



STAFF REPORT

TO: Environment & Planning Committee

FROM: Rose Biss and Shelagh Noble

REFERENCE: L314

SUBJECT: **PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE MAPUA AND RUBY BAY DEVELOPMENT - REPORT REP10-09-10-** Report prepared for meeting of 23 September 2010

“In Committee”

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to update the Council on the consultation feedback received on draft plan change 22 Mapua and Ruby Bay Development. It is also to make any alterations to the draft Mapua and Ruby Bay plan change and seek Council approval to enable the plan change to proceed to public notification. It also addresses whether some rules in the plan change should have legal effect.

2. BACKGROUND

The Council has considered a number of reports on the future development of Mapua and Ruby Bay EP05/03/26, EP08/06/04, EP09/06/06 and EP10/05/27. The process has included consultation on the draft Mapua Structure Plan in 2008 and most recently a draft Plan Change for Mapua and Ruby Bay development in June /July this year. Key issues raised at an early stage were infrastructure, coastal hazards, coastal access and protection of productive land.

3. CONSULTATION FEEDBACK

3.1 The Council approved the release of the draft plan change on Mapua and Ruby Bay Development for consultation at its meeting on 20 May 2010. The consultation included an open day at the Mapua Bowling Club on 16 June 2010 and a presentation to the Mapua and Districts Community Association and to local iwi. Letters were also sent to all landowners in the area affected.

3.2 There were 52 responses received most of which were from local residents. A summary is attached (attachment 1) and a full set of the responses is available to Councillors. The responses included some from community groups such as the Mapua and Districts Business Association and the Cycle and Walkways Group. Government agencies that responded were the NZ Transport Agency, NZ Historic

Places Trust and the Department of Conservation. There was no response from iwi. One response asked for a longer timeframe to reply. A summary list of those who responded is attached.

3.3 The main issues raised in consultation were:

- Infrastructure
- Hazards
- Productive land and rural character
- Open space
- Population growth and demand for residential land
- Type of residential zoning
- Business and commercial growth
- Zone changes
- Heritage

3.3.1 Infrastructure

A number of respondents either support or oppose the “deferred zoning”. The reasons for the deferral are generally understood by the respondents, however many still want the infrastructure works to be implemented more quickly.

The road widening and improvements to Seaton Valley, Pomona and Aranui Roads are supported, other than one response, as is the development of a “gateway” to Mapua / Ruby Bay. The Coastal Initiative Group suggests that the two other gateways at Seaton Valley / Gardner Valley Roads (the Moutere Gateway) and the northern Tasman Gateway be similarly identified.

Some respondents are concerned about the precise location of the “indicative roads” and may wish other site specific variations (to roads, walkways and esplanades), however the feedback generally supports the roading, walkway, cycleway and reserve initiatives. A concern is expressed that new playing fields should be located closer to the school (#9, #50).

A detailed submission from the Mapua and Districts Cycle and Walkways Group proposes a sequence for the implementation of listed projects. There is a suggestion that movement linkages to nearby rural living developments with the Mapua / Ruby Bay village and Tasman village areas also be identified and developed.

One respondent would like a staged progression of development from east to west from the current residential area.

Another respondent suggests that its land be zoned residential and allowed to be developed immediately with on site wastewater and potable water systems (150 Mapua Drive #36) while other land is already partly serviced but limited as to capacity of the system (71 Mapua Drive #32).

Comment: It is in the interests of all future landowners to be connected to sustainable reticulated networks in an efficient and consistent manner so deferrals and indicative roads are recommended to be retained.

No change to the location of the future playing fields is recommended.

Water storage - several respondents have suggested that all new residential development should have the facility to collect and store water for domestic consumption. It should be noted that the current rules do not prevent residents collecting and storing rainwater.

3.3.2 Hazards

While some respondents support the commitment to forward planning and the consideration of hazards leading to the extension of the Coastal Hazard Area and the closure of parts of the Rural 1 and Residential Zones (for example # 14), most respondents directly affected by these parts of the proposed changes oppose them. Some property owners state that they do not fully understand the effects of the proposed changes on their land and need a greater level of information. Others are concerned about the effects on the valuation of their properties.

Comment: The changes mean that subdivision, other than boundary adjustments would be a prohibited activity in any Closed Zone. This means no applications for subdivision will be received and any development proposals would be considered via a plan change. Changes to the rules would make any new dwellings a non-complying activity in the Coastal Hazard Area, although building alterations and extensions may be a restricted discretionary activity if certain conditions are met. The change to the upper end of Ruby Bay from Rural 1 to Residential Closed, would trigger a site cover limitation which applies as a condition of a Restricted Discretionary activity in any alteration or extension to an existing building. The concern of landowners directly affected by the development controls is clearly understandable. What Council has tried to achieve is a balance between containing the exposure to future hazard risks, ensuring Council itself does not have to bear the cost of servicing high risk development, but at the same time ensuring individual responsibility, should owners wish to pursue development opportunities.

There are requests to keep the status quo (#16,#33) and for further investigations and monitoring into the effectiveness of hard options in protecting the community from the effects of coastal hazards (erosion, inundation, tsunami). One respondent (#40) suggests that flooding should be dealt with separately from inundation and coastal erosion. Another (#9) suggests that coastal land use controls should be confined to erosion and not be for inundation. Response #49 suggests only undeveloped land should be included in a Closed Zone and all low lying land in the district should be considered at the same time.

Comment: Council is committed to operating within the framework of 'best available information' and is following MfE guidance on the likely extent of sea level rise. The extension of the Coastal Hazard Area and the closure of parts of the Rural 1 and Residential Zones are preventative measures considered necessary in the light of current research. The status quo has not proved effective in managing subdivision at Ruby Bay. Some land is subject to multiple hazards at Ruby Bay so it is impractical to address the hazards separately. Closed zoning has been used elsewhere in the district, including on some developed areas. The Coastal Hazard Area has been delineated on

the basis of no long term provision for full shoreline erosion and seawater inundation mitigation measures being taken.

The Department of Conservation (#35) suggests a two tier hazard risk approach and that some additional text is included in the Explanation section 6.15.30, to provide a historic context to the incidence of erosion along the Ruby Bay shoreline.

Comment: Part of the suggested text would add value and is recommended to be added. It is shown in bold italics in the strikeout version of the Plan change.

Some respondents (#50) request that the Council reconsiders the proposed Rules where a site is vacant; to allow an exemption for the erection of a single dwelling if it is able to be relocated and there is no other dwelling on the site. One respondent suggests that this could be accompanied by an encumbrance on the title indemnifying Council from liability should there be damage from a hazard event. This approach could be explored further for the few lots which remain unbuilt on at Ruby Bay. Since the release of the draft change some of these landowners have sought resource consent for a dwelling under the existing Plan provisions.

Comment: Some further options for vacant sites within the Coastal Hazard Area should be considered:

- **Amend the proposal to allow a dwelling as a discretionary activity, provided there is no other habitable dwelling on the site, that services are available, that hazard mitigation measures can be readily provided without adverse effects on other parties and Council is indemnified from any liability for damage sustained by a hazard event by way of an encumbrance on the title.**
- **Retain the draft change proposal that a habitable building is a non complying activity in all circumstances**
- **Should the relocation of an existing dwelling to a safer location be a non-complying activity or a discretionary activity?**

Some of the costs of the first option are that it would slightly weaken the policy that there are no further habitable buildings exposed to hazard risk in the Coastal Hazard Area. However a benefit is that landowners would still be able to build on vacant sites provided they are prepared to accept liability for hazard risk and can undertake hazard mitigation measures that do not adversely affect other parties or the environment. If the few vacant sites in the Coastal Hazard Area can still be used this may avert any appeal on the grounds of unreasonableness. An amendment to the limited discretionary activity in the Coastal Hazard Area rules is proposed. The Council can further protect itself through the use of hazard clauses on any Certificate of Title.

A further suggestion is that the Coastal Environment Area be rationalised along title boundaries, particularly in the vicinity of the Mapua Leisure Park. A respondent (#35) queries why Tahī Street and parts of Iwa Street are not included in the Coastal Hazard Area.

Comment: No action is recommended as the affected properties are all within the Coastal Hazard Area. The reason Tahī Street and Iwa Street have not been included in the Coastal Hazard Area relates to the slightly lower risk in these areas compared to Ruby Bay.

3.3.3 Productive Land and Rural Character

Some respondents oppose the loss of productive land in Mapua for residential use and do not support the release of any new land for urban purposes (#6). There is also a concern that the utilisation of nearby Rural 3 zoned land for rural residential use is not desirable and these areas should be better integrated with nearby townships. However the latter goes beyond the scope of the proposed plan change.

Comment: The choice of land available for future development at Mapua and Ruby Bay has been limited by hazard, servicing and coastal landscape considerations. It has been necessary to consider the use of some productive land.

3.3.4 Open Space and Walkways

A number of respondents in the future residential and industrial zones state that they have no objection to locating a reserve on their property as part of a future subdivision providing they have some input into the location of the reserve and in respect of the industrial zone reserve Seaton Valley Stream - the width. One respondent offers a further wetland reserve on lowlying land on their property at the south end of Aranui Park (#12). Another prefers walkways to link to reserves (not roads).

Comment: The reserves shown on the planning map are indicative so there can be some flexibility as to where they are provided within a subdivision. Usually the respondents have not indicated alternative sites where the reserves should be located so no change, other than a very minor change to a walkway on to Mapua Drive is recommended. It is common practice in urban subdivisions for walkways to link to both roads and reserves.

The Community Services Department does not support the wetland reserve proposal referred to in response #12. A drainage reserve is recommended instead as the land is too low and wet for development.

Some landowners have asked that indicative reserves are removed from land where there is no provision for subdivision such as where there is a QEII Trust covenant (#39) or where the zoning is closed along the Ruby Bay coast.

It is recommended that the walkway shown on the QEII covenant south of Higgs Road is removed. It is recommended the indicative esplanade strip on the P Talley property is retained because the Council has secured public access on either side of this property including the Old Mill Walkway and esplanade reserve.

3.3.5 Population Growth and Demand for Residential Land

Some responses query the need for additional residential land given recent approvals for 517 lots in the nearby Rural 3 Zone, and the 90 lot residential lot subdivision in Aranui Road.

Comment: the Council has identified requirements based on both government and its own projections to the year 2031. It anticipates 254 new households at a standard or higher density. The Rural 3 Zone subdivisions are targeting a different market in a different locality, although it is acknowledged that some of the nearby rural residents may use Mapua facilities.

A number of respondents support the location of future residential on higher ground. Some seek clarification with regard to suitability of residential development in the Special Residential Development Area at the northern end of Tahi Street and also the northern extension of the Warren Place Light Industrial Zone when land adjacent to both sites is proposed to be closed.

Comment: The LiDAR contour information recently acquired by Council confirms that both these areas are at, or can be raised to, a suitable elevation or can be readily protected from remaining hazard risk (apart from the southern end of the Council's Tahi Street site which is proposed to be in a closed zone) to minimise the risk of inundation by either seawater or floodwater. Therefore these areas would be suitable for subdivision and use as proposed.

3.3.6 Type of Residential Zoning

One respondent (#36) opposes the use of the Richmond West and South development controls at Mapua on the grounds that they are too prescriptive. However the greater consideration for environmental outcomes embodied in the Urban design guide in the TRMP is considered desirable for new development at Mapua and no alteration to the change is recommended.

3.3.7 Business and Commercial Opportunities

There is general support for additional commercial areas adjacent to and opposite the Mapua village and south of the Mapua wharf. Further business opportunity north of Warren Place is also generally supported apart from the neighbouring landowner (#45) on the east side of Seaton Valley Stream who prefers it to be on his own property (or alternatively rural residential).

The Mapua and Districts Business Association (#46) and #25 have asked for more consideration to be given for parking provisions for the two commercial nodes including public transport setdown areas outside the main village area.

