknowledged the mahi of everyone involved in the deliberations. She thanked the staff of both councils for the quality of the reports and their professional advice to the subcommittee during the hearing and deliberations process which has helped in their decision making.

She acknowledged the submitters to the FDS for their high quality submissions which demonstrates that both councils have an engaged community.

Mayor Reese also acknowledged the subcommittee members and thanked them for their best endeavours towards a FDS that aligns with the objectives.

She thanked Ms Kara-France who had joined the subcommittee at late notice and who had made an incredible contribution to the deliberations.


Deputy Mayor Edgar and Deputy Mayor Bryant also thanked the staff for the amount of effort that had been made towards the FDS. They also acknowledged Mayor Reese for her chairing skills and the ability to tie the many strands of the FDS together.

Mayor Reese invited Ms Kara-France to offer the closing karakia.

The meeting concluded at 1.14 pm.


CONFIRMED AS A TRUE AND CORRECT RECORD BY THE CHAIRPERSON AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE UNDER STANDING ORDER 26.4:

Chairperson:



Date: 26/8/22

Chief Executive:



Date: 26/8/22