

---

**MINUTES**  
of the  
**PORT TARAKOHE SUBMISSIONS HEARING MEETING**  
held  
**9.00 am, Wednesday, 7 August 2019**  
at  
**Golden Bay Service Centre Meeting Room, Commercial  
Street, Takaka, Richmond**

---

**Present:** Mayor R Kempthorne, Councillors S Brown, P Sangster and D McNamara,  
Golden Bay Community Board Chair A Langford, Mātauranga Māori Expert, K  
Stafford

**In Attendance:** Strategic Policy Manager (S Flood)

**1 OPENING, WELCOME**

Mayor Kempthorne opened the submission hearing and welcomed attendees.

**2 APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

Nil

**3 REPORTS**

The report was taken as read.

**4 HEARING OF SUBMISSIONS**

Mayor Kempthorne explained the order of the day and that the meeting would be closed with deliberations occurring on Friday 9 August 2019.

The resolution as presented in the Agenda was passed without amendment.

**Moved Cr Sangster/Cr McNamara**  
**SH19-08-1**

**That the Hearing Panel receives the submissions, including two late submissions, for the Port Tarakohe Proposed Development Plan and Draft Business Case.**

**CARRIED**

---

## 5 HEARING OF SUBMISSIONS

Strategic Policy Manager, Sharon Flood, provided an updated list of speakers.

### 1. Dr Christopher Bennett (20509)

Dr Christopher Bennet spoke to his submission and raised concerns about road safety with a proposed increase in road users. He requested a shared path in Pohara. There was a discussion between Cr Sangster and Dr Bennett on road use and road widening. Dr Bennett requested that Council be pragmatic and provide a safe road/path.

### 2. Miss Annabelle Edmond (20664)

Miss Annabelle Edmond has a master's in biodiversity and at the hearing, expanded on her written submission. She expressed concerns that increased industry at the Port and expansion of mussel farming would have adverse effects on biodiversity, detrimentally affecting ecotourism.

Miss Edmond emphasised the importance of ecological sustainability and tourism has on the region. She suggested creating an area for ecotourism and conservation with an education centre on korora. Miss Edmond was asked if she had submitted on the initial resource consents for the marine farming expansion in Golden Bay, to which she clarified that she had not but wanted to iterate the need for sustainable mussel farming practices in the future. In answer to a question, Miss Edmond stated she did not belong to any tourism promotional organisations.

### 3. Ms Victoria Davis (20581)

Ms Victoria Davis spoke to her written submission and raised concerns about:

- rising sea water temperatures.
- the heavy influence of the marine industry over this proposal.
- how the community is still funding the proposal via taxes if it is government funded.

Ms Davis would like:

- mussel farmers to barge directly to Nelson so as not to use the already vulnerable road over Takaka Hill.
- industry involvement in community beach clean-ups.
- an educational centre to engage the community.
- it noted that the Port is important for resilience in emergencies.
- risk management planning for the mussel industry.

Ms Davis stated she would support processing of mussels in Golden Bay provided employers paid a living wage.

### 4. Mr Martin Potter (20626)

Mr Martin Potter spoke to his submission. He supported:

- the separation of commercial and recreational activities, provided parking was improved.
- the provision for mussel processing at the Port (in answer to a question).
- the Port providing a public good and it funding the recreational component or cost overheads.

There was a discussion regarding the orientation of the existing harbour breakwaters and the proposed narrowing of the harbour entrance. Mr Potter expressed concern about the speed of boats going through the gap at present. In answer to a question regarding potential for deep

moorings inside the outer breakwaters, Mr Potter stated he did not see this as an option unless the wave action on the eastern side could be mitigated.

#### **5. Mr Rodney Barker (20655) Port Tarakohe Impacts Group**

Mr Rodney Barker read his written submission, outlining nine points: hours of operation; questioned the economic gains stated in the proposal; current housing and infrastructure ability to sustain the proposed labour increase; CO<sub>2</sub> emissions; industry impact on roads, transport, and flora and fauna, especially korora/little blue penguins; proposed monitoring of industry with fines; buoys and infrastructure tagged for GPS tracking; waste management (including microplastics); and the Port remain a public community asset.