Comment: a public setdown point is proposed to be included in the southern gateway beside the Ruby Bay Bypass. Further work on car parking provisions in Mapua is not proposed at this stage other than to construct the carpark at the waterfront park.

Several responses support motel development on part of the ex FCC site. The Mapua Leisure Park has queried the reduction of building coverage on its site in the Tourist Services Zone from 60% to 30%.

Comment: high building coverage at 60% on a site subject to coastal hazard risk such as the Mapua Leisure Park is inappropriate. The proposed threshold of 30% is consistent with the “as of right” standard that applies to residentially zoned land.

The landowners of the proposed commercial area near the junction of Seaton Valley Road and Mapua Drive oppose the particular location and the Business Association has requested further discussion on the location and function of the area. The option of having a commercial zone on the north side of Mapua Drive was assessed as option O in the Section 32 report presented to Council on 20 May 2010.

Comment: It is recommended that the Commercial Zone is retained on Seaton Valley Road. However, if Council is happy we could indicate a willing to adjust the siting with the landowners’ and the local Business Association’s input.

3.3.8 Zone Changes

Some landowners have sought a different zoning on their land:

Respondent #26 seeks light industrial or rural residential zoning on 4 hectare land immediately south of the Ruby Bay Residential Closed Zone. The Council has previously considered these options and rejected them (EP10-05-27).

The owners of a 3.3 hectare property in the proposed Rural 1 Closed Zone at the south end of Broadsea Avenue propose that it is zoned residential (#40). The land is low lying, poorly drained and it would be contrary to the plan change which is that the whole Ruby Bay coastal plain area is closed to future subdivision. The strategy for future residential and rural residential development at Mapua /Ruby Bay is to provide for it on the hills. For these reasons the proposal is not supported.

The owner of a 0.38 hectare block at 29 Aranui Rd (#11) adjoining the west side of the Council’s land seeks that his land and 23 and 25 Aranui Road is also included in the Special Development Area (SDA). However 29 Aranui Road is generally lower than the Council land which is in the SDA. Alternatively he suggests that 23 and 25 Aranui Road is zoned Commercial like the land to the east. No change is recommended.

Several landowners (#3, #33) in the proposed Rural 1 Closed Zone seek that their land is able to be subdivided for rural residential purposes. No change is recommended due to hazard risk exposure and that there is plenty of other higher land more suitable and zoned for rural residential development.

3.3.9 Heritage

Several responses seek changes to the heritage provisions. The owner of former apple packing shed building on Mapua Drive (shown on Area Map 87 as H25) seeks information on the heritage assessment. Two further buildings are suggested for

listing in the change - the Mapua Hall on Aranui Road and ex apple coolstore building adjoining the Mapua Wharf.

The Mapua Hall has no particular architectural merit but it has been the venue for many important public meetings and in earlier times was a popular dance hall so has strong community associations. The ex apple coolstore building, now used for various commercial uses is a significant character building in the Mapua wharf complex.

Comment: It is recommended that a copy of the heritage assessment is provided to the owner of the former apple packing shed and discussions are initiated with the owner of the former coolstore building about its heritage values.

3. OTHER MATTERS

3.1 Noise

When a draft of the plan change was presented to the Council on 20 May 2010 it included a new noise standard Leq for the residential zone. However proposed Plan Change 19 has since introduced a new noise standard across the district so it is no longer necessary to include this specific section of the plan change.

Comment: It is recommended that the noise provisions for the residential zone in the draft change are removed (sections 7.1.2 and 7.1.3).

3.2 Section 86 RMA

Section 86 is a new section of the Act introduced in 2009. It changes the presumption that new rules will have some legal effect once a plan change is publicly notified. As a result of the RMA amendments in 2009 new landuse rules, except heritage rules, do not have any legal effect until after the Council has made its decisions on submissions. However there is a provision for the Council to apply to the Environment Court to make some or all of the rules effective if it considers that it is important that particular rules do have immediate effect at the time of public notification. To prevent a rush of applications under the existing rules that could easily undermine the intent of the plan change it is recommended that the Coastal Hazard Zone, Residential Closed Zone and Rural 1 Closed Zone rules have legal effect at the time of public notification. There have already been several applications for resource consents made in the affected areas.

Section 86 does not apply to new policies so if the Council introduces new policies through a plan change they cannot be put into effect through new rules until after the Council has made its decision on submissions unless the Council obtains an Environment Court order to give the new rules legal effect as described above.

4. NETWORK SERVICES UPDATE

Steady progress is being made in upgrading services in the Mapua Ruby Bay area to support the proposed plan change.

4.1 Wastewater

A new wastewater main has been installed along Rabbit Island and in the last few months the section across the Mapua Channel was completed. Further work is required to upgrade pump stations throughout Mapua and Ruby Bay. The main pumping station at the Mapua Wharf is expected to be renewed and relocated in the next 12 months.

4.2 Stormwater

The upgrade of the tide gates at the Mapua Causeway has been completed. Further work on Seaton Valley Stream widening awaits the signing of landowner agreements. There has been recent consultation with Ruby Bay residents on improvements to local stormwater systems between Stafford Drive and the sea.

4.3 Water

The Council has received consent to take additional water from the Motueka area. After resolution of any appeals the pipeline is proposed to be laid between 2011 and 2019. The Aranui Road main is programmed to be replaced midway through that period in 2014- 2015.

4.4 Roothing

The Ruby Bay Bypass is expected to open on 22 October 2010.

5. PURCHASE OF LAND AT DOMINION ROAD FLATS

At the time of writing of this report the Property Officer is still in negotiations regarding the extent of surplus land from the Mapua Bypass construction project that the Council may purchase at Dominion Road flats. Some other zoning than Rural Residential would be appropriate if land is taken for wetland restoration purposes.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Committee:

1. **Approve** the Plan Change for Mapua and Ruby Development shown as Attachment 2 to REP10-09-10 (including the italicised amendments) for public notification on 9 October 2010.
2. **Approve** the forwarding of a request to the Environment Court under Section 86D of the Resource Management Act seeking that parts of the plan change relating to the Coastal Hazard Area, Residential Closed Zone and Rural 1 Closed Zone rules have legal effect from public notification.

Rose Biss
Policy Planner

Shelagh Noble
Policy Planner

Mapua and Ruby Bay Draft Plan Change No. 22 Summary of Responses

No.	Name	Summary
1	Mansbridge, Angus 46B Aranui Road	Concerned about future scale of commercial activity at the Mapua village, and that this might lead to an extended commercial strip towards the wharf. Supports the location of commercial uses at the junction of Mapua Drive and Seaton Valley Road.
2	Brown, Marie 1 Tait Street	Concerned about localised stormwater flooding. Requests a stormwater connection. DS has responded.
3	Senior, Gerald Re 49 Stafford Drive	Supports the rezoning of Mapua Rural Residential to Deferred Rural Residential Serviced. Relief sought: the balance of the Rural 1 land to be four approx. 8 ha blocks (one for reserve). (Note: The Draft Plan Change proposes to rezone as part Rural 1 Closed and part Deferred Rural Residential Serviced with access to Stafford Drive). Queries the existence of two archaeological sites on his land. This appears to be incorrect. No sites are indicated on the relevant map. SN has advised.
4	Kemp, David 190 Dominion Road	Concerned to identify vistas. Suggests a field trip with Cr Ensor to do this.
5	Lemke, Bruno 110 Stafford Drive	Supports the Seaton Valley walkway to Mapua School.
6	Jackson, John Re 138, 140, 142 Stafford Drive (also refer responses 15 & 47)	Comments below relate to the Structure Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Queries the demographics - 254 new households required by 2031. If new Rural 3 lots total 517 and the Aranui Road approved consent would provide 90 lots, there appears to be sufficient supply. • Opposes Principle 2 for Mapua Development. Queries Principles 3 and 6. Requests a new Principle regarding storage of rainwater for domestic consumption. • Objects to Stafford Drive rezoning Residential Closed. Objects to restriction on future subdivision and new residential buildings. Reasons - loss of property value; already invested \$70,000 in erosion protection; inconsistency when development proposed in the Mapua Wharf and Tahī Street locality on the former FCC site. • Queries Council's future erosion protection measures along the unprotected shoreline; supports Stafford Drive proposed stormwater pipes, waste water upgrade proposals, open space and walkways, and movement networks, but upgrade of Seaton Valley Road and Pomona Roads should be deferred.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes loss of productive land for residential use. • Supports the idea of 'live/work' units on the former FCC site, provided design complements wharf buildings; and suggests signage to identify special cultural features.
7	Cassin, Fred 8A Toru Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports encouraging urban development on higher land. • Concerned about ANY further subdivision on Tahī, Iwa and Toru Streets and Aranui Road south of Higgs Street in order to protect the old village character. Commercial / shops should locate south of the 4 Square supermarket, with parking, motel-style accommodation and boat ramp around the former FCC site. • Supports deferral of further subdivision until sewer and water are upgraded. • Supports promotion of heritage and green natural reserves, walkways and cycleways. • Supports the development of a 'gateway'.
8	Talley, Peter Re 154 Aranui Road (also refer response 17)	Supports 'umbrella' management plans and a long-term view SUBJECT to fully understanding the effect on property owners' rights. Information provided is unclear and the consequences may be significant. Reserves right to challenge.
9	Bibby-Smith, Fiona 11 Dawson Road	<p>Supports the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network of reserves/parks and walkways (as soon as possible) • The closed residential zones • The development of the former FCC site as a reserve • The development of large playing fields in Seaton Valley Road (though would be better closer to the school) • The access to the coastline via esplanade strips • Deferring subdivisions until infrastructure is available • The purchase of 'Dominion Flats' for Mapua gateway development • The landscaping corridor into the village, and • The upgrading of Seaton Valley Road. <p>Requests the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Box culvert under private driveway next to school for child safety • A cycle way on the hill up the Bluffs • No traffic on the wharf • Streetscaping between the two commercial zones (an avenue of trees?) • A walkway on one side of Seaton Valley Road (for safe walking to school) • Coastal control for erosion only (if necessary) and not to prevent inundation.
10	Tansley, Wilma 198 Stafford Drive	Opposed to closing the Rural and Residential Zones and preventing any new housing in the Mapua and Ruby Bay coastal areas. Requests private consultation to allay fears.
11	Aranui Syndicate (Chris Edmonds)	Supports the Special Development Area. Requests that Lot 59 DP 17242 be included in the Special Development Area. Suggests that 25 and 27 Aranui Road also

	Re 29 Aranui Road	be included either in the Special Development Area or in the extended Commercial Zone.
12	Brown, Andy & Jane 120 Higgs Road	Supports contribution of wetland areas and other areas on property for cycle and safe walkways. Suggests inclusion of additional area to provide a contiguous strip from Aranui Park through the Thawley's land to the coast. (Note: also refer to Thawley response #39) Suggests a staged programme for development (already proposed as 'Deferred Residential').
13	Lucas, David & Jane (Landmark Lile Ltd) 21 Tahi Street and 14 Iwa Street	Oppose the proposals to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change the current Residential to Residential Closed • Prohibit further subdivision (Rule 16.3.3.6) • Remove the right to construct a second dwelling as a Controlled Activity (Rule 17.1.3.1) (Note: it is 17.1.3.4(j) that makes a second dwelling non-complying) • Disallow filling below the 4.6 metre contour unless on Tahi Street for the purpose of constructing a building platform (Rules 18.5.2.1(p) and 18.5.2.3(b)). <p>The Plan Change does not provide for the efficient and sustainable use and enjoyment of the existing residentially zoned land. The response also refers generally to a number of the proposed policies and explanations in Chapters 6 and 13, namely Policies 6.15.1.1, 6.15.3.6, 6.15.3.7, Method 6.15.20.1(b), Explanation 6.15.30; Policies 13.1.3.2, 13.1.3.4A, 13.1.3.4B, 13.1.3.4C, Explanation 13.1.30.</p>
14	Sampson, Russell & Pam 8 Iwa Street	Support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The general principles • That 6 and 8 Iwa Street be included in the Future Residential Closed Zone (Note: also see response #16 below) • The 'Wharf Node' area. Oppose any future change to commercial zoning (No 6 is adjacent to the proposed Commercial Zone extension). Request immediate application of the Principles.
15	Jackson, Eve 142 Stafford Drive (also 138 & 140 Stafford Drive) (also refer responses 6 & 47)	Opposes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The closure and prevention of future development (eg extensions to existing dwelling or development of adjoining two sections). It would devalue the two undeveloped sections. Queries whether the proposed development of the former Fruitgrowers' Chemical Company is consistent with constraints proposed on adjacent land.
16	Waugh, John & Armstrong, Anne 6 Iwa Street (Landmark Lile Ltd)	Oppose the proposals to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change the current Residential to Residential Closed • Prohibit further subdivision (Rule 16.3.3.6) • Remove the right to construct a second dwelling as a Controlled Activity (Rule 17.1.3.1) (actually it is 17.1.3.4(j) that makes a second dwelling non-complying) • Disallow filling below the 4.6 metre contour for the purpose of constructing a building platform (Rules 18.5.2.1(p) and 18.5.2.3(b)).

