

About me

Name: Jan Heijs

Email: jheijnsz@gmail.com

Address: 14 Lionel Place, Māpua 7005

Mob: 021 354 782

I wish to verbally present in support of my feedback and happily answer any questions.

General

Thanks for the opportunity to submit on the draft-LTP. I see that that TDC is seeking feedback on the 'only' four big choices but not on other parts of the LTP. In fact, when asking for a copy of the full LTP I was told that this document was still being worked on. This does not meet my expectation of transparency and does not provide me with the opportunity to find what I am looking for. I also question whether this is legal.

Having worked for local government in the past, I am aware that the LTP process is complex, but I feel that a lot of information is not provided or very difficult to find.

I live in Māpua and much of my feedback is written from a Māpua-resident's point of view.

The 4 big choices - general

The options as presented in the '4 big choices' are limited and the options that are not tagged as the preferred are presented as resulting in higher taxes. I do not agree with this approach because the council has choices to (re)prioritise and/or seek savings elsewhere. Consequently, many submitters may choose for the lower tax options without having the option to say what they really want.

Growth in Mapua

Looking at the "What is proposed for the Māpua/Ruby Bay" [overview](#), TDC appears to go by 'growth projections' without accepting the ability to influence the outcomes and a local scale, consider what the need for the local communities are and doesn't recognise the ability influence the distribution of growth within the district. This overview makes comments such as "The actual number and location of new houses and commercial/industrial buildings is largely determined by the private sector...", confirming my concern that the needs of the Māpua community do not play a part in this. The map provided is at a large scale and does not show where in that area the growth is projected. It provides no basis for a meaningful place-based assessment about how much, where and when additional development is required.

The current zoning is based on the knowledge and planning insights that are old and do not meet today's needs, do not meet the local needs in Māpua (and other townships) and do not address the reasons behind the housing crisis.

Insights related to climate change, the need for connectivity and the need to provide for affordable housing for our Māpua community are reasons to change what has been planned. I understand that TDC is working on a review of the TRMP and that central government will replace the RMA with other bits of legislation. This will be a long process and we feel that Māpua cannot wait for these lengthy processes to be completed.

TDC has the ability to re-zone or review the zoning of areas such as the 'deferred residential areas'. The way these are currently zoned do not meet the needs of the Māpua community. The market, that TDC is fully relying on, will continue to provide for large lots and large expensive houses in new greenfield subdivisions.

Infill plan changes undertaken elsewhere in the region where not initiated in Māpua. I fail to understand what the justification for this is.

The Future Development Strategy is already outdated. The areas for future growth shown in this Strategy do not meet the test of current requirements such as connectivity, climate change and will encourage more larger houses, more car-use far away from the village centre. Nothing to address the housing needs for the local community: no allowance for closer to town smaller and affordable housing.

Although these areas are tagged in the Development Strategy, these have not gone through a plan change process and thus any investment in unlocking these areas is premature and not justified.

As pointed out in the overview, the population and Tasman and Māpua will age. As people in Māpua get older and those that want to downscale, they have no local alternative, they will have to leave their community, their friends and family in Māpua and find smaller housing elsewhere. Young people, young families from the Māpua community will also struggle to find affordable housing in the current market.

We are aware of examples where people wanted to build smaller and more affordable housing and have been basically frustrated by consent/planning staff because what they wanted to offer to the community was not permitted under the current zoning rules.

Council intervention is urgently required to change the problems discussed above and are highly likely to continue under the 'business as usual approach' shown in the LTP. I understand that the LTP is not a planning document but the LTP can set priorities and provide funding for activities that will address the housing needs for the Māpua community.

