
MINUTES
of the
DELIBERATIONS FOR THE PORT TARAKOHE
SUBMISSIONS HEARING MEETING
held
9.00 am, Friday, 9 August 2019
at
Tasman Council Chamber, 189 Queen Street, Richmond

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

In Attendance: Strategic Policy Manager (S Flood), Property Services Manager (M Johannsen), Commercial Portfolio Manager (A Ellis), Transportation Manager (J McPherson), Senior Consent Planner (R Squire), Finance Manager (M McGlinchey), Marine Farmers Association (J Large and N Wells), Stantec (N Beatson), Graduate Policy Advisor (J Nguyen)

1 OPENING, WELCOME

Mayor Kempthorne opened the Deliberations and noted that the meeting was about making recommendations to Council, and that no decisions would be made during deliberations.

Ms Flood introduced Nigel Beatson from Stantec and two representatives from the Marine Farmers Association, Jonathan Large and Ned Wells. She noted that Mr Large and Mr Wells plus a number of staff were present to help answer any technical questions the Hearing Panel may have.

2 APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Nil

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Nil

4 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Moved Mayor Kempthorne/Cr Sangster

SH19-08-1

That the minutes of the Submissions Hearing meeting held on Wednesday, 7 August 2019, be confirmed as a true and correct record of the meeting.

CARRIED

5 REPORTS

5.1 Port Tarakohe Business Case Submissions and Deliberations Report

Ms Flood gave a brief recap of the hearing on 7 August and proposed that the deliberations be run by going through question by question. Technical staff and outside experts were made available to answer any questions that may arise.

Mayor Kempthorne wanted to note that this meeting was about making a recommendation to Council, and no decisions would be made during deliberations.

Moved Mayor Kempthorne/Cr Sangster

SH19-08-2

That the Submissions Hearing Panel:

- 1. receives the Port Tarakohe Business Case Submissions and Deliberations Report; and**
- 2. provides staff with recommendations on matters raised in the submissions received on the Port Tarakohe Development Plan and Draft Business Case; and**
- 3. notes that the Hearing Panel report will be presented to Full Council for consideration and adoption on 29 August 2019.**

CARRIED

6 DELIBERATIONS

1. Do you support the separation of the commercial and recreational activities?

Ms Flood stated there was strong support for the separation of the two activities.

Recommendation:

Agreement from the Panel that there are benefits to separating the commercial and recreational activities. It was noted that the penguin proposals and submissions would be dealt with later in the meeting.

2. Do you support reconfiguration of the existing marina area to become a commercial marina with new floating concrete pontoons?

3. Do you support the extension of the inner and outer breakwater arms to provide increased protection from wave action?

16. Do you support saving \$570,000 by not constructing a sheet pile wall to the north of the new harbour manager building?

Ms Flood advised that submissions were overall, supportive of this part of the proposal (Questions 2 and 3).

Mr Ellis talked through the current layout of the Port, noting the mix of recreational and commercial, rock/dolomite movements, and how different users use the Port. Mr Beatson and Mr Large talked through the proposed layout in terms of engineering design and industry requirements.

The Panel discussed various options and issues raised by submitters. This included moving a number of the commercial berths to provide more wharf space to provide additional space for wharf unloading. Mr Solly's concerns were also discussed regarding access to the wharf for the transport of rock and dolomite and also rock storage on the wharf.

The Panel also discussed sheet piling the area north of the harbour master building as raised by a number of submitters (Question 16). It was agreed that the works should be completed if it could be included in the budget. The Panel discussed whether this was part of the project that could be staged or constructed at a later date.

The Panel also discussed submitters request to widen the eastern inner breakwater to provide more car parking. It was agreed this was a good idea, however if the cost was too high, then the Panel were amenable to keeping with the current design. They noted it could be completed at a later date if needed.

Recommendation:

- Support for the new commercial area and marina and inner and outer breakwaters.
- Support for inclusion of sheet piling to north of proposed harbour master building, depending on cost.
- Staff and MFA to undertake further discussions with Mr Solly to determine if a solution with regard to the transportation and storage of rock and dolomite can be found.