		<p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain rights for landowners on Iwa Street to subdivide and develop properties in accordance with current TRMP provisions. (The site can accommodate 4 dwellings ... consent has been obtained to demolish one and construct two.) • Recognise the suitability of the site for more intensive residential accommodation or tourist accommodation • Look for more innovative design tools to utilise valuable serviced residential land in the heart of Mapua. <p>The response also refers generally to a number of the proposed policies and explanations in Chapters 6 and 13, namely Policies 6.15.1.1, 6.15.3.6, 6.15.3.7, Method 6.15.20.1(b), Explanation 6.15.30; Policies 13.1.3.2, 13.1.3.4A, 13.1.3.4B, 13.1.3.4C, Explanation 13.1.30.</p>
17	Talley, P, Fyder, J, and Fitchett, J 154 Aranui Road (also refer response 8) (Landmark Lile Ltd)	<p>The land is 2.7952ha of undeveloped serviced land, protected by a seawall, and at a level of approximately 5.0m. A dwelling could be constructed on the land outside the existing Coastal Hazard Area as a Controlled Activity. The draft Plan Change would prohibit subdivision and make construction of a habitable building a non-complying activity (Rules 18.9.2.1 - 18.9.2.4). If subdivision is prohibited the 'indicative reserves / strip' is unnecessary.</p> <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend 18.9.2.1 to allow construction of a dwelling on titles where there is no dwelling • Amend the policy framework to allow this (Policies 6.15.3.2, 6.15.3.6, Method 6.15.20.1(b), Explanation 6.15.30; Policy 13.1.3.4C, Explanation 13.1.30) • Remove the 'indicative reserves / strip' from the frontage to the subject site.
18	Jarvis, Martin 44 Stafford Drive (also refer response 26)	<p>The property is elevated, furthest from the sea, shares no boundaries with waterways and is outside the Coastal Environment Area. Respondent intends to lodge a resource consent to subdivide (Discretionary Activity in Rural 1 currently).</p> <p>Opposes the introduction of the Rural 1 Closed Zone.</p> <p>Advises that one of the site owners has NOT expressed interest in a recreational use for the property.</p>
19	NZ Historic Places Trust	<p>Supports the draft Plan Change, particularly Issue 6.15.1.2, Policy 6.15.3.2, Reasons and Explanations 6.15.30 and the addition of the Wells Packing Shed to the Waimea Moutere Ward Schedule 16.13A with amendments as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend 6.15.3.4 '<i>To maintain Mapua Wharf and its historic wharf buildings as a vibrant and active visitor destination, incorporating the eastern part of the ex FCC site to provide for a limited extension of visitor attractions that complements the historic and low key maritime atmosphere and enhances public access to the foreshore</i>'. • Amend 6.15.20.1(f) '<i>Rules limiting the removal of and alteration to archaeological sites prior to gaining archaeological authority and if required, Council consent.</i>' (This is in relation to a submission on Plan Change 16 Rule 16.13.6.1) • Consider listing the apple store on Mapua Wharf in the Waimea Moutere Ward Schedule 16.13A: Heritage Buildings.
20	Carter, Lois 20A Tahi Street	<p>Concerned about a number of infrastructure and maintenance issues outside the ambit of the draft Plan Change, namely</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stormwater ponding on Tahi Street and Grossi Point (stormwater upgrade scheduled for 2012/13 needs to happens

		<p>sooner - ponding is worse since the rehabilitation works on the former FCC site)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potholes on Tahi Street - speed humps would discourage fast drivers • Trees dying at the Grossi Reserve • New barbecues needed to replace the old ones.
21	Darling, Keith 209 Stafford Drive	<p>Supports the recognition of coastal hazards, and the limiting of subdivision and building on low lying land.</p> <p>Queries the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>'Encouraging development on higher land'</i> is confusing alongside proposals for <i>'development on the Fruitgrowers' Chemical Company site'</i>. What sites are earmarked for wetlands / biodiversity / recreational parks? • Rural resident appears to subsidise the demands of the urban resident for high cost and high maintenance infrastructure assets. Protect and enhance the sustainable rural lifestyle • <i>'Providing for further growth opportunities'</i> is confusing when the development opportunities are deferred • Why does the plan not have a wider Mouere Ward context?
22	Robinson, T & J Re 22 Iwa Street	<p>Oppose the draft Plan Change if it will prevent the opportunity to build a granny flat and rebuild or renovate the existing house.</p>
23	Adventure Leisure Properties (Nigel McFadden Mapua Leisure Park) 33 Toru Street (Landmark Lile Ltd)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes the inclusion of <i>coastal protection structures</i> within the definition of <i>building</i>, as there is no explanation as to why this is necessary, and it would appear that a rock wall is already included in the definition of <i>structure</i>. • Queries Policy 6.15.3.6 what is meant by <i>channel entrance</i>? (Note: Mr Lile is of the view that the draft Plan Change does not affect buildings on the Leisure Park site, however as the Coastal Hazard Area is extended to include the whole of the Leisure Park site, any new habitable buildings <i>would</i> be non-complying.) • Queries Policy 6.15.3.15 (Note: this relates to the former FCC site and waterfront park, not the Leisure Centre.) • Queries the removal of words in Reasons 6.15.30 'which makes future scenarios difficult to predict' ... these words are proposed for inclusion, not deletion. • Opposes the reduction of Building Coverage from 60% to 30% (Rule 17.2.4.1(b)(iii)) on the grounds it is unnecessary. • Opposes changes to Reasons 17.2.20 as the site's location in the Coastal Environment Area already provides sufficient control. • Opposes the additional controls over fill in Chapter 18.5 Land Disturbance Area.
24	Mapua Auto Centre Marion & Peter Satherley 7 Warren Place (also refer response 25)	<p>Request the area be renamed the 'Ruby Coast'.</p> <p>Request Council review the sub-leasing conditions in future leasing of the Mapua Wharf to avoid exploitation.</p> <p>Support the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The expansion of the Light Industrial Zone at Warren Place • The decision not to pursue development between the southern edge of Ruby Bay housing and the Seaton Valley Stream <p>as this will ensure light industry is kept in one locality, with one access point to Stafford Drive, and minimal conflict with the</p>

		residential interface.
25	Satherley, Marion 69 Stafford Drive (also refer reponse 24)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the following: (note comments relate to the Structure Plan not the draft Plan Change) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ More open spaces ○ Intense walkway / cycle links ○ Street tree plantings ○ Increased reserve areas, which all preserve the character of Mapua. • Suggests a structure plan be developed for the wider 'Ruby Coast' area. • Supports the 10 principles for development. • Supports the Infrastructure and Open Space section, especially widening of the Seaton Valley stream, and upgrading of Seaton Valley Road. Urges collection of rainwater, reuse of waste water, an additional walkway from Stafford Drive through to the Old Mill Walkway (end of Broadsea Avenue), and extension of the Aranui streetscaping to Stafford Drive and Mapua Drive. • Supports Landscape & Natural Character, and Land for Residential Needs with some flexibility required. • Supports the Commercial & Industrial Needs section, provided extra parking is provided at the Mapua Wharf. • Supports the Movement Networks - gateway concept could be extended to Dominion Flats, Stagecoach Road and Tasman Road. Forest restoration supported. • Queries the need for Natural Risk Management if property owners are prepared to fully accept the risks. • Supports the preservation of our past. Mapua Hall should be a Historical Building; construct a viewing platform to appreciate the area at the top of Dominion Road. • Commends Council on the consultation process.
26	Jarvis, Gary Re 44 Stafford Drive (also refer response 18)	Opposes the Closed Rural 1 Zoning. Challenges the IPCC data on climate change and global warming. Asserts that a more likely sea level rise would be 16cm by 2100, not 80cm. (Note: the MfE advises Councils to plan for 80cm or 0.8m by 2100.
27	Bannister, F 16 Iwa Street	Opposes the Residential Closed Zone for the small portion of Iwa Street, for the reasons that many properties have already subdivided and the respondent would like to build an elevated and moveable family flat on the land adjacent to the existing dwelling. Council has kept development options open for its remediated land - is this a double standard?
28	Pratt, E J 190 Stafford Drive	Queries why the Warren Place Industrial Zone and extension is excluded from the Coastal Hazard Area (Note: it is outside the flood risk area).
29	Johns, Richard & Christine Re 6 Seaton Valley Road, cnr Mapua Drive	Oppose the Rural 1 Closed Zone, as this would result in inability to develop the land. The site is above 3.5m contour and does not flood. If this land is to be used for retention to control flooding elsewhere should compensation apply?
30	Brown, Jim & Panes, Julie 18 Stafford Drive	Oppose the acquisition of a 5 metre strip along the Seaton Valley Stream at the rear of the property, unless this can be included as a reserve contribution when subdivision occurs in the future as part of the deferred Light Industry Zone. Query on which side of the stream the walkway would be located, and have concerns regarding weed control and

		maintenance.
31	Jones, Michelle 177 Mapua Drive (also see response 44)	Opposes the Closed Zone from Seaton Valley Road (Rural 1). Applications should each be assessed on their merit.
32	Freilich, D & A 71 Mapua Drive and Seaton Valley Drive (via Staig & Smith)	<p>The land is some 25ha.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the Deferred Residential Zone on their land, and urge Council to upgrade the capacity of the wastewater system. Their land is already serviced, but capacity of the network is the issue. • Oppose the Commercial Zone on their land, as it is too close to the intersection, would not be required for some time, and conflicts with current plans to subdivide the surrounding land already zoned and serviced Rural Residential. A commercial zone in the locality may be appropriate in the future in an alternate location. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Relief sought: Remove the zoning. • Oppose the specific siting of a reserve area on the land. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Relief sought: 'The submitters support a small neighbourhood Reserve on their land holding for the future, however they oppose the Council defining that position at this early stage, as it is considered inappropriate until such time as detailed design consideration has been given to subdivision layout on this land holding'.
33	Kelly, Tim & Lyn 38 Broadsea Avenue	<p>The land is 6.4ha accessed from southern end of Broadsea Avenue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes the Rural 1 Closed rezoning • Relief sought: Defer the proposal until robust computer simulations have been completed; the sea-wall performance has been monitored and tested; and the IPCC predictions have been more robustly confirmed.
34	Stephens, Roseanne 156 Aranui Road	<p>Opposes the restrictions on building within the Coastal Hazard Area - too stringent. Supports the rezoning of rural land in the Higgs Road area to residential.</p>
35	Conservation, Dept of	<p>DOC has a particular interest because of the proximity of the Mapua Development Area to the Waimea inlet. Queries whether Council has completed a full risk assessment of the natural hazard risk (erosion, inundation and tsunami) and the effectiveness of revetment walls in managing the risk. DOC suggests a Bay of Plenty methodology that identifies primary and secondary risk areas (Env. Court decision A141/2002). Specific comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue 6.15.1.1 Change the word '<i>data</i>' to '<i>projections</i>'. • Issue 6.15.1.5 This is more a policy rather than an issue - rewording suggested. • Policy 6.15.3.2 This is supported and should be retained. New policy suggested that addresses intensification of existing uses in the area subject to coastal hazards (refer NZ Coastal Policy Statement policies 3.4.2,3.4.4 and 3.4.5). • Policy 6.15.3.3 Queries the reference to '<i>Ruby Bay flats</i>'. This should apply throughout. Suggests removing the words '<i>on the Ruby Bay flats</i>'. • Policy 6.15.3.6 This is supported. Suggests adding '<i>residential</i>' before '<i>buildings</i>', and including an additional policy that addresses risks for other types of activities including storage of hazardous substances. It is unclear

