

**RE: Fwd: Liquorland Licence Mapua**

1 message

**peterp** <peterp@snap.net.nz>

Mon, May 16, 2022 at 5:28 PM

To: Christeen Mackenzie &lt;Christeen.Mackenzie@tasman.govt.nz&gt;, peterp@snap.net.nz

Cc: info@ourmapua.org

Thanks Christine

Thank you for obtaining a response from the TDC. So it seems that if I can't get a say through the licence application (none of the matters of safety I raised are listed in the Act) and there's no consenting process, this operation can do exactly what it pleases. Some democracy we live in!?? Of course the other licence is the one that's close to a school so I expect the Council to honour its stated interest in proximity to the school when it considers the Super Liquor application.

While I have your attention I am concerned about the National Policy on Urban Development published under the TDC banner in July last year - specifically the reference to a NCC+ TDC accord to designate all the small settlements along SH6 and SH60 as Urban Tier 2. This appears to be TDC's mandate to double the size of Mapua village and which has precipitated TDC's seemingly urgent complicity in the proposed development at 49 Stafford Drive. The questions are: Was the Council consulted on the Government Plan and did it consult the communities involved before the Plan was agreed and adopted? Does the Council stand by its many statements in many development reports that it strives to preserve the special nature of its rural communities? Is the Council confident that there has been sufficient community communication and that the majority of citizens are aware that they are now considered part of the Nelson City conurbation? Was it the full Council which voted to include Brightwater, Wakefield and Mapua in the Nelson conurbation? Did the Government, in considering this mandate, know that none of these towns/ villages are served by public transport? Was it not the Government's intention to encourage high density inner city housing rather than the urban sprawl that you are now encouraging? Does the Council, in seeking to honour its Climate Change commitments accept the irony of adding 700 to 1,000 vehicles to the Ruby Bay/ Mapua area alone, and that the Richmond Deviation is already past its capacity? Given that the document accepts that Tasman, together with Auckland, is the most unaffordable housing area in New Zealand and that 80% of first home buyers could not afford to live in Tasman, let alone Ruby Bay/ Mapua, does the Council have confidence there is adequate demand for the extra houses it is chasing in this area?

If there is even a small chance that the Senior farm development fails mid stream, would the Council regret that the Stafford Drive wetland would have had thousands of tonnes of clay dumped on it?

Christine, the first baby boomers were born in 1946 and the last in 1956. The last of them turned 65 in 2021 so it's fair to assume that the bulk of retirees has already moved to their preferred retirement haven. There may be another bubble of urban escapees, but falling house prices may stem the desire to sell. A bear property market, tightening of credit, soaring petrol prices and general inflation, coupled with a post Covid renewed assault on climate change does not bode well for the kind of developments proposed for Tasman. I presume the statisticians know that 35% of our local population are retirees who have a median age of 73 and that the housing density of these people is much less than 2. That's a lot of houses that will be vacated and available for whoever wants to buy here on the next 10 to 20 years.

Planning can never be 100% perfect but our Councillors are the gatekeepers of poor decision making and need to voice their opinions and cautions.

Regards

Peter Paterson

Sent from my Galaxy

----- Original message -----

From: Christeen Mackenzie <[Christeen.Mackenzie@tasman.govt.nz](mailto:Christeen.Mackenzie@tasman.govt.nz)>

Date: 16/05/22 10:12 am (GMT+12:00)

To: [peterp@snap.net.nz](mailto:peterp@snap.net.nz)

Subject: Fwd: Liquorland Licence Mapua

Good morning Peter

It's a bit frustrating that I still have not had a response from the TDC on this matter. I have just sent them a follow up email and have asked if I can get a response today.

Just keeping you informed.

Regards  
ChristeenChristeen Mackenzie  
Waimea-Moutere Ward Councillor  
[Christeen.mackenzie@tasman.govt.nz](mailto:Christeen.mackenzie@tasman.govt.nz)  
Mobile: 0274387949

Begin forwarded message:

**Christeen Mackenzie**

Councillor

Call +64 3 543 8400 | Mobile +64 27 438 7949 | [Christeen.Mackenzie@tasman.govt.nz](mailto:Christeen.Mackenzie@tasman.govt.nz)

Private Bag 4, Richmond 7050, NZ



**SUBSCRIBE TO REAL-TIME LOCAL UPDATES AND  
REPORT ISSUES TO US QUICKLY AND EASILY**



**Antenna**  
Be informed. Get involved.

This e-mail message and any attached files may contain confidential information, and may be subject to legal professional privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete

**From:** Christeen Mackenzie <[Christeen.Mackenzie@tasman.govt.nz](mailto:Christeen.Mackenzie@tasman.govt.nz)>

**Date:** 10 May 2022 at 11:55:28 AM NZST

**To:** [peterp@snap.net.nz](mailto:peterp@snap.net.nz)

**Subject: Re: Liquorland Licence Mapua**

Hello Peter

In relation to your email I have just sent off a number of clarifying questions to the TDC. I will get back to you as soon as I hear back.

Regards  
Christeen

Christeen Mackenzie  
Waimea-Moutere Ward Councillor  
[Christeen.mackenzie@tasman.govt.nz](mailto:Christeen.mackenzie@tasman.govt.nz)  
Mobile: 0274387949

On 10/05/2022, at 11:33 AM, [peterp@snap.net.nz](mailto:peterp@snap.net.nz) wrote:

Hi Christine

You will recall that I stood up last night at the MDCA meeting relating that I had written to the licencing committee in relation to the Liquorland off premise licence application. I stressed the safety aspects of the new venture in its location. I was then shot down in flames by a Zoom attendee telling me that if the land was zoned commercial there was absolutely nothing I could do about it.

So I now presume that the resource consent process is the right place to do it. I can find no notified resource consent application for this venture so it's either not been lodged or it's floated through as non-notified. Can you please ascertain what the state of this building proposal is so I can re-submit my safety concerns to the correct authority?

I also expressed a concern that the Local Alcohol Policy hasn't seen fit to prevent the granting of a liquor licence within 200/300/400 metres of a school. Surely that's something that needs to be changed. Does the Council recognize any obligations to mitigate alcohol harm?

We just don't need either of these two businesses in Mapua Village. I can already buy wine and beer from a Mapua supermarket and Motueka and Richmond have three Liquorlands, two Super Liquors, a Henry's, a Black Bull and a Big Barrel. I can also buy liquor online. The law as it sits prevents the villagers any options for objection. Why is it that the rights of a person to engage in any business activity for profit over-rule my rights as a rural resident to enjoy a small village rural lifestyle?

BTW there is no Notice of Application posted on the proposed Liquorland site at 65A Aranui Road.

Peter Paterson

3 Coutts Place

Mapua

TASMAN 7005

M: +64 21 362 664