4. Do you support construction of a new recreational marina, including associated dredging?

Ms Flood stated that of the 81 submitters, 63 were in support and 18 in opposition. Those in some opposition were against cited reasons of the disposal of dredged material, issues over the floating wave screen and floating pontoon. One submitter committed on his knowledge of limestone rocks in the harbour and potential issues for sheet piling. Ms Flood noted it would be worthwhile talking to this submitter during the detailed design phase of the project.

Recommendation:

- Agreement to support construction of the new recreational marina, including dredging.

5. Do you support dredging of the Harbour for a future resilience rock ramp?

14. Do you support saving \$868,000 by not constructing the proposed new (resilience) concrete ramp?

Ms Flood noted that this question also related to Question 14 about not constructing the associated concrete ramp.

There was a mixed response to Question 5 with 56 in support and 23 opposed.

The Hearing Panel requested that staff communicate to submitters that a temporary rock ramp is supported by users, and that this meets their needs better than a fixed concrete ramp in times of emergency as the ramp can be designed to suit the vessel.

Recommendation:

- Agreement to support dredging in this area for future resilience. This recommendation was superseded by the Hearing Panel on day two in regard to the new port layout which was supported meaning this dredging was no longer required.
- Staff communicate to submitters why a concrete ramp is not the best option.

6. Do you support demolition of the existing timber wharf and construction of a new sheet piled wharf area?

Ms Flood noted that there was strong support from submitters. Cnr Sangster remarked that his understanding was that submitters thought they were supporting the rebuilding of a new wharf to replace the existing wooden one, as opposed to sheet piling at the current ground level.

The Panel discussed consentability, cost, and also whether this could be done at a later time.

Council consent planner Rosalind Squire provided advice to the Panel about reclamation for the wharf. Her advice was as the reclamation is to replace an existing structure and it is within a working commercial port, she did not see it an obvious insurmountable problem for consentability for a minor reclamation with no known adverse effects on surrounding areas. She noted that a similar reclamation had recently been consented in Collingwood.

Mr Beatson provided advice that the cost of the works would be mostly in terms of rock infill. He also noted that it would be very costly to complete at a later date as the area would need to be sheet piled again and backfilled.

Mr Large was asked his opinion about how this would affect industry and whether the boats could be accommodated alongside the breakwater. He responded that there would be a disadvantage in terms of losing the big berths in the front of the wharf. However Mr Beatson noted that with the extension of the breakwater, there was enough sheltered water for the vessels. He noted it would mean the loss of some of the commercial marine berths. Mr large did not think this would be an issue in the short to medium term as there were enough berths for industry requirements, including fishing and cray boats, and tourism vessels.

Recommendation:

- Panel supported rebuilding the wooden wharf to the seaward limit, sheet piling and backfilling with material. They noted support was dependant on the cost.

7. Do you support repairs to existing concrete wharf?

Ms Flood commented that there was strong support for this work to proceed.

Recommendation:

- Panel agreed that the repairs were necessary.

8. Do you support upgrade of the power and water networks?

Ms Flood stated there was strong support by submitters for this proposal.

Mr Beatson explained that currently there is no potable water to the Port and that for the upgrade, the project proposed to bring water from Council's Pohara Valley water supply. He noted that the supply was limited, especially in summer, hence the need for the nine water storage tanks. The bulk of the water would still be supplied from PTL.

Recommendation:

- Panel recommended that Mr Beatson (Stantec) has further discussions with PTL (submitter 20695) regarding water supply.

9. Do you support two new ablution buildings – one in each of the commercial and recreational areas?

19. Do you support saving \$145,000 by locating the public toilets close to the Boat Club, instead of locating them near the recreational marina and ramp

Ms Flood noted that submitters were supportive of the new ablution block in the commercial area, and that the recreational ablution building was also addressed in Question 19. A number opposed the proposal to install the ablution block next to the Pohara Boat Club. They preferred that the facilities were installed adjacent to the marina where they were needed.

Ms Flood noted that when the proposal was made, staff involved were unaware that Council paid a lease to the Boat Club to provide public access to their ablution facilities. She also noted that public access to the facilities is only between the hours of 9am to 5pm.

Recommendation:

- The Panel supported the commercial ablution building as proposed.
- The Panel recommended that the second ablution block be installed adjacent to the recreational marina.