		<p>which are the coastal margins, channel entrance and cliffs that are referred to. Suggests use of two hazard overlays as in the Env. Court decision A141/2002.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 6.15.3.9 This is supported. Suggests inclusion of the following ‘... and enhance and restore natural vegetation by way of both regulatory and non-regulatory methods, including Council reserve acquisition and management.’ • Explanation 2.3.11 Suggests including the following text: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ‘A report prepared for the District Council by Professor R M Kirk and Dr J C Allan in November 1998 presented the results of an investigation into coastal erosion and sea water inundation hazards at Ruby Bay. This report found that chronic erosion has occurred at Ruby Bay for at least most of the twentieth century. It states that some 13.2 hectares of land were lost to the sea between 1912 and 1988 at an average coastal retreat rate of 0.48 metres per year. ○ Since this report was published much of the Ruby Bay shoreline has been protected by a series of rock revetments. These revetments provide protection of the coast from further erosion but limited protection from flood inundation from storm surges. They have required a substantial investment by the Council and adjoining land owners and may not provide a long term solution to the ongoing coastal hazards in the area. ○ Much of the existing development on the coast between Ruby Bay and Mapua is rural residential in character and is of relatively low intensity. It is important that more intensive subdivision, use and development in the area is located and designed to ensure that the community’s dependence on the coastal protection works is not increased. More intensive residential development in this area may not be appropriate but there may be scope for managing coastal hazards by restricting development to land use activities that are less sensitive to damage from coastal processes.’ • Section 17.2 Commercial and Tourist Services Zone Rules: There appears to be inconsistency with these rules 17.2.4.1(b)(iii) which reduces site cover from 60% to 30%, and the rules in the Coastal Hazard Area which make any ‘habitable building’ non-complying. Suggests the Coastal Hazard Area rules should equally apply to the Mapua Leisure Park site. <p>Comments on the Planning Maps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggests that those lots on the peninsula containing the Mapua Leisure Park be located entirely within the Coastal Environment Area (Lots 2 & 3 DP 10904, Part Lot 4 DP 10904, Lots 1 & 2 DP 414200 and lot 1 DP 20295). • Residential Closed Zone Iwa Street and Tahī Street: queries why these are not within the Coastal Hazard Area. • Height above mean sea level - in the Richmond West Development Area Council has proposed a minimum platform level of 4.6 metres amsl. DOC queries why this has not been adopted for Mapua and Ruby Bay. DOC seeks deletion of the Residential Closed Zone in these localities, and a minimum building platform height of 4.6 metres for the whole development area.
36	Mt Hope Holdings Ltd 150-166 Mapua Drive (per Duncan Cotterill Lawyers)	<p>Support the increase in residential density on some sites. Oppose the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rezoning of Rural 1 land as Deferred Residential. Policies 6.1.3.1 and 6.2.3.2 both promote increasing urban density. Does not follow to defer the residential zoning. Owners are able to provide reticulated water and the land is large enough to provide for sewerage and water. Policy 6.15.3.16 is considered unnecessary (Seaton Road

		<p>Stage 2 deferral)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extension of the Richmond West Development Area and the Richmond South Development Area controls to the Mapua Development Area. These controls are considered unduly restrictive and unnecessary • The use of indicative roads and walkways. The owners wish to design own road network. Rule 16.3.3.1(o)(ii)(d) will require amendment to remove reference to indicative roads. Limited connection to specified roads is supported. The walkways should link to reserves rather than a highway • The inclusion of Heritage Building H25. The values of the building have never been stated and the owners not consulted <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land be zoned Residential, not Deferred Residential
37	Mapua & Districts Cycle & Walkway Group David Mitchell and Janet Taylor	<p>Comments are on the Structure Plan document, not the draft Plan Change material.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggests existing cycle / walkways be shown on the map. • Suggests improved cycle links from large subdivided areas within the Rural 3 Zone eg Awa Awa Road (115 dwellings), Stringer Valley (121), clusters in Apple Valley Road and Bronte Road (36), and a further cluster in Westdale Road / Hoddy Road (122). • Suggests Principle 5 should be more specific eg by the inclusion of <i>'and the creation of a community network of cycle-walkway paths which link residents to key destinations (such as the school and pre-schools, shops, bus stops, places of work and community facilities.'</i> Wording is from the recently-adopted Tasman Land Transport Strategy. Also see October 2008 submission on the Structure Plan. • Supports the planned new cycle-walkways in the Pine Hill Road / Pomona Road area, the Korepo Road / Seaton Valley Road area, Pomona Road to Seaton Valley Road, Seaton Valley Stream area and extension to the wharf area, Links from Dawson and Chaytor Roads to Seaton Valley Road, and routes giving access to coastal reserves. Urges physical separation with barriers and vegetation on the Seaton Valley Road and Mapua Drive between Higgs Road and the Sonoma Orchard area. Routes should be mapped and signposted, with implementation dates scheduled. Views can be identified by signs. <p>Priorities are suggested below, with routes getting children to and from school having the highest priority:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Seaton Valley Stream Walkway - from Toru Street to Mapua Drive 2. Seaton Valley Road to Mapua School via proposed new playing field area and Seaton Valley Stream combined with linking cycle-walkway to Dawson Road 3. Mapua to Ruby Bay shopping areas via Aranui Road and Stafford Drive - a footpath cycle-walkway (existing cycle-walkway could be extended to the wharf 4. Higgs Reserve to Central Mapua 5. Old Mill Walkway - Aranui Road to Mapua Beach 6. Pomona / Marriages Roads to Pinehill Road 7. Pomona Road to Pinehill Heights side of Ruby Bay 8. Defined cycle-walkways in new subdivisions 9. Development of a cycle-walkway linking Mapua and Tasman on the eastern side of the Bypass 10. Cycle-walkway links around the Waimea Estuary.

38	Jessen, Gina & Davies, Trevor Re 154 Stafford Drive	<p>Oppose and question Council's right to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate future residential development is closed on the assumption that something may or may not happen • Change the conditions on individual property titles (title states that if the property is subdivided the land that goes onto the beach and into the water would be lost - there is no mention of NO subdivision and NO additional residence). <p>Have concerns about stormwater and lack of footpaths.</p>
39	Thawley, Eileen & Graeme 86 Higgs Road	<p>Opposes subdivision of productive rural land. In the future would prefer a rural residential zoning. Note that a QEII Trust Deed does not allow for walkways or cycleways on the land.</p>
40	Gallagher, Devin & Charmaine 32 Broadsea Avenue (per Duncan Cotterill Lawyers)	<p>Oppose the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extension of the Coastal Hazard Area • Inclusion of the land in the Rural 1 Closed Zone • The zoning of adjacent land (and the access driveway to the land) as Residential Closed. <p>Comments provided as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest site is suitable for residential infill and would be best zoned Residential (3.3 hectares) • Suggest flooding (particularly from upstream water catchments) should be treated as an issue separately from coastal inundation and erosion. Refer Principal Reasons and Explanation 13.1.30. The basis on which the Coastal Hazard Area has been adjusted is challenged • Disagree with the inclusion of Ruby Bay in 16.3.3.6 (Prohibited Subdivision - Residential Closed Zone) and the Principle Reasons and Explanation 6.15.30 second paragraph. • Disagree with new Policy 13.1.3.4C limiting further subdivision and habitable buildings, because the policy treats all land the same which it is not • Policy 6.15.3.2 also fails to recognise unique situation of this land - suggest should be zoned Residential • Disagree with new rule 17.14.2(b)(v) which proposes deferring residential land until land is serviced • The land is not suitable for rural development because of cross boundary conflict • The land is suitable for efficient residential expansion and has 2 sewer mains and 14 laterals crossing the property; it is north facing with a variation in elevation and is a natural extension of an existing residential area • Residential use would assist stormwater management • Multiple access not necessary as there is access via Tait Street • Subdivision would not increase the risks from coastal hazards as the land is further inland. The inclusion of a phrase '<i>with limited development in appropriately identified land within this area</i>' would address the situation • Principle Reasons and Explanation 6.15.30 and Policy 6.15.3.12 relating to infrastructure, are supported. Poor stormwater drainage has been a major issue for years; water and wastewater services should be upgraded to an adequate standard. <p>The TDC Ruby Bay Stormwater Options Report is being independently reviewed by the owners as the proposed work has the potential to adversely affect the land.</p>

41	Hellyer, Karl & Katherine 80 Stafford Drive	<p>Supports the rezoning of residential properties on Stafford Drive as Closed Residential, however there is still a conflict between residential properties and the Rural 1 land at rear, where the planting of eucalypts has shaded the adjacent properties.</p> <p>Relief sought: more residential zoning closer to the village centre to avoid fragmentation, and improve pedestrian / cycle safety.</p> <p>Suggests some subdivision of Rural 1 land closer to the village centre (min size 2500 sq m) with appropriate site and building construction and caveats on titles to protect Council from liability in the event of any hazard risk eventuating.</p>
42	NZ Transport Agency	<p>The NZ Transport Agency comments as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the encouragement of urban development on higher land to the northwest and southwest of Mapua. Accompanying documentation is consistent with NZTA's role, and relates well to the Ruby Bay Bypass • Consultation with NZTA with regard to development of the Gateway Node to Mapua will be required • The two pedestrian / cycle underpasses shown in the Draft Structure Plan have been included in the Bypass project as a result of community demand and an increase in recreational cycling • The ecological link and screening of the highway for residents to the north is supported. The Plan Change should make provision for noise mitigation measures such as buffers in any development close to the highway.
43	Blair, Malcolm & Natalie Re 148 Stafford Drive	<p>Concerned regarding coastal protection in particular. No issue with the rest of the document.</p> <p>In the last 19 years since owning the property most of the coastal erosion has been from the Broadsea Avenue area down to the estuary entrance at Mapua. The respondents have raised their log wall 800mm and are prepared to protect their own land. Council must decide whether to plan ahead or walk away. A clay wall walkway bund from the Leisure Park to the wharf is suggested.</p> <p>Query how Council can consider development on part of Grossi Point for housing when the land is the same level as this property. (Discussed with Councillor Norris)</p>
44	Schroder, Ben 6 Seaton Valley Road	<p>Opposes the changes to the rules affecting filling land, as it would limit ability to deal with water coming from higher land. Drainage problems downstream caused by lack of maintenance, however lowering of the causeway would have solved some drainage problems. (Note: Mr Schroder is not in an area affected by the proposed change to the rules.)</p>
45	Evans, Barry & Linda 36 Stafford Drive	<p>Oppose the growth of the Light Industrial Zone north east of Warren Place. The respondents are owners of land across the Seaton Valley Creek from the proposed zone extension. They have offered the southern portion of their land in the past for light industrial zoning and believe it would be better.</p> <p>Relief sought: zone respondent's land Rural Residential and allow three more titles for family members. Portions of land meet the minimum platform heights or can be reached with minimum fill.</p>
46	Mapua & Districts Business Assn Janet Taylor, Coordinator	<p>Committee represents 170 business members from Mapua, Ruby Bay, Tasman and inland beyond Upper Moutere. Thanks Council for time and effort in consultation.</p>