Mr Barker stated the proposed funding model downplays the contribution from the Provincial Growth Fund (PGF), and asked why commercial businesses were not contributing financially when they would be the main beneficiaries of development.

In answer to questions, Mr Barker stated he would like public consultation on a site for a fishing platform and the running of an information centre, clarified there were six members in the PTIG, and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions could be mitigated via alternative measures.

#### **6. Marcus Benecke (20665)**

Mr Marcus Benecke spoke to his written submission which supported the inclusion of a resilience ramp. Mr Benecke asked the hearing panel why it had not been included in the proposal when it was in the draft plan. Cr Brown answered by confirming resilience was a high priority and the hearing panel had received advice that unless a ramp and barge was in constant use, the preference was to build a ramp as and when required to meet the needs at the time.

#### **7. Mr Steve Du Feu (20670) Pohara Boat Club**

Mr Steve Du Feu spoke to his written submission as the Commodore of Pohara Boat Club (PBC) which broadly supported the proposal with equal weighting on development of commercial and recreational activity. Mr Du Feu sought clarification from the hearing panel on the dark area of the map beside PBC, as at present it was in use as a boat lock up and as a New Zealand Motor Caravan Association (NZMCA) park over area. He stated the present PBC building provided public toilets and showers, and an additional ablutions block was unnecessary.

Mr Du Feu said the PBC supported speed bumps and a sealed road on the western breakwater, and asked to be consulted on parking and placement of the barrier arm. In answer to a question from the hearing panel about the narrowing of the harbour entrance, Mr Du Feu commented that as the swells came rolling in, so did the silt.

Cr Brown asked Mr Du Feu to clarify his submission statement that the cost of dredging was too high as this was contrary to advice Council had received. Mr Du Feu clarified he was concerned the cost of dredging would be passed on to recreational users of the Port.

In answer to a question about the scope to increase the usage of the PBC building, Mr Du Feu said the PBC was a conduit for informing the recreational boating community, and offered the venue as a location for meetings and workshops with user groups of Port Tarakohe.

#### **8. Ms Iona Sarah Margaret Jelf (20680)**

Ms Iona Jelf expanded on her submission. She agreed Port Tarakohe required upgrading but did not support the proposal in the current form.

Ms Jelf raised a number of concerns, including:

- an increased rate load on ratepayers;

- high berthage fees in comparison to other ports;
- major investment on Abel Tasman Drive to cater to the increased traffic;
- a lack of clarity around water source, usage, and cost - it is under budgeted for drinking water supply and ablutions use; and
- a request for a cost comparison between shipping to Nelson and trucks on our roads.

Ms Jelf said waves were stronger and wake wash was more significant at the southern end of the harbour where the recreational area was proposed, and the current plan would limit available space for learn to sail lessons.

#### **9. Mr Ian Stewart (20744)**

Mr Ian Stewart was absent from the hearing.

The meeting adjourned for morning tea at 10.15am.

The meeting resumed at 10.50am.

#### **10. Prof John Cockrem (20580)**

Prof John Cockrem spoke to his submission and gave a power point presentation.

The hearing panel asked Prof Cockrem if the korora/little blue penguins could be swapped to the eastern breakwater and he replied it was not a practical solution as birds returned to the same nests they had been previously. Prof Cockrem advised recent surveys of the nesting boxes indicated of the 100 boxes placed on the western breakwater arm, 70 were considered active nests.

Cr Brown asked Prof Cockrem if a potential deep water mooring area inside the outer western breakwater would be incompatible to the penguin colony, to which Prof Cockrem replied that as long as boats moved slowly, the two would be compatible.

Prof Cockrem asserted the importance of the western breakwater to the established korora/little blue penguin colony as it was easily defended from dogs. In response to a question from Mayor Kempthorne, Prof Cockrem stated it was essential to keep the penguin colony dog free.

A hearing attendee in the public area thanked Council on the recent instalment of signs stating “dogs must be on leashes”.

Cr McNamara asked Prof Cockrem to quantify the worth of the Oamaru korora colony, which Prof Cockrem estimated at \$10-15M, emphasising that viewing birds at dusk lead to overnight stays, increasing visitor spend in the area.