10. Do you support Council changing the Port to a cost recovery model (as opposed to a profit model)?

Ms Flood stated that a number of submitters' commented on this question, with the majority in opposition and of the view that the Port should be profitable. Council's Finance Manager Mr McGlinchey noted that the Business Case was different to Council's policy on this matter –in terms of cost recovery and depreciation. Mr McGlinchey noted that this question as well as the issue of funding and financing of the Port would be covered in an upcoming workshop with all Councillors.

Recommendation:

- The Panel supported a profit model but welcomed the advice to come with the finance team.

11. Do you support the Port remaining in Council ownership?

Ms Flood noted that 95 percent of submissions supported Council retaining ownership. A majority also wanted Council to ensure that it retained management and operation of the Port.

Recommendation:

The Panel agreed with submitters, and concluded that ownership and management should remain with Council.

11a. If the Port remains in Council ownership, do you support ratepayers subsidising the commercial area?

Ms Flood stated that the majority of submitters opposed any subsidy for commercial users.

Recommendation:

The Panel agreed with submitters, and did not support any subsidy.

11b. If the Port remains in Council ownership, do you support ratepayers subsidising the recreational area?

Ms Flood noted that there was strong support from submitters (91%) for some sort of subsidy for the recreational component of the Port. Most noted the wide community benefit provided by the Port.

The Panel discussed the public benefits of the Port and how activities that benefit the public can be funded through rates. Mr McGlinchey noted that further work was to be done by staff to determine if a rates contribution would trigger a Long Term Plan amendment. Advice from staff included how to define recreational activities. Mr Ellis noted that some parts would still be funded by users including the recreational marina and boat ramp.

Recommendation:

That Panel recommended that activities that were beneficial to the wider public could be subsidised.

12. Do you support Council only accepting a Government loan as opposed to a Government grant to fund the proposed upgrade? Any loan would mean that ratepayers would have to subsidise the loan repayments and servicing costs.

Ms Flood stated that most of the submissions supported Council applying for a grant. She noted that the intention is to apply for funding from Government's Provincial Growth Fund.

Recommendation:

The Panel acknowledged this development is premised on a grant from the PGF.

13. Do you support the following non-commercial activities at the Port?

(a) penguin nesting boxes; (b) extension of the waka ama ramp; (c) new ramp on outer wall near Boat Club for safety; (d) appropriate amenity planting; (e) new reserve area near entrance to the recreational area.

Ms Flood noted that the majority of submitters supported all the proposals listed above. She noted that a few submitters did not want the proposed ramp on the outer western rock barrier or the extension of the Boat Club/ waka ama ramp. Ms Flood noted that the sailing and waka ama groups had requested the new ramp and extension for safety reasons.

Recommendation:

The Panel supported all of the proposed non-commercial activities.

Transportation

The Panel had a wide ranging discussion around transportation issues raised in submissions. Mr McPherson, Council's Transportation Manager, spoke to his comments in the staff report. He noted that his calculations of truck movements were based on average daily truck movements spread over a year. Mr Large clarified that there were peak seasons for harvesting mussels in the Bay (April to May and August to October), and for that reason the number of truck movements were not regular over the year.

Mr McPherson noted that Council would need to look at roading issues, including a cycle and walking path in its next LTP 2021-2031 and its Regional and Transport plan. The key would be ensuring an NZTA subsidy for the upgrade of the road and cycleway.

The Panel heard that in addition to traffic movements associated with the Port, there were also tourism peaks during the summer season. Mr Large noted that the increase in truck movements would happen over time, with peak production not occurring for several years.

Recommendation:

The Panel were of a view that the road needed upgrading to ensure the safety of road users, and that this was an issue that council needed to address separate to the Port upgrade. As the peak increase in truck movements would not happen for several years, and as the funding needed to be looked at in the LTP process to secure NZTA funding, it should be a priority project for Council.

The Mayor and Councillors had another engagement so the meeting finished early. Staff were asked to find another time for the Panel to reconvene to complete deliberations.