		<p>Comments are on the Structure Plan document, rather than the draft Plan Change and are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the 12 guiding principles - sustainable economic growth and sustainable environmental management go hand in hand • Relationship between the Village Centre Node and the Wharf Node needs further consideration. Suggests highlighting similarities and differences with a thematic approach, including signage, integrated car parking, and streetscape plantings • Further discussion required regarding the 'future commercial' area at the beginning of Seaton Valley Road, around the location, size and intended use of the site • Supports the location for future business development adjacent to the current business area in Warren Place. Needs to be a model area with separation planning along the Seaton Valley Stream walkway, and consideration for the pedestrian and cycling interface • Concern over lack of consideration of need for increased parking, public transport links • At point 14, note it is the Mapua <i>and Districts</i> Business Association.
47	Jackson, Jojo Re 138, 140 and 142 Stafford Drive (also refer responses 6 and 15)	<p>Opposes the proposal to close the zone and development along the coastline.</p> <p>Comments as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three properties were purchased to integrate within one garden and as an investment for future generations • The sea defences have been constructed at no cost to Council • Queries why parts of the area are to be zoned Residential Closed, and other areas at the wharf and adjacent to it are not.
48	Coastal Initiative Group Per Janet Taylor	<p>The Coastal Initiative Group is made up of members of the Mapua and District Business Association and the Mapua and Tasman Community Associations. Congratulates staff on the consultation and feedback processes. Would like to see the process continued up the Ruby Coast past Tasman and Kina.</p> <p>Comments as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Group has a project to develop a series of gateway precincts at the three entrances to the Ruby Coast area. The first, which is identified is called the 'Mapua Gateway', the second, at the Seaton Valley / Gardiner Valley interchange is called the Moutere Gateway. Requests that this be identified on the Mapua Structure Plan • Suggests an integrated plan for the roads of the Ruby Coast area using 'Self Explaining Roads (SER)' concepts and strategies. These would include traffic calming measures and street lighting options • Supports off-road walking and cycleways • Concerned that the Plan does not address the increasing number of vehicles in the Village areas. Innovative parking solutions required, that integrate with public transport and encourage walking into the Village.
49	Simpson, Barry 53 Tahī Street	<p>Suggests 'closed areas' apply only to undeveloped land.</p> <p>Suggests all low-lying areas in the Tasman District Council be considered at the same time.</p>
50	Glazebrook, Sarah 40 Stafford Drive	<p>Opposes the proposal that no new habitable building be allowed in the extended Coastal Hazard Area. Has had property valued and on that valuation committed to contribute to the seawall to ensure property protection and improve value.</p>

	(also has interest in 10ha block at 102 Aranui)	<p>Allowed trucks to cross land in return for construction of a driveway for a new dwelling. Changes in policy direction would reduce value of land and not warrant earlier commitment to the cost of the seawall.</p> <p>Relief sought: allow for relocatable buildings where the owner takes full responsibility for any costs incurred should there be flooding or damage.</p> <p>(Discussed with Councillor Higgins)</p>
51	Mitchell, David and Judy 107 Aranui Road	<p>Support the Structure Plan.</p> <p>Support the following initiatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limiting coastal residential development in areas subject to threat from erosion and sea level rise • The new coastal reserves, esplanade reserves and linking cycleways • Planting on Mapua Drive and at the SH 60 / Mapua Drive intersection • New cycle / walkway links within the wider area and initiatives associated with the Tasman Regional Cycle Trail • New sports ground in the Seaton Valley Flats area. <p>Concerned about the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ad hoc development on the periphery of Mapua • The apparent exemption of the Mapua Leisure Park property from provisions restricting coastal development. (Note: the Leisure Park IS subject to the same restrictions on new habitable buildings as elsewhere in the Coastal Hazard Area and subdivision is already non-complying) • Limited access to the beach between the estuary mouth and the Old Mill Walkway • Distance of proposed sportsground from the School and centre of the community • Lack of inclusion of a proposed route for the proposed Regional Cycle Trail • Lack of planting on south side of Mapua Drive near the Bypass intersection • Cycleway location along Mapua Drive to the Seaton Valley area - could go through Higgs Reserve • Land south of the 'Mapua Wetland' zoned Deferred Residential is low lying and flood prone. <p>General Principles should cover the following:</p> <p>Sustainability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ruby Bay residential area a separate 'node' • Outstanding quality of the landscape, rural coastal character, and estuary environment • Retention of productive land • Management of growth • Limitation of services leading to complementary growth in Upper Moutere and Tasman. <p>Concerned about the ad hoc development on the periphery of Mapua. These areas need greater consideration of community and transport links along with protecting the landscape and productive land. (eg Stringer Valley subdivision could be linked to Upper Moutere, and the Awa Awa development linked to Tasman.)</p> <p>Concerned about the extent of area proposed for residential use. Development Plans for new areas need to be matched by certainty over water and sewerage service</p>

		<p>Support the continued development of Mapua Wharf, and suggest better walking and cycle links between this and the Mall / Mapua Store, and better signage to walkways around the estuary to Moreland Park reserve and around the estuary and beach front to the Old Mill Walkway.</p> <p>Suggest a 'stand-alone cycle / walkway route for the Regional Cycle Trail, or an alternative route from Higgs Road in the west to the Old Mill Walkway in the East via Aranui Park, with physical separation from roads.</p> <p>Urge production of new maps for the community with new road names as a result of Bypass changes</p>
52	Mitchell Sonja 115 Wallace St Wellington 6021	<p>Supports the increased public spaces including pocket parks and waterfront park</p> <p>Seeks better cycleway provisions that are offroad</p> <p>Supports an estuary cycleway</p> <p>Seeks all tide public access along Mapua beachfront</p> <p>Urges increased protection of productive land</p> <p>Queries residential development on unsuitable land</p> <p>Supports compact residential development on ex FCC site</p>

TASMAN DISTRICT COUNCIL
TASMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

SEPTEMBER 2010

PROPOSED plan CHANGE No. 22

Mapua and Ruby Bay Development

Notified [Date]

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

The Council proposes to amend the Tasman Resource Management Plan to allow for future expansion of Mapua township and Ruby Bay away from low lying land and the inundation and erosion prone coastline between Mapua and Ruby Bay on to more elevated land northwest of the township. There will be opportunities for an increase in residential density on some sites close to amenities in Mapua as well as provision for new interconnecting walkways, open spaces and business sites.

The change recognizes the completion of the remediation of the previously contaminated site adjoining the intersection of Aranui Road and Tahī Street and the Waimea Estuary. It creates new opportunities for recreation, housing and tourism on that site that will complement the historic Mapua wharf area. A small extension of the existing central commercial area in Aranui Road is also facilitated by the change.

A high standard of design will be expected for any development in the coastal environment as well as a careful recognition of the many archaeological sites and natural features which are located close to the coast and the Waimea estuary. The coastal landscape values are being retained by limiting development east of Seaton Valley Stream and south west of Higgs Road.

The coastal hazard area has been revised to take account of coastal erosion, coastal and freshwater inundation and the latest information on climate change (including sea level rise) and activities that could increase risk. There is no provision for further subdivision on the coastal plain or sandspits to avoid an increased level of development in these vulnerable areas.

The change will be complemented by a rejuvenation of infrastructure that is well coordinated, and designed to address current unmet and future needs and included in the Council's Long Term Council Community Plan. Greenfield development will be deferred until the current infrastructure has been upgraded.

In the process of developing the plan change the Council has taken account of the consultation responses on a draft structure plan prepared in 2008 and subsequently redrafted. It has considered the options and the benefits and costs, and effectiveness, efficiency and appropriateness of these amendments. Council policy reports REP10-05-27 and REP10-09-10. assess the options and are prepared in compliance with the duties under Section 32 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

AMENDMENTS

The Tasman Resource Management Plan is amended in accordance with the following schedule.

1. CHAPTER 2: MEANINGS OF WORDS

1.1 Section 2.2

1.1.1 Amend the following definitions:

Building

Add to definition of “**Building**”, after “accessory buildings”: *and coastal protection structures.*

Compact Density Development

Add to definition of “**Compact Density Development**” after “Richmond West” reference to Mapua Special Development Area.

2. CHAPTER 6: urban environment effects

2.1 Section 6.1: Sustainable Urban Design And Development

2.1.1 **Add** to Policy **6.1.3.1** a new item:

(j) *locating more compact density and comprehensive residential development within walking distance of town centres and urban facilities.*

2.1.2 **Add** to Policy **6.2.3.2**: *and part of Mapua.*

2.1.3 **Add** to Explanation **6.2.30** in the last paragraph, after the words “Richmond:”reference to the Mapua Development Area.

2.2 Section 6.3.30: Principal Reasons and Explanation

2.2.1 **Add** in first sentence, second paragraph, after “Motueka,” : *Mapua.*

2.3 Section 6.15: Mapua/Ruby Bay

2.3.1 **Delete** Issue **6.15.1** and **rewrite** as:

The Mapua Ruby Bay area is defined as the area east of the Ruby Bay Bypass and Old Coach Road extending to the coastline at Ruby Bay, northwards to the Brabant Drive subdivision and southwards to the Waimea Estuary. It is characterised by a

diverse mix of lifestyle properties, orchards, cottage industries, low-lying rural land and the village settlements of Mapua and Ruby Bay. It is flanked by the Rural 3 Zone on the hills to the north and south.

Key issues for settlement planning in Mapua and Ruby Bay are:

- 6.15.1.1 Sustainable management of major coastal hazards of erosion and inundation that takes account of existing coastal protection structures, current projections on sea level rise, land levels and demand for public access.*
- 6.15.1.2 Management of the extent of urban development so that the unique character of the area is retained, including the protection of many archaeological sites, natural vegetation features and some orchard land.*
- 6.15.1.3 Identification of some suitable areas for more intensive residential development to provide for changing lifestyles and to make more efficient use of land and energy.*
- 6.15.1.4 To have ample well connected open space in new development areas and adjoining the Waimea Estuary.*
- 6.15.1.5 Redevelopment of the remediated previously contaminated site adjoining the Tahī Street/Aranui Road intersection with an appropriate mix of well-designed residential, commercial and recreational activities.*
- 6.15.1.6 The management of cross boundary effects of buildings on the coastal plain at Ruby Bay.*
- 6.15.1.7 Integration of Mapua/Ruby Bay community with adjoining parts of the rural residential community.*
- 6.15.1.8 The need for the rate of urban development to be aligned with the servicing provisions in the LTCCP.*
- 6.15.1.9 Integrated management of stormwater using low impact design solutions where practicable and maintaining low-lying flood prone land for ponding during major flood events.*

2.3.2 Delete policies 6.15.3.1 to 6.15.3.9 and rewrite as:

- 6.15.3.1 To maintain and enhance the character of Mapua by accommodating growth within specified limits on the surrounding hill land and in such a way that it retains its village scale, its heritage and natural vegetation and wildlife features.*
- 6.15.3.2 Accommodate residential growth at Ruby Bay on the hill slopes above the Bay to retain a transition between urban and rural landscapes and to avoid exacerbating the risks from coastal erosion, inundation and the loss of archaeological sites on the coastal plain.*
- 6.15.3.3 To provide improved management of the cross boundary effects of buildings and structures on the Ruby Bay flats.*
- 6.15.3.4 To maintain Mapua wharf and its historic wharf buildings as a vibrant and active visitor destination, incorporating the eastern part of the ex FCC site to provide for a limited extension of visitor attractions that complements the historic and low key maritime atmosphere and enhances public access to the foreshore.*

