

2021 LTP Submissions – suggestions from members

David Briggs:

1) The logic of the plan is back-to-front.

Tim King said that the overall aim of the Council is to make sure that we make Tasman a better place for future generations to live in. In the plan, however, the starting point is the residential development - and this is spelled out with detailed numbers of people and houses that will be catered for. The vast spending on the dam, and the commitment to keep going on that whatever the cost, is part of this development drive. Everything else - the environmental and social stuff especially - gets fitted around it, and shares whatever money is left. Significantly, there are NO quantitative targets for environmental for social issues: the percentage reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, for example, or the impacts on vehicle kilometres travelled. All we get, instead, is empty phrases. This needs to be changed. We should start with our social and environmental goals clearly spelled out, and development should be fitted into those. That means we need a clear and concrete vision of what those environmental and social goals are.

2) The climate change actions are weak in the extreme.

The list of actions and spending under the banner of climate change are vapid at best, and in many ways downright misleading. Waste management, for example, has very little to do with climate change - and in any case is not being paid for by the Council. Continuation of commercial forestry on TDC land is in no way a means of mitigating climate change; if that were the aim, we'd be converting the land to semi-natural or natural forest as the forests were harvested. It is purely for the purpose of making money. Investigating a more agile response to biosecurity (whatever that might mean) is a vague irrelevance. New tree planting is of course good - but is likely to be negated by the continued removal of trees by development and other land use change; nothing is said about conserving existing tree cover. Insulating 500 homes (option B) when the planned development will create 4300 additional homes - with all their associated emissions - is essential for social reasons, but almost meaningless in terms of climate change effects (There's evidence to suggest that, while insulation improves the indoor living environment, it doesn't greatly reduce energy use or emissions.)

3) There MUST be clear quantitative targets for all policy areas

One of the principles of good policy is that it is defined in terms of clear and quantitative outcomes. Without those, the Council has no means of knowing whether or not it's actually achieved its goals - and cannot be held to account for its actions. Nor does it know whether individual actions make the situation better or worse. Likewise without clear measures of outcome, the public consultation is meaningless, because no-one really knows what they are voting for.

Martin Barlow:

The MBC will be making a submission re the funding in the LTP for a boat ramp, which has now been reduced from 1.1M\$ (as it was in the current LTP) to \$600K – with construction put back from 2021/22 to 2026. One would have thought construction costs will increase in the intervening years!

The MBC would appreciate the MDCA including support for a replacement boat ramp in the Mapua (which has previously been mandated by the MDCA membership) and I have attached a copy of a generic submission we will be asking boat club members to sign and submit in addition to the MBC submission for your reference.

Tim Robinson:

I would be keen to see MDCA ask council to keep funds for a new community boat ramp in the LTP.