The meeting adjourned at 12.00 pm

The meeting reconvened on 19 August 2019

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

In Attendance: Strategic Policy Manager (S Flood), Commercial Portfolio Manager (A Ellis), Property Services Manager (M Johannsen), Finance Manager (M McGlinchey), Marine Farmers Association (N Wells), Stantec (N Beatson), Executive Assistant – Community Development (T Fifield)

1 OPENING, WELCOME

Ms Flood introduced Nigel Beatson from Stantec and Ned Wells from the Marine Farmers Association, who were present to answer any questions of a technical nature.

2 APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Nil

3 DELIBERATIONS

Staff reported back the outcome of discussions with Mr Bob Butts and Mr Merv Solly in relation to the use of the wharf for rock and dolomite transport. A number of the suggestions made at the hearings and discussed at the Deliberations meeting on day one were supported by operators.

The Hearing Panel viewed the revised physical layout of the commercial area of the Port and made comments. The main changes recommended included

- Allow rock and dolomite vessels continued access to the concrete wharf
- Excavate small area landward to allow barges more room.
- Allow rock to continue to be stored adjacent to the wharf rock in a way manner that will not adversely affect the other wharf users (wash down area, wet rock if required to reduce dust etc)
- Harbour Master building moved slightly south to allow a bigger gap between the building and the new sheet piled wharf for potential loading area
- remove car parking from the wharf to provide a more usable working Port area
- Reclaim to the north of the inner rock arm to create additional car parking
- move the maintenance grid closer to the proposed resilience ramp (the grid is to allow boats to undertake minor prop repair work/tangled rope etc)
- remove area to be dredged for the resilience ramp – meaning a significant cost saving

Recommendation:

- The Hearing Panel confirmed it was supportive of the proposed changes as outlined above to the commercial wharf space. The recommendation from day one for dredging for the resilience ramp was superseded as the dredging is no longer required with exception of the small area close to the concrete wharf.

Cost Saving Options (Questions 14 - 19)

14. Do you support saving \$868,000 by not constructing the new (resilience) concrete ramp?

This was covered when the Hearing Panel deliberated on day one in relation to Question 5.

Recommendations:

- The Panel confirmed that it did not support the construction of the concrete ramp as it was not needed.

15. Do you support saving \$486,000 by retaining the existing main wharf fender system, instead of replacing it?

The Panel discussed why this was originally included in the proposal. Staff noted that the current fender system will still be required if the larger vessels for transporting rock and dolomite are to continue to use the wharf.

Recommendations:

- The Panel supported the upgrade of the current fender system

16. Do you support saving \$570,000 by not constructing a sheet pile wall to the north of the new harbour manager building?

Staff noted that this questions was discussed in relation to Question 6 on day one of deliberations.

Recommendations

- The Panel did not support this cost saving proposal. They recommended that the sheet piling be undertaken to future proof the Port and provide more working wharf area.

17. Do you support saving \$600,000 by not constructing the maintenance wharf for commercial boats?

One of the panel members noted that at the recent Marine Biodiversity Forum, marine contamination and biofouling was discussed and questioned whether facilities should be provided at Port Taroakohe for this purpose. Advice was provided that significant land and resources are required for the establishment of such a facility and that Council staff are working with Nelson City Council and Port Nelson Ltd on this issue. They noted that a study was being completed to identify where these facilities were best located across the Nelson Tasman region. It was made clear that this maintenance facility was not for that purpose. .

Recommendation

- The Panel agreed that in order to reduce costs that the maintenance wharf was not included in the proposal. However when funds became available this was an item that could be developed at a later date.

18. Do you support saving \$1,290,000 by not constructing the third pontoon for the recreational marina?

The Panel discussed that this would probably be a Council cost as opposed to an item that would be funded through the PGF. It was clarified there is currently no demand for the third pontoon and

that there had been discussions with the Port Tarakohe Manager and the new layout provided enough berths to cater for the current recreational users. It was agreed that this will be discussed at Thursday's workshop when Council will be discussing the financial model.

Recommendation:

- The Panel agreed it was something they wanted discussed at the Council workshop on 22 August as to Council's financial ability to include into the project.
- Noted that the area was being dredged to allow it to be established at a later date

19. Do you support saving \$145,000 by locating the public toilets close to the Boat Club, instead of locating them near the recreational marina and ramp?

Staff noted that this question had already been addressed on day one of deliberations in relation to Question 9.