- 6.15.3.5 *To develop and extend the Mapua commercial area as the retail and community facilities centre and integrate it with the development of the adjoining reserve, particularly in respect of parking, landscaping and ensuring a safe traffic environment on Aranui Road.*
- 6.15.3.6 *To avoid new buildings on those parts of the coastal margins, Mapua channel entrance, and Ruby Bay cliffs which are most at risk from erosion, slips and inundation.*
- 6.15.3.7 *To identify a coastal hazard area between Mapua and Ruby Bay where all subdivision and development will be strictly limited to avoid the long term adverse effects of coastal erosion and inundation.*
- 6.15.3.8 *To create a highly connected network of open spaces and accessways through and around Mapua and Ruby Bay that encourages people to walk and cycle.*
- 6.15.3.9 *To retain a natural buffer between the edge of the Waimea estuary, the coastal vegetated gullies and scarps and surrounding land use.*
- 6.15.3.10 *To ensure streets are well connected to reduce travel distances for vehicle, cycle and pedestrian traffic in Mapua and Ruby Bay.*
- 6.15.3.11 *To encourage heavy industrial activities to locate outside the Mapua township and to enable a modest extension of the Warren Place business area as a light industrial park based on principles of waste minimization and sustainable energy.*
- 6.15.3.12 *To minimise stormwater runoff through catchment wide management and utilize low impact stormwater design where practicable that provides for stormwater as well as open space and recreational needs.*
- 6.15.3.13 *To enable a range of housing types that meet different household needs such as for more energy efficient housing and for smaller households.*
- 6.15.3.14 *To develop and maintain high quality, enduring public spaces both at the water's edge and within Mapua.*
- 6.15.3.15 *To provide specific management of land disturbance at the Mapua waterfront park site, the ex landfill site and adjacent creek and Tahi Street roadway.*
- 6.15.3.16 *To defer development in areas where services require upgrading and to indicate an area on the southwest side of Seaton Valley Road where very long term development beyond 2031 could take place.*
- 6.15.3.17 *To ensure a high quality visual experience and a gateway environment on the Mapua Drive route from the Ruby Bay Bypass to Mapua.*

Methods of Implementation 6.15.20

- 2.3.3 **Delete** Method of Implementation **6.15.20.1(a)** and replace with:
Setbacks from identified cliffs and the coastline.
- 2.3.4 **Add** to Method of Implementation **6.15.20.1(b)**: *close to the coast.*
- 2.3.5 **Delete** Method of Implementation **6.15.20.1(d)**: *“Chemical Hazard Area ...”*
- 2.3.6 **Add** Method of Implementation **6.15.20.1(f)**:

Rules limiting the removal of and alteration to archaeological sites prior to gaining archaeological authority and Council consent.

2.3.7 **Add** to Method of Implementation **6.15.20.2(a)** after “commercial area”: *hall.*

2.3.8 **Add** Method of Implementation **6.15.20.2(b)**:
Concept plan for integrating the waterfront park with wharf area.

2.3.9 **Add** to Methods of Implementation, Works and Services **6.15.20.3**:

- (b) Maintenance of viewpoints.*
- (c) Streetscaping of Aranui Road.*
- (d) Site Management Plan for Waterfront Park.*
- (e) Site Management Plan for ex landfill site.*

Principal Reasons and Explanation 6.15.30

2.3.10 **Delete** the first paragraph and **rewrite** as:

Mapua Ruby Bay is a popular place to live and visit with its attractive views and access to the sea and surrounding hills. It also provides a service centre for central parts of the Rural 3 Zone nearby.

In recent years it has sustained quite a high rate of growth and services such as water supply have become stretched at times. Low-lying parts of Mapua and Ruby Bay are susceptible to flooding during high rainfall events.

To keep pace with and ensure sustainable development in the Mapua Ruby Bay area wastewater, stormwater, water supply and roading systems are being upgraded. A programme of works is included in the Council’s LTCCP.

2.3.11 **Delete** the second paragraph and **rewrite** as:

Coastal erosion and inundation are significant hazards experienced on the coastal plain extending from McKee Domain to the Mapua Leisure Park. A report prepared for the Council by Professor R M Kirk and Dr J C Allan in November 1998 presented the results of an investigation into coastal erosion and sea water inundation hazards at Ruby Bay. This report found that chronic erosion has occurred at Ruby Bay for at least most of the twentieth century. It states that some 13.2 hectares of land were lost to the sea between 1912 and 1988 at an average coastal retreat rate of 0.48 metres per year. Since the report, coastal erosion and inundation protection structures have been erected along a substantial length of this coastline. Many of these are privately owned, have variable degrees of effectiveness and do not fully prevent inundation. Almost all have affected public access to and along the coast, particularly at the time of high tide. Land adjoining parts of Tahi St and Iwa St is low lying and susceptible to future coastal inundation.

The latest advice from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and the Ministry for the Environment is that base sea level will continue to rise, to 0.50m above the 1980-1999 average by 2090-2099. Within this timeframe, the consequences of at least a further 0.30m sea level rise also need to be considered. On land most at risk from coastal erosion and inundation, further permanent building development will not be permitted and the area closed to further subdivision. Residential development at Ruby Bay, parts of Tahi and Iwa streets is closed to further subdivision, to minimize the hazard risk to additional dwellings. The coastal hazard area, previously based only on long term erosion rates occurring until 2040 on a natural coastline, has been

reassessed and adjusted, to account for present works and also for when further planned protection works have been completed. It also takes account of inundation.

2.3.12 In the third paragraph, fourth sentence, **delete** words after “accretion” and rewrite as:
which makes future scenarios difficult to predict.

2.3.13 **Delete** the fourth paragraph and **rewrite** as:

Mapua wharf and its related historic buildings have redeveloped as a vibrant area for specialist shops and cafes while the adjoining boat ramp provides access to the Mapua Channel. The remediated site nearby provides opportunities for a mix of residential, commercial and recreational developments which complement the wharf area. The western side of the site has been remediated to a sufficient standard to allow residential activities. Because the site is within walking distance of many facilities it is considered suitable for a slightly higher density of residential development that is less car dependent. The design of the remediated area should emphasise the creation of a pedestrian friendly precinct with appropriate development that responds to the coastal setting and historic character and allows pedestrian access from the Mapua Channel frontage across the site to the Waimea estuary frontage.

2.3.14 **Delete** the sixth paragraph and **rewrite** as:

The main commercial area at Aranui Road/ Toru Street has the potential to expand and be better integrated with the adjoining hall and reserve land. Future streetscaping is expected to calm traffic and improve the appearance of Aranui Road once pipe services beneath the street have been renewed. A modest expansion of the Warren Place business area is provided for to the west of the Seaton Valley Stream.

Wetlands and bush remnants (in coastal gullies, on ridges and scarps) contribute to the landscape character of Mapua and Ruby Bay and provide a natural edge to the Waimea estuary, a wetland of international importance. They should be retained wherever possible.

There are opportunities to enhance ecological values as new reserves are developed in new subdivisions on the hillsides and near the coast and Seaton Valley Stream and as existing older reserves are redeveloped.

3. CHAPTER 8: MARGINS OF RIVERS, LAKES, WETLANDS AND THE COAST

Add to 8.2.30 in the last paragraph after “Waimea Inlet is adjacent to”: *Mapua and*

4. CHAPTER 12: LAND DISTURBANCE EFFECTS

4.1 **Add** to Policy **12.1.3.2**, a new clause:
(d) coastal hazard areas

4.2 **Add** to Principal Reasons and Explanation **12.1.30** in the first sentence after “appearance of land”: *, land subject to hazards.*

5. CHAPTER 13: natural hazards

5.1 Policies 13.1.3

5.1.1 **Rewrite** Policy 13.1.3.2 as:

When determining appropriate subdivision, use or development in the coastal environment to assess the likely need for coastal protection works and, where practicable, avoid those sites for which coastal protection works are likely to be required.

5.1.2 **Add** three new policies after Policy 13.1.3.4 :

13.1.3.4A *To avoid the construction of new habitable buildings in the Residential Closed Zone at Ruby Bay.*

13.1.3.4B *To limit the reconstruction or replacement of an existing habitable buildings to a position that is no further seaward than the original habitable building in the Residential Closed Zone at Ruby Bay.*

13.1.3.4C *On the coastal plain from Ruby Bay to Mapua, to limit further subdivision and habitable buildings in order to avoid their exposure to long term coastal inundation, flooding and erosion risks.*

5.1.3 **Add** to Policy **13.1.3.10** after “other erosion processes”: *and inundation.*

5.2 Methods of Implementation 13.1.20

5.2.1 **Add** to the end of Methods of Implementation (a): *and Ruby Bay.*

5.3 Principal Reasons and Explanation 13.1.30

5.3.1 **Add** after *Totara Avenue* in the fourth sentence of the fifth paragraph: *Mapua/Ruby Bay.*

5.3.2 **Add** to the end of the fifth paragraph:

As inundation and erosion are ongoing hazards along the Ruby Bay coastline habitable buildings that are redeveloped are not permitted to locate further seaward than the existing building and new habitable buildings are to be avoided. The coastal hazard area has been adjusted to account for current sea level rise projections and the continuing inundation and erosion hazard risk.

6. CHAPTER 16: GENERAL RULES

6.1 Section 16.2: Transport (Access, Parking and Traffic)

16.2.2.3 Permitted Activities (Land Use – Provision for Parking and Loading)

6.1.1 **Add** to “2 spaces per unit” under the ‘Dwelling’ activity in Figure 16.2C: *except that Mapua Compact Density Development is one space per unit.*

6.1.2 **Add** to **16.2.2.3(n)(ii)**: *other than compact and comprehensive residential developments where there are more than two units.*

6.1.3 **Add** to **16.2.2.3(r)** after “Development Area “, *Mapua Commercial Zone and Mapua public car parks”.*

16.2.2.4 Controlled Activities (Land Use – Carparking Layout and Landscape Design in Richmond West Development Area)

6.1.4 **Add** to heading 16.2.2.4 “, *Mapua Public Car Parks and Mapua Commercial Zone*”.

6.1.5 **Add** to 16.2.2.4 in the first sentence after the words “car park in the”: “*Mapua public car parks , Mapua Commercial Zone or*”.

6.2 Section 16.3: Subdivision

6.2.1 Replace all references to the ‘Richmond South Development Area and Richmond West Development Area Subdivision and Development Design Guide’ with ‘Urban Design Guide’ including reference to Part II, Appendix 2 where not already included (including headings).

16.3.3.1 Controlled Subdivision (Residential Zone)

6.2.2 **Add to Figure 16.3A(viii) reference to:** Mapua Development Area.

6.2.3 **Add to** 16.3.3.1(m) at the end of the sentence on protected trees reference to the: Mapua Development Area.

6.2.4 **Add to** 16.3.3.1(o) at the end of the heading reference to the: *Mapua Development Area*.

6.2.5 **Add to** 16.3.3.1(o), first sentence after the words: “Richmond West” reference to the: Mapua Development Area.

6.2.6 **Add to** 16.3.3.1(o)(i)(a): *except in the Mapua Development Area where each allotment is at least 450 square metres*.

6.2.7 **Add to** 16.3.3.1(o)(ii)(a) at the end of the sentence after “Richmond East” reference to the Mapua Development Area.

6.2.8 **Add** new paragraph after 16.3.3.1(o)(ii)(d):
Except for the indicative roads shown in the Mapua Development Area on the planning maps, no new road in the Mapua Development Area is designed to connect directly to Mapua Drive, Stafford Drive, Higgs Road, Aranui Road or Seaton Valley Road.

