

Meeting Minutes

Subdivision 166 Mapua Rise

Location	TDC CEO Office
Date	16 th April 1.30pm
Present	Janine Dowding (Chair), Dennis Bush-King, Richard Hilton, Marion Satherley, Mike Kininmonth (scribe)

- [1] Purpose of this meeting is to discuss the issues raised in letter from Mapua and Districts Residents Association, dated 14th Jan 2021 to various TDC staff. It was agreed that minutes of this meeting would suffice the response to this letter.
- [2] Janine commenced, asking why there was a delay in replying to this letter. Dennis apologised and agreed to reply, including action points from this meeting.
- [3] Dennis commented that the land owner had not applied for a Resource Consent for residential subdivision, and that until this had occurred, TDC had very little jurisdiction in determining events on that land. He noted that under the National Environmental Standards for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health (NES), that the standards are very much “prescriptive ideology” and that NES lacked exact standards to measure compliance.
- [4] Dennis confirmed that there was a robust set of requirements involved in obtaining a Resource Consent and that affected parties would be involved in this process. There is a big difference between “affected parties” and “interested parties”. His opinion is in this instance, community involvement is possibly desirable. However, this would only occur if through the Resource Consent process it was not deemed necessary to Publically Notify the application. Stating that public notification would occur if independent agreement between the applicant and all affected parties had not occurred or been reached.
- [5] TDC has compiled a register (HAIL) of land used previously for agriculture and horticulture where hazardous chemicals may have entered into the soil.
- [6] *Dennis to provide script of events or changes to land/environment that would trigger non-compliance with NES or HAIL sites and report back to MDCA.*
- [7] Marion explained how the Mapua Community is involved in Aranui Park and asked for clarification of how “setbacks” were determined and enforcement.
- [8] Dennis explained how Council determined the subdivision requirements, during a Resource Consent application and that non-compliance was taken very seriously.
- [9] Marion asked two additional questions:
- [10] That consideration be given to increase linking of roading network and pathways/cycleways.
- [11] Dennis replied that this was in hand and to review the work carried out in the Tasman District Plan and Future Development plan for Mapua and Environs.
- [12] As notated in the MDCA letter a number of important trees along the boundary of 166 Mapua Rise and Aranui Park had either been removed, had root structure severely disrupted, or exposed. It was noted that the six kahikatea trees in Aranui Park that initially looked threatened have recovered, and the cabbage tree that have fallen are developing young plants along the fallen trunk.
- [13] Richard commented that in his opinion the trees that had been removed were not of significance and those remaining were of minor significance.
- [14] Dennis explained that unless the individual trees had “historical covenanted status”, that there was very little TDC could do. Stating that prior to 2013 all trees were

protected by Government Regulations and the removal of trees was tightly monitored. This changed with a law change in 2013.

[15] Richard explained how TDC is likely to require, as part of the Resource Consent process, a landscape plan be provided whereby vegetation and trees would be planted, to offset those removed or requiring removal.

[16] Denis explained that a TDC compliance officer had visited the site and did not deem the work to have contravened any bylaws etc. It was unclear whether the compliance officer's report was verbal only.

[17] Dennis is looking into this and will report back to MDCA

[18] Marion noted the general effects on the environment, trees had in general and asked whether the subterranean water flows had been investigated and whether subdivision would impact these? There was an awareness of this, and it was unclear whether it had been investigated.

[19] Marion raised the issue of disconnect between NZ Government policies and the everyday implementation of climate change within local communities.

[20] Janine agreed and that this was a significant issue with her role and within TDC.

[21] Richard spoke that TDC staff (Rosliand Squire) is in communication with the land owner, regarding potential Resource Consent application for land subdivision. For instance, adjacent to western boundary of Aranui Park and a stream/storm water retention pond, a retaining wall is proposed. TDC will be requiring a design that allows for accessing and replacing the wall at the end of its useful life and not interfere with tree planting etc.

[22] Marion stated that there appeared to be gaps between the policies that guide development and the information with the Mapua Structure Plan 2010. Dennis explained that the two policy documents used as a guide for a Resource Consent application were the Future Development Strategy (FDS) which states where development may occur, and the Tasman Resource Management Plan (TRMP). Dennis also explained that the Mapua Structure Plan (MSP) was used as a guide in the development of the TRMP.

[23] Dennis also acknowledged some of the information from the MSP may not have been captured fully into the TRMP.

[24] Dennis is going to provide MDCA with the area's within the TRMP that specially relate to Mapua and surrounding areas.

[25] Dennis to action.

[26] Dennis welcomed a report from MDCA identifying any such gaps.

[27] Marion to action.

[28] Dennis spoke of how the TDC would be in a position to lift "Deferred Residential" status on a number of parcels of land in the Mapua area, when all conditions of the deferrals have been met. Guidance would be received from Services Manager, when this could occur.

[29] Janine, reviewed the list of issues in MDCA letter 14th January 2021 and confirmed that all had been addressed.

Janine thanked everyone for attending.

Meeting closed 2.35pm