I request that:

1. Priority and funding be allocated to review the zoning in and around Māpua to allow for more, smaller, and affordable housing.
2. Any investments proposed in the LTP to accommodate undesirable and unsustainable development on the outskirts of Māpua/Ruby Bay be removed, including the infrastructure connecting the 'Seaton Valley Hills' area.
3. Provide funding for social housing and other affordable housing initiatives, enabled in part through this fund.
4. Provide for a fund for 'strategic purchases' and 'development initiatives' to enable and initiate smaller and affordable housing including social housing in Māpua. It is very unlikely that the market as referred to in the overview, will provide for this demand. Although initial funds would be required, this approach would not necessarily cost TDC long term because the housing provided is intended to be sold. A partnership with the private industry will be needed. As a first step, a business model would need to be set up to achieve this. Funding for this is required.
5. In relation to the 'big choices' provided in the LTP communication plan, the options do not provide the detail for the Māpua community to provide a specific response but based on the reasoning provided above, developments such as 'Upper Moutere Hills' are not sustainable and should be rejected. For that reason, I recommend option A.

Climate Change

Contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation is particularly important. There are many climate-change actions that TDC could take that are not mentioned. The options do not provide the full suite of potential activities and do not provide adequate information on what is currently programmed. It is not clear how the three key themes as referred to in the climate action plan are programmed and funded (mitigation, adaptation, leadership).

The information on the webpage part "[big choices / climate change](#)" makes the observation that "As part of developing our Tasman Environment Plan (TEP) under the Resource Management Act, we're working on a project to involve our Tasman Bay/Te Tai o Aorere and Golden Bay/Mohua communities in planning for how we can best respond to sea level rise and coastal hazards." The plan for adaptation refers to the TEP as the only instrument. Surely that is not the case?

It is great that TDC works with the local communities to develop climate adaptation plans. The development, implementation and funding of climate adaptation plans is critically important.

It is also not clear how TDC will take leadership on this topic as promised in the climate action plan. One example of leadership TDC could take is the inclusion of climate mitigation related requirements in the TDC procurement processes.

It is not clear from the LTP documents provided that all activities related to climate change mitigation and adaptation and providing leadership are identified, prioritised, and funded. The list of actions listed under options A and B is extremely limited.

I request that:

1. Actions related to the development of adaptation plans are specifically included and funded.
2. Actions related to climate change mitigation actions are specifically included and funded.
3. Actions related to TDC providing leadership in climate change actions are specifically included and funded.
4. That the LTP provides adequate funds to give effect to the 'climate change adaptation plans' and if not yet identified provides for a placeholder-budget to enable for such action when confirmed.
5. Of the options provided I recommend option B but there is much more TDC should do!
6. I also endorse the submission from the Nelson Tasman Climate Forum

Waimea Community Dam - allocation of irrigators costs

It is very frustrating to hear that the costs keep increasing even though we were promised hand-on-heart by the previous mayor and staff in a community meeting only a few years ago that the risks were costed and that it was very unlikely that the cost would escalate.

I strongly feel that the community pays a remarkably high costs related to the ever-increasing costs of the dam. I cannot see a justification to pay for the irrigator costs.

For this reason, we recommend option D.

Current performance, levels of service and following actions

I struggle to locate information related to the current performance and Levels of Service. This is a key component of what should be provided in an LTP. After asking, I was sent a [link](#) to the 'draft council Activities summary 2021-2031 document. Thanks for that. It was very hard to find this information which confirms my concern related to the transparency of the process as discussed under general.

I am concerned that the levels of service and the activities listed, largely relate to undertaking very general activities such as monitoring, and reporting and many levels of service are not specific, general 'blue-sky' statement and not measurable.

As an example, the [Richmond CMP](#) shows that streams at many locations In Richmond have a poor or very poor quality (stream habitat score). The LTP, nor this activities document shows what TDC intends to do to address this. It also appears that no catchment plans are available for other townships. So, for Māpua, I have no idea what the targets are, if targets are met and what actions TDC will undertake to address water quality issues.

Another example is that there is no target for the number of wastewater overflows allowed. This is directly related to the need to justify capital works in the wastewater network. Without a quantifiable target, I question how expenses are justified without measurable targets and assessments how the current state is meeting these targets. It is very well possible that TDC provides for an over-designed, gold plated network or the opposite. A similar observation can be made in other service areas.

I request that the activity plans be reviewed:

1. to include measurable/meaningful outcomes as Levels of service and the current state of performance
2. to include activities to improve the outcomes where the current state is not meeting the levels of service.

Jan Heijs
14 Lionel Place, Māpua
021 354 782