6.2.9 **Insert** in 16.3.3.1(o)(ii)(e): after the words “Except for”: *roads in the Mapua Development Area and*.

6.2.10 **Add** new item (k) after 16.3.3.1(o)(ii)(j):
No allotment in the Mapua Development Area created after the [date of notification of Mapua Change] gains direct access from Mapua Drive between Seaton Valley Rd and the Mapua Bypass.

6.2.11 **Insert** in 16.3.3.1(o) after “Richmond South” in Note 2 reference to the Mapua Development Area.

6.2.12 **Insert** after 16.3.3.1(r) regarding landscaping, a new condition:
(rr) Where allotments adjoin Mapua Drive between Ruby Bay Bypass and Aranui Park, amenity plantings 3 metres wide are provided, and there is no close-boarded or solid fencing.

and **delete** heading “Landscaping” and replace with “*Landscape Treatment*”.

6.2.13 **Insert** in 16.3.3.1(t) after “Richmond West”: *and Mapua*,
and to the end of the sentence: *or adjoins Mapua Drive at Mapua*.

6.2.14 **Insert** in 16.3.3.1(u) after “Richmond West”: *and Mapua*.

6.2.15 **Insert** in 16.3.3.1 matter (5), first sentence after “For subdivision in” reference to the Mapua Development Area.

16.3.3.2 Restricted Discretionary Subdivision (Residential Zone)

6.2.16 **Add** to heading “Richmond South Development Area and Richmond West Development Area Compact Density” and in condition (a) reference to the Mapua Special Development Area.

6.2.17 **Add** to end of 16.3.3.2 (a)(i)(a): *“(in Richmond) and at least 1500 square metres in the Mapua Special Development Area.”*

6.2.18 **Add** to 16.3.3.2 (a)(ii)(a): *except that in the Mapua Special Development Area the minimum allotment area is 200 square metres.*

6.2.19 **Add** in 16.3.3.2 (a)(iii)(a) after the bracketed words “for Richmond South”: *and Mapua Development Area*.

6.2.20 **Add** to ‘Privacy’ heading of 16.3.3.2 matter (4): *and Solar Access*.

6.2.21 **Add** to matter (4) after the word “privacy”: *of and solar access*.

6.2.22 **Add** to matter (17): *In the Mapua Special Development Area, the provisions of the Site Management Plan will need to be complied with.*

16.3.3.3 Discretionary Subdivision (Residential Zone)

6.2.23 **Add** to heading of 16.3.3.3(c) reference to the Mapua Development Area and Mapua Special Development Area.

6.2.24 **Add** in 16.3.3.3(c) reference to the *Mapua and Mapua Special development areas*.

6.2.25 **Add** to 16.3.3.3(c)(i) the following: *except the Mapua Development Area has a minimum net area of 450 square metres and the Mapua Special Development Area has a minimum net area of 200 square metres.*

6.2.26 **Rewrite** matter (4) as: *Consistency with the Part II Appendix 2 Design Guide.*

16.3.3.5 Non Complying Subdivision (Residential Zone)

6.2.27 **Add** to **16.3.3.5** reference to the Mapua Development Area and Mapua Special Development Area.

16.3.3.6 Prohibited Subdivision (Residential Closed Zone)

6.2.28 **Add** to **16.3.3.6** after “Residential Closed Zone at Anchorage”: *Ruby Bay and parts of Tahi and Iwa Streets at Mapua.*

16.3.4.1 Controlled Subdivision (Business and Industrial Zones)

6.2.29 **Add** to **Figure 16.3B** after “Light Industrial Zone: Richmond West Development Area”: *and Mapua.*

6.2.30 **Add** to ‘Amenity Plantings within a Boundary Setback’ heading for condition **16.3.4.1(p)**: *and Mapua Development Area.*

6.2.31 **Add** new item to ‘Amenity Plantings’ condition **16.3.4.1 (p)**:
(vi) *Amenity plantings at least 2.5 metres wide are provided on boundaries adjoining Stafford Drive and Seaton Valley Stream. The latter shall be locally sourced indigenous plantings.*

6.2.32 **Add** to ‘Reserves’ condition **16.3.4.1 (v)** after “Richmond West Development Area”: *and Mapua Light Industrial Zone.*

6.2.33 **Add** after item (v) of condition **16.3.4.1 (v)**, a new provision:
(vi) *5 metre wide reserve adjoining the western side of Seaton Valley Stream.*

16.3.5.1 Rural 1 Zone Controlled Subdivision

6.2.34 **Add** to ‘Filling of Allotments’ condition **16.3.5.1(m)** after the words “Richmond West Development Area”: *and lower Seaton Valley and Mapua coastal plain (Rural 1 Closed Zone).*

16.3.5.3 Discretionary Subdivision (Rural 1 Closed Zone)

6.2.35 **Add** in **16.3.5.3** after “Golden Hills Road”: *or at Mapua.*

16.3.5.4 Prohibited Subdivision (Rural 1 Closed Zone)

6.2.36 **Add** in **16.3.5.4** after “Golden Hills Road”: *or at Mapua Rural 1 Closed Zone.*

16.3.20 Principal Reasons for Rules

6.2.37 **Add** a new paragraph to the end of section on Residential subdivision:
The purpose of the special development area at Mapua is to allow for a more compact and different style of residential development to be located within walking distance of the facilities provided in the town centre, rather than in more remote locations.

6.2.38 **Add** new section prior to ‘Richmond South Development Area and Richmond West Development Area’ section:

Mapua Development Area

The Mapua Development Area is an expansion of the Mapua urban area intended to cater for residential and business growth to 2031 and beyond. It provides for residential and rural residential development on the hills behind Mapua. It includes an extensive network of streets, walkways and cycleways to connect with the facilities in Mapua and the wider Rural 3 community.

6.2.39 **Add** to 'Pedestrian and Cycle Linkages' section, a new paragraph:

At Mapua, Seaton Valley Stream links Mapua, Ruby Bay, Seaton Valley and the Waimea Inlet and has an important role in managing stormwater, providing opportunities for off-road cycling and walking along its margins and enhancing ecological values.

6.2.40 **Add** to 'Industrial Zones' section, a new paragraph:

Individual site access to Stafford Drive is limited between Seaton Valley Stream and Warren Place because of its proximity to the shared path leading to Mapua School.

6.2.41 **Add** a new paragraph to the end of the 'Rural Closed Zone' section:

At Mapua Ruby Bay on the coastal flats between Mapua and Ruby Bay the lot sizes are all below the minimum Rural 1 lot size so there is no provision for further subdivision which might encourage additional dwellings in this low-lying area that is increasingly vulnerable to both seawater and freshwater inundation. Rural residential development is already well provided for on the hills to the west and in the Rural 3 Zone.

6.3 Section 16.13: Historic Heritage

6.3.1 Schedule 16.13A: Heritage Buildings

Add to Waimea Mouere Ward:

Wells packing shed Mapua Drive 1938024600 Lot 2 DP 8474 H25 87

6.3.2 Schedule 16.13B: Protected Trees

Add to Waimea Mouere Ward

<i>T867 Category C</i>	<i>Fraxinus spp</i>	<i>15 Pine Hill Road</i>
<i>1938000300 87</i>		
<i>T910 Category B</i>	<i>Eucalyptus leucoxylon rosea</i>	<i>86 Higgs</i>
<i>Road 1938026700 87</i>		
<i>T909 Category B</i>	<i>Liquidambar styraciflua</i>	<i>86 Higgs Road</i>
<i>1938026700 87</i>		

Delete from Waimea Mouere Ward

<i>T628 Category C</i>	<i>Fagus sylvatica</i>	<i>103 Aranui Road</i>	<i>Valuation No.</i>
<i>1938036300</i>			

7. CHAPTER 17: zone rules

7.1 Section 17.1: Residential Zone Rules

17.1.2.1 Permitted Activities

7.1.1 **Add** to 17.1.2.1(b)(vi):

comprehensive residential development or compact density development.

17.1.3.1 Permitted Activities (Building Construction)

7.1.2 **Add** to height rule **17.1.3.1(q)(i)**: *except in the Residential Mapua Special Development Area the height limit is 6.5 metres*

17.1.3.2 Controlled Activities (Building Construction)

7.1.3 **Add** new conditions to **17.1.3.2**:

(c) *The site is not in the Residential Closed Zone at Ruby Bay.*

(d) *The site is not in the Residential Zone at Mapua, the Residential Closed Zone at Mapua or the Mapua Special Development Area.*

17.1.3.3 Controlled Activities (Building Construction or Alteration)

7.1.4 **Add** to the **first paragraph** of **17.1.3.3** after “Richmond West” reference to the Mapua Special Development Area.

7.1.5 **Add** to condition **17.1.3.3(c)**: *except for compact density in the Mapua Special Development Area where the maximum coverage is 50 percent.*

7.1.6 **Add** a new item to ‘Internal Boundaries’ condition **17.1.3.3(e)**:

(v) *a minimum of 4.5 metres applies in the Mapua Special Development Area with an intrusion no more than 1.5 metres deep and 3 metres wide for an entry feature or bay window.*

7.1.7 **Add** to ‘Outdoor Living Space’ condition **17.1.3.3(h)** after the words “20 square metres”: *except at Mapua, 30 square metres.*

7.1.8 **Delete** outdoor living space condition **17.1.3.3(l)** and **rewrite** as:

Outdoor living spaces are designed in accordance with the Urban Design Guide (Part II, Appendix 2).

7.1.9 In **17.1.3.3**, matter **(1)**, **rename** the Design Guide as:

Urban Design Guide (Part II, Appendix 2).

17.1.3.4 Restricted Discretionary Activities (Building Construction or Alteration)

7.1.10 **Add** to condition **17.1.3.4(a)** after the words “Richmond West” reference to the Mapua Special Development Area.

7.1.11 **Add** a new condition:

(j) *The site is not in the Residential Closed Zone at Ruby Bay.*

7.1.12 **Add** to heading before matter **(40)** **reference** to the Mapua Development and Mapua Special Development Areas.

17.1.20 Reasons for Residential Zone Rules

7.1.13 **Add** a new paragraph to the ‘Building Coverage’ section:

Higher coverage is permitted on compact density sites compared to standard density residential sites. Here it is intended to encourage two storey developments which enhance thermal efficiency but also to ensure that there is sufficient outdoor space provision, some stormwater dispersal and sunlight entry on site.

7.1.14 **Add** to ‘Building Height’ section, a new sentence at the end of the second paragraph:

However for compact residential development, a higher height limit is permitted if there is careful integration of buildings and surrounding spaces that retains residential amenities.

7.1.15 **Add** to second to last heading on Development Areas reference to the Mapua and Mapua Special development areas.

7.1.16 **Add** to end of the first sentence of the section on Development Areas reference to the Mapua Development Area.

7.1.17 **Rewrite** the last sentence of the section on Development Areas as:
All development in the Richmond South, Richmond West and Mapua and Mapua Special development areas is subject to the requirements of the Urban Design Guide (Part II, Appendix 2).

7.1.18 **Add** after the 'Stormwater' section:

Water and Wastewater

Because water, wastewater and some stormwater services at Mapua and Ruby Bay are over their design capacity, second dwellings are not included as a controlled activity in the Residential Zone in this locality. At Ruby Bay and parts of Tahi and Iwa Streets there is also a need to minimise the number of dwellings exposed to coastal hazard risk so second dwellings are not permitted there.