#### **11. Ms Cynthia McConville (20613) Mohua Golden Bay Blue Penguin Trust**

Ms Cynthia McConville spoke to her written submission and urged the hearing panel to consider closing off public access to the western breakwater by way of fencing to enhance the korora/little blue penguin sanctuary. Ms McConville supported the development of the eastern breakwater for recreational use. Ms McConville encouraged the integration of recreation, commercial and natural environments to build a significant development Golden Bay can be proud of.

#### **12. Mr Michael Cunliffe (20647)**

Mr Michael Cunliffe expanded on his submission and asked the hearing panel to encompass a broader proposal to benefit wider community interests. Mr Cunliffe expressed concern that development would affect coastal communities with noise, dust, and increased road traffic; and adversely impact on the environment and biosecurity. Mr Cunliffe corrected his submission which stated there was no washdown area at present. Mr Cunliffe asserted Council must retain

ownership and management of the port, supported a resilience ramp, and requested better location of the public toilets.

When advised by the hearing panel that the PGF focuses on growing businesses and employment, Mr Cunliffe conceded the Council did not set the funding model up but asked the Council to take the opportunity to improve on the proposed plan.

### **13. Rosemary Callaghan (20696)**

Ms Rosemary Callaghan spoke to her written submission.

Ms Callaghan supported

- the resilience ramp and fences to prevent penguins getting to the road, and
- Council seeking \$35M to do all the proposals.

Ms Callaghan raised concerns about

- the increased levels of road use,
- allowance for increased CO<sub>2</sub> levels,
- waste such as microplastics and suggested industry funding be established for beach clean-ups.

### **14. Mr Brian White (20708)**

Mr Brian White spoke to his written submission and raised a wide variety of concerns, many of which were unrelated to the draft business proposal. Mr White did not support expansion of Port Tarohe.

### **15. Tania Belworthy (20712)**

Ms Tania Belworthy spoke to her written submission and asked the hearing panel if the proposed development would proceed if the PGF application was denied. Cr Brown confirmed that there was limited funding in the Long Term Plan for Port Tarohe, and without funding from the PGF there was no capacity for Council to undertake the proposed development.

Ms Belworthy commended local mussel farmers for responding to public concerns about rubbish. She mentioned she had filmed a brown layer on the water surface at the Port from boats. Cr Brown asked for evidence of boats discharging.

### **16. Ms Heather Wallace (20694) and (20675) Friends of Golden Bay Inc.**

Ms Heather Wallace spoke to her written submission which did not support the development of Port Tarohe by way of funding from the PGF.

### **17. Mr Merv Solly (20676) Sollys Freight (1978) Ltd**

Mr Merv Solly spoke to his written submission as a commercial user of Port Tarohe, operating a transport company based throughout the top of the south, and tabled a site plan with alternative options for the Port development.

Mr Solly informed the hearing panel the market for Golden Bay dolomite was growing and shipping was more efficient than trucking the dolomite over the hill.

Mr Solly spoke of improved practices for loading dolomite for shipping, including active dust control. Mr Solly stressed the rock loading area needed to remain in the existing area to protect the community from noise disturbance.

Mr Solly expressed disappointment that the draft business plan excluded shipping and transportation, and encouraged a model encompassing all commercial port users, both present and future.

Mr Solly suggested spending money to fix and extend the existing wharf by going with a proposal from 2016.

Mr Solly pointed to the draft business plan would dramatically increase traffic on the road.

In answer to a question Mr Solly confirmed he supported a grant from the PGF over a loan.

Cr Brown asked Mr Solly if he had any comment on proposed narrowing of the harbour entrance, to which Mr Solly replied “a 30m closure was a bit tricky with a 35m wide vessel.”, he stated the current 45m opening suited the needs of the various commercial users.

In response to a question about the resilience ramp model, Mr Solly advised the hearing panel that a static ramp would not be ideal and would have limited use. Mr Solly referred to Cyclone Gita which was the first time he'd ever had to barge, and the ramp used to disembark the barge had been created quickly.

Mayor Kempthorne asked Mr Solly about the flushing of the harbour if the breakwaters are closed, to which Mr Solly stated there would be less movement of water if the breakwaters were closed and the breakwaters needed to stay open to flush the silt.

