

Fw: Liquor application submission concern

Paul McIntosh <pmcintosh64@yahoo.com>
Reply-To: Paul McIntosh <pmcintosh64@yahoo.com>
To: Marion Satherley <marionawayfromhome@gmail.com>

Thu, Jun 1, 2023 at 8:34 AM

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: "Lynette Graham | Traffic Concepts" <lynette@tcl.kiwi>
To: "Mapua & Districts Community Association" <info@ourmapua.org>
Cc: "Gary Clark | Traffic Concepts" <gary@tcl.kiwi>
Sent: Wed, 31 May 2023 at 8:24 pm
Subject: Liquor application submission concern

MDCA meeting, Monday 8 May 2023

Dear MDCA Chair

We came away from the recent MDCA meeting somewhat concerned about the process and the material represented in the meeting. The presentation on the liquor applications came across as personal and unbalanced and felt like a member of the Executive Committee was pushing their view and was seeking the MDCA to support their position. It was more concerning that the Constitution was being used as a lever to develop support for this position.

There have also been other isolated emails and comments made to the MDCA by the Executive that either are pushing a personal point of view or seeking action from the MDCA for a personal matter. These whether real or perceived are a conflict of interest.

Going to the presentation at the last meeting, the information presented was very unbalanced and some of the information was designed to overplay the issue and evoke emotion. We found it interesting for example the Tasman liquor licenses per population was being compared to Utah. This is extremely misleading and lacks credibility, especially when taking into account the large population of Mormons (over 2 million) who reside in Utah and are taught not to drink any kind of alcohol. Why would the presenter use something from Utah when there are real examples within Nelson Marlborough etc. The legal framework for liquor licences is bound to be very different in Utah to NZ. This concerns us as using this information by the MDCA in a submission objecting to the current applications reflects badly on the organisation as a whole. If we can see the attempt to use statistics in this way, we are sure the hearing panel will too.

The presentation fails to accept that it is our collective responsibility to look after our people through education and guidance and not "nanny state" type control. Simply not having a "Bottle Shop" in Mapua doesn't change the issues raised in the presentation, merely tries to shift it onto someone else. NIMBYism at its best. There was a bottle store opposite the school and a tavern for many years and we are not aware of any issues with these when they were operating. The suggestion of normalising alcohol we find somewhat disingenuous when we have a supermarket with wine and beer at the front door and we have alcohol next to recreation areas at the wharf. We don't have a problem with this as we ensure our child knows what alcohol is, what harm it can do, and he is responsible both to himself and others. This is dealing with the problem rather than pushing it away and hope it looks after itself. This is an ambulance at the bottom of the cliff approach.

Latest research released shows that young people's attitudes towards alcohol is changing, and they are choosing to drink less.

As per our vote in the meeting we do not believe this is the role of the MDCA to get involved in these types of matters. The MDCA has 128 financial members which is a very small number compared to the number of people that live in Mapua and surrounds which we believe is around 2,500 people. The demographic of the financial members is also very narrow and does not truly reflect that of the community, and particularly the younger population. Putting in a submission to suggest that the MDCA is representing the community again we believe this is disingenuous based on the number of members, demographic of the members and the size of the community it supposedly represents.

We believe the MDCA does an excellent job informing the community of issues that may affect them and encouraging them to put in submissions etc for the wider community good. We don't believe that a show of hands by attendees, noting that some of those are not voting members, is a reflection of the wider community's position on this matter.

Gary Clark & Lynette Graham