Recommendation:

The Panel confirmed they do not support this cost savings measure and recommended that the new ablution block be constructed adjacent to the new recreational marina out on the western breakwater.

Recreational Marina and Swing Moorings

The Panel discussed the impact of constructing the additional recreational marina berth and the loss of another four or five swing moorings. Mr Beatson confirmed that once the outer breakwater was extended it would be possible to add a few more moorings on both the western and eastern side, and the new wave modelling would confirm the best locations.

Recommendation:

- The Panel recommended that as many new moorings are installed as possible, with location and number to be confirmed once the new wave modelling when complete.

Noise, Light and Rubbish

Noise: Staff advised that they had been working with the marine farmers and had reached an agreement to help reduce vessel noise in the mornings. It was agreed that all vessels would leave the Port under low revs (5 knots) until they are 1 nautical mile out of the Port.

An issue was raised in regard to truck noise in Pohara and Council's legal responsibility if residents choose to build near roads? Staff noted that they would seek advice from Council's consents team and Transportation Manager and report back on this question

Light Pollution: Mr Beatson noted that the upgrade to the lighting at the Port has been included in the cost estimate and that it would likely be LED lighting. The Panel noted that it would be good if the lights were LED, as it makes a significant difference to light spill.

Recommendation:

The Panel noted the issues raised by the submitters and that the mitigation measures be noted back to them.

Penguin Precinct

The panel discussed the proposed penguin precinct and submissions received. The Hearing Panel supported a penguin precinct and a predator free u-shaped fence constructed to prohibit access onto the rock inner and outer arms.

The Panel noted that viewing platforms for penguins could be a future project and the community may want to become involved.

Recommendation

- The panel supported a penguin precinct is established and that the inner and outer western rock arms fenced to protect the area
- The panel noted a shorebird roosting area could be established as recommended by Dr Cockrem in his submission.

Other Comments

The Panel discussed a number of the other matters that were raised by submitters including future car parking and the current Council leases with the Motor Home Association and boat storage. It was confirmed the grey highlighted area on the map was to show future car parking space if and when required by user demand.

The Panel discussed whether the western arm could also be widened to provide more usable space. Ms Flood noted that advice from consents staff was that it would be more difficult to secure a coastal permit to reclaim any of the coastal marine environment outside the Port environs. This was also the case with the previously discussed idea of pumping sand dredged from inside the Port area to outside the western rock arm.

Ms Stafford highlighted that iwi are likely to be interested around wastewater and water. This was particularly with regard to the new ablution block located near the marina and the piping of water from the Pohara Valley scheme to the Port.

Staff confirmed that there was space provided for any future eco-tourism venture that may eventuate with the operators able to disembark passengers at the recreational marina.

The matter of an overall strategic plan for Tarakohe was also discussed. The Panel agreed that it would be very beneficial to develop a strategic plan in future. Staff noted that this was on the work programme, but currently staff did not have the capacity and that it was likely this would not be able to be looked at until the next Long Term Plan 2021-2031 was completed.

In regard to plastics and rubbish being washed up on the local beaches, Mr Wells noted that a lot of work is already happening and being led by MFA via beach clean-up days. He noted that of the rubbish they collect it is usually 70% from other users and 30% related to the mussel farms. Mr Wells said that there is technology being developed to use at the farms where ties will no longer be used and floats will be secured in a way that they can't break loose. Ms Langford suggested that it would be beneficial for the marine farmers to attend a Golden Bay Community Board meeting to discuss the activities they have underway and how they could work better with the local community.

The Panel also discussed the location of the ice tower on the wharf. It was agreed that it needs to move from its current location with the changes to the working wharf. Mr Ellis noted that there were three potential locations close to the wharf where the tower could be relocated to and that staff would have further discussions with Talley's to determine their preferred location. It was confirmed that if it remains on the wharf this would be by a lease agreement with Council.

The Hearing Panel noted that they are seeking clarification at the Council workshop on 22 August regarding any proposed Marine Farmers Industry contribution to the project. Mr Wells clarified that they are looking to fund the cranes needed as part of the project. He noted that in the short term the operators are happy to work with what is available.

The meeting concluded at 11.06 am.

Date Confirmed:

Chair:

Unconfirmed