#### **18. Mr Nigel Lloyd OBE (20622)**

Mr Nigel Lloyd spoke to his written submission, stating his previous experience managing a Southampton military port. Mr Lloyd stated the proposal listed commercial benefits but did not give details on the adverse effects of development.

Mr Lloyd would like more information on the proposal to make an informed decision and was concerned the proposal had not been properly analysed. He stated he was not opposed to the project but doesn't think it can be funded.

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 12.20pm.

The meeting resumed at 1.00pm.

#### **19. Hera (SM) Livingston & Ueli Marti (20747)**

Ms Hera Livingston spoke to her written submission.

Ms Livingston stated her whānau objected to the fencing and signage currently installed around the commercial area of the Port, which limited access to wharf areas and in particular the “pirate cave” on the western side of the harbour area. She requested the road access through the hole in the rock needed to be improved for pedestrians and cyclists. Ms Livingston called for nature to be put ahead of business, protection of the environment for future generations. Ms Livingston did not support taking money from the PGF.

Cr McNamara asked Ms Livingston to clarify if she supported the Port staying in Council hands as her submission said she did not. Ms Livingston replied she had ticked no to all the boxes as she did not agree to the proposal.

#### **20. Mr Alan Vaughan (20586)**

Mr Alan Vaughn had lodged apologies for the hearing.

#### **21. Amy Ashford (20678) Pohara Boat Club**

Mrs Suzy Hall spoke on her behalf of Amy Ashford as PBC secretary.

Ms Ashford's written submission was taken as read. Mrs Hall spoke of the PBC support for the port development being dependant on an equal weighting being placed on commercial and recreational users. Mrs Hall expressed concern about safety to recreational users of the port with increased commercial activity, especially during learn to sail events.

Mrs Hall stated the emergency ramp needed to move from the current location, and that repairing the fender system would be preferred to developing new items. In response to a question regarding targeted rates, Mrs Hall stated the preference was for a targeted rate across the District.

**22. Mrs Suzy Hall (20679)**

Mrs Suzy Hall spoke to her written submission and stated recreational boating was always safer when it was removed from commercial activity, and emphasised the proposed recreational berth required power, water, and sewerage connections. Mrs Hall stated liquor licencing laws required PBC to provide a set number of carparks and the widening of the road corner had resulted in the loss of carparks. Mrs Hall said the proposed overflow parking location beside the PBC was not practical due to distance. A PBC member asked Mrs Hall to relay to the hearing panel that the boat compound was used and valued, and it would be a shame to lose it.

**23. Mr & Mrs Stocker & Garrett Richard and Patsy (20681)**

Mr and Mrs Stocker and Mr and Mrs Garrett were absent from the hearing.

**24. Mr Tony and Roland Lawton and Toder (20690)**

Mr Tony Lawton spoke on behalf of Mr Roland Toder to their joint submission and tabled a graph comparing hybrid and diesel boat engine costs.

Mr Lawton voiced concern for adverse effects on tourism, potential whale stranding's and environmental disasters, light and noise pollution, CO<sub>2</sub> emission costs; and called the hearing panel to require electric engines in vessels.

When asked if there should there be a combination of funding models, Mr Lawton stated there should be as mussels had an environmental impact.

**25. Mr Mike Shannon (20706)**

Mr Mike Shannon spoke to his written submission. Mr Shannon was supportive of the Port development in a considered manner, but asked for a cost-benefit analysis on the impact to Golden Bay.

Mr Shannon said the planned extension of the eastern breakwater arm would put increased commercial movements and significant wake wash into the recreational area, and stated "I would not park my boat there".

Mr Shannon stated articulated trucks cannot use Abel Tasman Drive without crossing the centre line on some corners and the Takaka-Pohara Cycleway would increase cyclists on Abel Tasman Drive, raising concerns for the safety of all road users.

Cr Brown asked if the recreational area could be located in the north east corner of the harbour. Mr Shannon suggested it be moved to the outer arm on the western side and building an additional breakwater wall. Cr Sangster asked how this would impact wave action to which Mr Shannon was unable to answer.