7.2 Section 17.2: Commercial and TOURIST SERVICES Zone rules

7.2.1 **Add** to rule **17.2.4.1(b)(iii)**: *except for Mapua Tourist Services Zone which is 30 percent.*

7.2.2 **Add** to Reasons for Rules **17.2.20** at end of 'Building Coverage' section, a new paragraph: *The Tourist Services Mapua Zone is distinguished by its unique location on a dynamic sandspit formation at the entrance to the Mapua Channel. Its character is low key tourist development that can respond to the dynamic nature of the site. High building coverage is inappropriate in this vulnerable environment.*

7.2.3 **Add** to Reasons for Rules **17.2.20** in 'Building Design and Appearance' section, after "St Arnaud": *and Mapua.*

7.3 Section 17.4: Industrial Zone Rules

7.3.1 In condition **17.4.2.1(j)** on amenity plantings, **rewrite** the first sentence as:
Amenity plantings 2 metres wide are provided along all site boundaries with formed roads, sites adjoining a Residential Zone and the Seaton Valley Stream.

7.3.2 **Add** after **17.4.2.1(ja)**, a new 'Amenity Plantings' condition:
(jb) Fences, including security fences, along site boundaries that adjoin roads, reserves and the Open Space Zone, are setback behind the width of amenity plantings and are no higher than 1.8 metres.

7.3.3 **Add** to 'Building Coverage' condition **17.4.3.1(d)** after "planning maps" the words "*and at Mapua*" after the bracket.

7.4 Section 17.8: Rural Residential Zone Rules

7.4.1 **Delete** home occupation condition **17.8.2.2(i)** and **rewrite** as:

Employment and Area

A home occupation (which is other than visitor accommodation):

- (i) occupies no more than 75 square metres gross floor area;*
- (ii) employs or engages no more than two full-time equivalent persons who reside elsewhere than on the site.*

7.4.2 **Add** after **17.8.3.1(j)**, a new 'Setback' condition:

- (ja) Buildings are set back from the top of the identified ridgeline at Ruby Bay behind a slope that is projected at an angle of 45 degrees from the toe of the ridge and set forward from the toe at least half the vertical height of the ridge.*

7.4.3 **Add** a new condition to Restricted Discretionary Activities rule **17.8.3.2**:

- (bb) The building is within the Ruby Bay ridgeline setback but a favourable geotechnical report has been provided.*

7.4.4 **Add** a second paragraph to Principal Reasons for Rules **17.8.20** under the 'Building Setbacks from Boundaries, Roads, Lakes, etc.' section:

Buildings are required to be setback from the top and bottom of the ridge at Ruby Bay to avoid falling debris and adverse visual effects. They are not necessarily prevented but should be justified both geotechnically and on visual amenity grounds.

7.5 Section 17.14: Deferred Zone Rules

7.5.1 **Delete** **17.14.2 (b)(v)** and **replace** with:

In the Mapua Development Area until reticulated water, wastewater and stormwater are provided by the Council or to the satisfaction of the Council. The Residential Zone in Stage 2 is deferred until 2031.

7.5.2 **Add** to the end of **17.14.2(d)**:

or when the required date is reached for Stage 2 developments.

17.14.3 Deferred Rural Residential Zone

7.5.3 **Add** to **17.14.3(a)**:

and the southern extension to the Korepo Road Rural Residential Zone.

7.5.4 **Replace** the first sentence of **17.14.3(b)** with:

The zone will become effective for the southern extension of the Korepo Road Rural Residential Zone when water, wastewater and stormwater have been upgraded and the zone at Kaiteriteri and Mariri will become effective when the adjoining Riwaka-Kaiteriteri Road and Old Coach Road have been upgraded.

17.14.6 Deferred Light Industrial Zone

7.5.5 **Add to 17.14.6(a):**

and on Mapua Zone Map 87.

7.5.6 **Add new item:**

(ca) *The Light Industrial Zone north of Warren Place, Mapua is deferred until adequate reticulated water, wastewater and stormwater systems are provided by the Council or to the satisfaction of the Council.*

17.14.20 Reasons for Rules

7.5.7 **Add** at the end of the first sentence: *to maintain a coherent urban form.*

8. chapter 18: area rules

8.1 Section 18.5: Land Disturbance Area 1

8.1.1 **Add** to recontouring rule **18.5.2.1(p):**

except that

- (i) *there is no filling below the 4.6 metre contour in the Rural 1 Closed Zone at Mapua and at the Tourist Services Zone Mapua;*
- (ii) *there is no filling in the Residential Closed Zone at Ruby Bay and part of Iwa St Mapua; and*
- (iii) *there is no filling in the Residential Closed Zone at Tahi Street other than to create a building platform area.*

8.1.2 **Add** to **18.5.2.3 Controlled Activities (Recontouring of Land)** a new condition:

- (b) *It is not within 200 metres of the coastal marine area and in the Residential Closed Zones at Ruby Bay and Iwa St, Mapua, and in the Rural 1 Closed Zone and Tourist Services Zone at Mapua/Ruby Bay*

8.1.3 **Add** to **18.5.20 Reasons for Rules** in 'Recontouring' section:

Filling can block drainage paths and interfere with water storage.

8.1.4 In section on 'Activities which raise the level of the land', **add** after "flood prone ":
or inundation prone

8.2 Section 18.9: Coastal Hazard Area

18.9.2.1 Permitted Activities (Building Construction or Alteration

8.2.1 **Delete** from Rule **18.9.2.1**, conditions (b) and (c).

8.2.2 **Add** to **18.9.2.1**, a new condition (d):

The building is relocatable and not habitable.

8.2.3 **Add** to **18.9.2.1**, a new condition (e):

The building is not a coastal protection structure.

18.9.2.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities (Building Construction and Alteration)

8.2.4 **Add** to the end of the first sentence:

if it complies with the following conditions:

- (a) *It is relocatable and not a dwelling (unless there is no other dwelling on the site).*

8.2.5 **Delete matter (1) and rewrite as:**

The nature of the building and its construction.

8.2.6 **Insert** two new matters:

- (1A) *The effects of the proposed activity on the risk of coastal erosion and flooding on the subject property and on other properties.*
(1B) *The effects of the proposed activity on natural character.*

8.2.7 **Add** a new rule:

18.9.2.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities (Other)

Construction or alteration of a structure which does not comply with the conditions of Rule 18.9.2.1 or Rule 18.9.2.2 is a restricted discretionary activity, if it complies with the following conditions:

- (a) *It is the installation of a coastal protection structure.*
(b) *it is any activity, including earthworks that will alter the shape of the natural landform.*

A resource consent is required. *Consent may be refused, or conditions imposed, only in respect of the following matters to which the Council has restricted its discretion:*

- (1) *The extent of negative and positive effects on adjoining properties, natural environment, coastal processes.*
(2) *The finished appearance of the works, including buildings and land.*
(3) *Any effects on access to the coastline.*

8.2.8 **Add** a new rule:

18.9.2.4 Non-Complying Activities

A dwelling is a non-complying activity.

A resource consent is required. *Consent may be granted and conditions imposed, or consent may be refused.*

8.2.9 **Add** to Principal Reasons for Rules **18.9.20** after the words “coastal erosion”:
and inundation

8.3 Section 18.11: Coastal Environment Area

8.3.1 **Add** to rule **18.11.3.1 (f)** after the words “Kaiteriteri and Torrent Bay” wherever they occur: *and the Mapua Special Development Area.*

8.3.2 **Delete** matter (2) in rule **18.11.3.1** and **rewrite** as:

Consistency with any design guide applying to the area and any heritage character.

8.3.3 **Add** to Principal Reasons for Rules **18.11.20** in the ‘Building Design and Appearance’ section after the first sentence:

Commercial development in the vicinity of the Mapua Wharf will be expected to respond to the heritage character of the existing wharf buildings.

9. CHAPTER 19: INFORMATION REQUIRED WITH CONSENT APPLICATIONS

- 9.1 **Add** to rule **19.2.1.6**: *and set back from the Ruby Bay ridge top and toe, if applicable.*
- 9.2 **Add** to rule **19.2.1.12** at the end of first sentence: *or the Mapua Special Development Area.*
- 9.3 **Add** to rule **19.2.1.12(a)** **reference to the** Mapua Special Development Area.
- 9.4 **Delete** in Rule **19.2.1.12(b)** the words “Richmond South Development Area and Richmond West Development Area Subdivision Design Guide” and replace with: *Urban Design Guide (Part II, Appendix 2).*
- 9.5 **Add** to rule **19.2.1.13**, a new provision:
(g) changes to areas that are inundated.
- 9.6 **Add** to **19.2.2.7** after the words “Richmond South “, wherever they occur, reference to the Mapua Development Area, and **delete** in **19.2.2.7(c)** the words: “Richmond South Development Area and Richmond West Development Area Subdivision Design Guide” and replace with:
Urban Design Guide (Part II, Appendix 2).
- 9.7 **Add** to **19.2.9.1** after the word ‘structures’:
(including coastal protection structures)

10. PART II APPENDIX I: DESIGNATIONS

- 10.1 **Add** to **Figure A1.10** Tasman District Council – Transport – New, two new lines as follows:
D238 142 Higgs Road AM 87 curve realignment Lot 2 DP 6597 0.0030 10 yrs
D238 83 Higgs Road AM 87 “ ” Pt Lot 4 DP 693 0.0164 10 yrs

11. PART II APPENDIX 2: URBAN DESIGN GUIDE

- 11.1 **Delete** heading and rewrite as “*Urban Design Guide*“ “*Applies at Richmond South Development Area, Richmond West Development Area, Mapua Development Area and Special Development Area*”
- 11.2 **Add** new paragraph to section 1 ‘Introduction’:
“The Mapua Development Area and Mapua Special Development Areas (MDA and MSDA) are priority areas for Mapua’s development over a 20-year timeframe following the Mapua Ruby Bay Development Study in 2004 and a structure planning exercise in 2008. These processes have identified a need and support for a planned approach that ensures a quality living environment and sustainable and efficient use of land.”
- 11.3 **Add** to section 3 ‘Relationship of the Design Guide to the Tasman Resource Management Plan’ after the words “RSDA and RWDA” wherever they occur: *MDA and MSDA*”.

- 11.4 **Add** to section 4 ‘How to use this Design Guide’ after “RSDA and RWDA”: *MDA and MSDA*.
- 11.5 **Add** to Guideline A ‘**Allotment Layout**’ after “RSDA and RWDA”: *MDA and MSDA*.
- 11.6 **Add** to Guideline B ‘**Dwelling Size**’ after the word “Richmond” wherever it occurs: *and Mapua*.
- 11.7 **Add** to Guideline B ‘**Dwelling Size**’ after the word “RWDA”: *and MSDA*.
- 11.8 **Add** to Section C ‘**Street Network**’ at the end of the first sentence: *and Mapua*.
- 11.9 **Add** to Section C ‘**Street Network**’ after the words “RSDA and RWDA” wherever they occur: *MDA and MSDA*.
- 11.10 **Add** to Guideline C2 ‘**Street Connectedness**’ in fourth bulleted point after “Richmond”: *and Mapua*.
- 11.11 **Add** to Guideline D ‘**Garaging and Carparking**’ after the word “Richmond”: *and Mapua*.
- 11.12 **Add** to Guideline E ‘**On-Site Amenity**’ in first and last sentence of the first paragraph: *MDA and MSDA*.
- 11.13 **Add** to Guideline E ‘**On-site Amenity**’ in second sentence after the word “RWDA”: *and MSDA*.
- 11.14 **Add** to Guideline E1 ‘**Outdoor Living Space**’ in first bulleted point after “20m²:“(or 30m² in MSDA).
- 11.15 **Add** to Guideline F ‘**Frontages**’ after the word “RWDA”: *MDA and MSDA*.
- 11.16 In Guideline G ‘**Public Open Space**’, **rewrite** the first sentence as:
The provision of public open space within the Richmond and Mapua areas is a strong feature of their character;
and **rewrite** the end of the second sentence as: *... quality of Richmond and Mapua as places to live.*
- 11.17 In Guideline G1 ‘Function’, **add** to the second bulleted point after “greenways”:
“and open space in accordance with the Mapua Structure Plan for the MDA and MSDA ”