**26. Mr & Mrs John and Pene Michell and Ralph (20704)**

Mrs Pene Ralph spoke on behalf of Mr John Michell to their written submission. Mrs Ralph told the hearing panel she travelled past the port twice a day and expressed concern that the mana of the limestone rock was being diminished with rubbish dumping and fencing. Mrs Ralph spoke in

particular of fencing which she stated had encroached from the wharf area inside the road reserve to create a road verge along Abel Tasman Drive less than 0.5m wide. Mrs Ralph asked the hearing panel to give the rocks their space and protect their mana.

**27. Mr Richard Struthers (20633) Golden Bay Cycle and Walkway Society Inc.**

Mr Richard Struthers read and expanded on his written submission on behalf of all cyclists and walkers, and tabled notes from his speech.

Cr Brown sought clarification from Mr Struthers on prioritisation of his submission given the active transport projects within the Golden Bay cycle strategy. Mr Struthers confirmed Golden Bay Cycle and Walkway Society Inc. (GBCWS) now saw Port Taroakohe as a high priority with the proposed upgrade and redevelopment of the Port given increased traffic/truck movements.

**28. Ms Katie and Sonya Hames and Tuerlings (20693) Port Taroakohe Services Limited**

Mrs Katie Hames and Mrs Sonya Tuerlings spoke to their written submissions and tabled speaking notes as directors of Port Taroakohe Services Limited (PTSL). Their points include:

- PTSL supports the full upgrade via a 100% grant and a plan for all of Taroakohe.
- PTSL opposes the business case and technical reports.
- PTSL think it is likely that the Port will be set up as a Council-Controlled Trading Organisation and requests to know who will own the rest if Council owns 51%.
- PTSL request that Council honour agreement for a services upgrade for Mohua Encounters to create an overarching strategic plan for Golden Bay.

In answer to a question from the hearing panel, Mrs Tuerlings stated PTSL would support development as long as the Port was retained in a model 100% owned and operated by Council, as this would see the greatest benefit across the community. Mrs Tuerlings asked for clarification for proposed future ownership model.

Cr McNamara asked for clarification on water and wastewater concerns raised by Mmes Hames and Tuerlings, to which Mrs Hames asked if planned water take would come from the PTSL water supply as in her view bringing water from Pohara Valley Road would be a short term solution. Mrs Hames pointed out no water had been confirmed for boat wash down, and incorporation would be required to create a water supply. Mrs Hames said engagement from Council had been lacking and the proposal was restricted to a port only development when tying port, land and surrounds would make the best benefit to the various port users.

**29. Mr Gordon Mather (20697)**

Mr Gordon Mather spoke to his submission as a recreational user of the Port and stated the proposal seemed rushed and that it required further consultation from recreational and commercial users.

Mr Mathers said the setting of the port was unique and worthy of development into a high class multi user development. Mr Mathers said the port was of strategic significance to the top of the south region as it was not tide dependant and there were limited berthing options elsewhere. Mr Mathers expressed concern any development would increase traffic, requiring a large investment to upgrade the road.

Mr Mathers opposed Council taking on the financial risk of the Port development for marine farming industry, and stated the Port must remain publicly owned for the benefit of the public. He stated the industry should take on the risk and voiced concern the proposal as privatisation by stealth.

Mr Mathers was concerned the proposed development lacked vision and feared more of the Port would be fenced off from the public.



**30. Mr Andrew Yuill (20698)**

Mr Andrew Yuill spoke to his submission about the impacts of increased traffic and financial risk. Mr Yuill stated the proposal seemed hasty in how it had been put together. Mr Yuill said that it should be the mussel industry to take on the financial risk of port development.

**31. Ms Laura Sixtus (20743)**

Ms Laura Sixtus was absent from the hearing.

**32. Mrs Joan Butts (20695) Port Tarakohe Limited (PTL)**

Mrs Joan Butts spoke to her submission and tabled speaking notes as a company director for Port Tarakohe Limited. Her points include:

- PTL does not endorse the business case.
- PTL supports the profit model only, and opposes more debt against the Port.
- Future-proofing the wharf.
- PTL supports 100% Council ownership and management.
- Golden Bay residents want to know how the upgrade would benefit Golden Bay.
- Impact of traffic – safety and congestion.

**33. Mr Bruce Burgess (20722)**

Mr Bruce Burgess was absent from the hearing.

**6 CONFIDENTIAL SESSION**

Nil

The meeting concluded at 2.43 pm

Date Confirmed:

Chair: