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This report has been prepared by Hill Young Cooper Limited and Resource Management Group Limited.
Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy
Round One Consultation Summary

1 Introduction
This report provides a summary of the survey responses received in relation to public consultation on high-level growth options as part of the Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy (FDS). It describes the consultation process undertaken by Nelson City Council and Tasman District Council (the Councils) and the methodology adopted for processing and reporting on the feedback received. The public consultation document is attached as Appendix 1.

2 Executive Summary
The first round of consultation on the FDS sought to gather feedback on initial high-level growth options for the combined Nelson and Tasman Regions. The Councils sought feedback via a public survey, which was open to receive feedback between 23 January and 13 February 2019 (inclusive). The period to receive feedback was extended by two days (from February 11) to allow for responses amid the February 2019 fires. Detailed comments were also received from a variety of organisations and groups.

The public survey sought responses on three generic growth options presented - Spread Out, Intensify, and/or Start from Scratch, and offered opportunity for feedback on other options and challenges to be considered. The majority of responses utilised the online survey platform provided on the Councils’ websites, though many respondents did not respond to all questions. Other respondents utilised hard copies of the feedback form or provided feedback via email.

In summary, the main findings from public consultation on the proposal are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback Overall</th>
<th>Spread Out</th>
<th>Intensify</th>
<th>Start from Scratch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Supportive</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not Specify</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The most preferred growth option across both Nelson and Tasman is to intensify by focusing growth in and around existing centres. The least preferred option by Nelson respondents is to spread out by focusing growth on the outskirts of existing centres, while the least preferred option in Tasman is to start new settlements from scratch.
- The top five considerations for urban settlement and growth are:
  1. Preservation of natural landscapes
  2. Preservation of flat productive land
  3. Affordable housing (such as lowering land costs)
  4. Climate change responsiveness and CO2 reduction
  5. Diverse housing choices
Feedback from groups and organisations was varied. Generally there was support for more compact forms of growth where new housing was placed close to transport and services while productive land was retained for horticulture.

3 Structure of Report

This report is organised as follows:

- scope of consultation;
- outline of the three growth options and survey questions asked;
- a brief description of the feedback summary process;
- presentation of results;
- identification of key trends; and
- feedback from groups and organisations.

4 Scope of Consultation

The period for initial consultation on high-level growth options ran from 23 January to 13 February 2019 (inclusive).

The process involved the following:

- Information relating to the Nelson Tasman Development Strategy, together with a downloadable feedback form, and link to the online survey were placed on both the Tasman District and Nelson City Council websites.
- Other media outlets were used to promote the consultation process, including social media and articles in the Nelson Mail.
- Hard copies of the feedback forms were made available at all Tasman District and Nelson City Council offices and libraries. Hard copies were able to be emailed, posted, or handed in at either Tasman District or Nelson City Council.
- Feedback was also able to be received via direct email to Tasman District or Nelson City Council.

5 Three Growth Options Presented

The three high-level options for growth presented in the consultation material are summarised in turn below.

5.1 Growth Option 1: Spread Out

Much of the flat, easier land to develop for housing is in Tasman District. Current trends suggest some of its larger populated areas such as Richmond, Mapua/Ruby Bay and Motueka will continue to expand outwards. But in some places, this could see land with high productive value change from horticulture to roads and housing. There is sea level rise to consider, as well as upgraded infrastructure to pay for. Nelson City has some options to expand into the foothills on the eastern side of the city.
5.2 Growth Option 2: Intensify

We could accommodate growth within existing urban areas through infill housing, new town houses and terrace housing. This approach allows people to live near jobs, schools, community facilities, services and public transport. It will also lead to taller buildings, smaller properties and a more urban character overall. Existing infrastructure such as wastewater and stormwater systems and transport services would need to be upgraded. Coastal living is attractive, but only if it is not affected by sea level rise or coastal erosion. Some rural residential areas in Tasman could be re-zoned for residential housing. Some areas may see more infill and redevelopment.

5.3 Growth Option 3: Start from Scratch

We could grow by creating new townships or suburbs, such as new or expanded neighbourhoods to the north of Nelson. Inland places in Tasman could expand into larger townships, rather than expanding existing urban areas. Elevated Coastal Tasman areas could also be considered. New townships need substantial infrastructure, including facilities such as schools and community halls, water infrastructure and much better transport and communication links back to main centres (for access to jobs and services). This requires a long term financial commitment from the Councils.

6 Feedback Questions

The feedback forms\(^1\) included questions designed to gather feedback on the three presented growth options at a general level, and on the potential challenges and way Council could overcome these. The specific questions were organised as follows:

6.1 General Details

1) ‘Your details’ - Name, Organisation (if applicable), email address, and phone number
2) What is your age?
3) Where do you live?
4) Which of the following are most important to you in considering urban settlement and growth in the region? Please pick your top 5.

6.2 Three Growth Options

Spread Out

5) Should we focus growth on the outskirts of existing urban areas and settlements? Why or why not?
6) What do you see as the main challenges of taking this approach and how could we overcome these?

Intensify

7) Should we focus growth in and around existing centres? Why or why not?
8) What do you see as the main challenges of taking this compact growth approach and how could we overcome these?

\(^1\) The feedback forms and hard copy forms used identical question formats
Start from Scratch

9) Should we focus growth in new settlements? Why or why not? Where should they be?
10) What do you see as the main challenges of taking this compact growth approach and how could we overcome these?

Other Growth Options

11) Are there other options we should be considering and why? Please outline your ideas.

7 Feedback Summary Methodology

As noted above, an online form and survey were created to receive feedback, and respondents were able to email, post, or hand in hard copy responses. The feedback form requested that respondents supply their name and contact information. Duplicate submissions detected were subsequently consolidated for analytical purposes.

Overall, 277 responses² were received as follows:

- 229 electronic survey responses were made via the online survey platform;
- 34 ‘hard copy’ paper submissions were received by Council; and
- 14 bespoke submissions were received by Council.

Overall, the responses ranged in length and detail from a single sentence through to multiple specific outcomes sought. Some respondents used the form as a cover sheet, attaching further pages with feedback set out in narrative form. Wherever possible, narrative responses have been correlated with the feedback form questions for comparative purposes.

Each response was individually analysed and the results were collated. Responses were categorised and organised into a database structured to compile results for the specific questions provided in the feedback forms. Additional fields were also used for general comments and feedback that extended beyond the scope of the direct questions on the forms.

The compiler has exercised some discretion for the purposes of tabulating the data into defined categories as follows:

- for the submissions that utilised the formal feedback forms provided by Council, responses have been analysed where they were recorded by the respondents, meaning that where a respondent has repeated a certain theme or point in multiple fields, some issue duplication has resulted;
- for the submissions that adopted an alternative format:
  - hard copy feedback forms and feedback received via email were manually entered into the electronic online survey database to be collated for analysis;
  - themes that were applicable to specific questions on the feedback forms were recorded under the relevant field(s) for quantitative purposes; and
  - where themes were not applicable to the specific questions, these were summarised as ‘other’ comments.

The tabulated output is the compiler’s best assessment of wording to accurately reflect each response, and to group like responses for comparative purposes.

---

² Consistent with Council practice, a small number of additional submissions were received but were ruled invalid for various reasons, including use of profane or non-sensical language, or being duplicate responses.
8 Summary of Survey Responses to Questions

The summary below focusses on the results of responses to the form questions, along with some general, high-level comments regarding the nature and trends seen in the feedback. The summary also includes some of the wider responses provided in the ‘other comments’ section of the form, and in the bespoke submissions which did not utilise the form format.

Responses to each growth option have been assessed as either supportive, not supportive, neutral, or did not specify. It is to be noted that the degree of supportiveness in relation to each growth option is not mutually exclusive, in that some respondents were supportive or unsupportive of all three or no growth options.

It is to be further noted that respondents may have been supportive of a particular growth option whilst identifying challenges or unsupportive reasoning, or conversely been unsupportive of a particular growth option whilst identifying opportunities or supportive reasoning.

8.1 Responses Received

8.1.1 Demographic Information

In total, feedback was submitted by 227 individuals and 50 companies/organisations.

These companies/organisations included:

- Chorus New Zealand Ltd
- New Zealand Transport Agency
- NMDHB Public Health Service
- Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of New Zealand (Forest & Bird)
- Nelson Tasman Chamber of Commerce
- Nelson Tasman Housing Trust
- Waimea Irrigators Ltd
- Nelson Forests Ltd
- Friends of Nelson Haven & Tasman Bay (Inc)
- Nelson Youth Council

A qualitative summary of responses by a selection of the companies/organisations is contained in section 8.4 below.

The majority of respondents were from the Tasman area.

- 145 respondents were from Tasman;
- 115 respondents were from Nelson; and
- 21 respondents selected other (5 of which selected Motueka).³

---

³ Note some respondents selected more than one location in response to this question.
In terms of age, the most represented age bracket was 55-64.

Question 4: Which of the following are most important to you in considering urban settlement and growth in the region? Please pick your top 5.

- Preservation of natural landscapes
- Preservation of flat productive land
- Affordable housing (such as lowering land costs)
- Climate change responsiveness and CO2 reduction
- Diverse housing choices
- More frequent and efficient public transport
- Ensuring that new development does not place people at risk from natural hazards, like...
- Improved walking and cycling opportunities
- Resilience to sea level rise and coastal erosion
- Better road/transportation connections
- Other (please specify)
- Being able to live close to work opportunities
- More and better public places
- Smart and technology-enabled infrastructure
- Being close to beaches, shops and activities
The most common consideration identified by respondents was the preservation of natural landscapes.

Responses received in the ‘other’ category most commonly referred to limiting growth (9), the need to consider the impacts of climate change (8), and planning for an aging population (4).

Examples of ‘other’ considerations include:

- “Control of growth and tourism numbers”
- “Make Tiny Homes a legitimate and legal housing choice”
- “Respect for Tangata whenua sacred sites”
- “Better intensive use of existing buildings within Nelson CBD”
8.2 Option One: Spread Out

Question 5: Should we focus growth on the outskirts of existing urban areas and settlements? Why or why not?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback (245 responses)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Supportive</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not Specify</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.2.1 Reasons opposing option one

Based on all responses to this part of the question, reasons opposing focusing growth on the outskirts of existing urban areas and settlements from most common to least common are:

- Loss of productive land & its economic value
- Prefer intensification & higher density
- Increased travel congestion & pollution
- Inefficient use of land (sprawl) & resources
- Infrastructure at capacity - cost to upgrade/expand
- Need to consider climate change & sea level rise
- Loss of natural amenity and green space

8.2.2 Reasons in support of option one

Based on all responses to this part of the question, reasons in support of focusing growth on the outskirts of existing urban areas and settlements from most favourable to least are:

- If productive land and/or green space is to be retained
- Opportunity for a range of housing options (including affordable options)
- Opportunity for good urban planning and well integrated services and amenities (including…)
- Close to existing infrastructure and services
- Provides for economic growth and vibrancy
**Question 6: What do you see as the main challenges of taking this approach and how could we overcome these?**

### 8.2.3 Challenges associated with option one

Based on all responses to this part of the question, challenges of focusing growth on the outskirts of existing urban areas and settlements from most challenging to least are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic congestion/poor road infrastructure</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community resistance</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council red tape and developer ideologies</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of productive land and/or green space</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost and investment required</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring suitable land</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure at capacity-need to upgrade/expand</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of character/lifestyle/community</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of affordable options</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstategic/ad-hoc development</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from existing centres and/or amenities</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8.2.4 Ways to overcome challenges associated with option one

Based on all responses to this part of the question, ways to overcome challenges of focusing growth on the outskirts of existing urban areas and settlements from greatest opportunity to least are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investing in good public transport, cycling and walking options</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensification including mixed use and higher density development</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring good and innovative urban design and planning</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for a range of housing options (including affordable options)</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative ideas eg: green technologies (solar, rain water collection), smaller sections, tiny...</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting and retaining productive land and/or green space</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring infrastructure meets current and future needs</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to provide well integrated services and amenities (including work and school)</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking into account climate change and sea level rise</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development incentives eg: higher density, building on hills etc</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.3 Option Two: Intensify

Question 7: Should we focus growth in and around existing centres? Why or why not?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback (238 responses)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Supportive</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not Specify</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3.1 Reasons opposing option two

Based on all responses to this part of the question, reasons opposing focusing growth in and around existing centres from most common to least common are:

Infrastructure at capacity - cost to upgrade/expand
Loss of amenity/ crowding

8.3.2 Reasons in support of option two

Based on all responses to this part of the question, reasons in support of focusing growth in and around existing centres from most favourable to least are:

Opportunity for a range of housing options (including affordable options)
Opportunity for good urban planning and well integrated services and amenities (including green...)
If productive land and/or green space is to be retained
Close to existing infrastructure and services
In favour of intensification and higher density
Provides for economic growth and vibrancy
Reduces travel distance/ emissions
Alleviates climate change and sea level rise issues
Question 8: What do you see as the main challenges to taking this compact growth approach and how could we overcome these?

**8.3.3 Challenges associated with option two**

Based on all responses to this part of the question, challenges of focusing growth in and around existing centres from most challenging to least are:

![Challenges Diagram]

**8.3.4 Ways to overcome challenges associated with option two**

Based on all responses to this part of the question, ways to overcome challenges of focusing growth in and around existing centres from greatest opportunity to least are:

- Opportunity for a range of housing options (including affordable options)
- Ensuring good and innovative urban design and planning
- Intensification including mixed use and higher density development
- Protecting and retaining productive land and/or green space
- Innovative ideas eg: green technologies (solar, rain water collection), smaller sections, tiny houses etc
- Ensuring infrastructure meets current and future needs
- Investing in good public transport, cycling and walking options
- Opportunity to provide well integrated services and amenities (including work and school)
- Taking into account climate change and sea level rise
- Development incentives eg: higher density, building on hills etc
8.4 Option Three: Start from Scratch

Question 9: Should we focus growth in new settlements? Why or why not? Where should they be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback (235 responses)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Supportive</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not Specify</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.4.1 Reasons opposing option three

Based on all responses to this part of the question, reasons opposing focusing growth in new settlements from most common to least common are:

- Focus on existing centres
- Prefer intensification & higher density
- Infrastructure at capacity - cost to upgrade/expand
- Increased travel congestion & pollution
- Cost
- Too far away from existing centres & amenities
- Stop growth

8.4.2 Reasons in support of option three

Based on all responses to this part of the question, reasons in support of focusing growth in new settlements from most favourable to least are:

- Opportunity for good urban planning and well integrated services and amenities (including...)
- Potential to alleviate climate change and sea level rise issues
- If productive land and/or green space is to be retained
- Opportunity for a range of housing options (including affordable options)
- Provides for economic growth and vibrancy
Question 10: What do you see as the main challenges of taking this approach and how could we overcome these?

8.4.3 Challenges associated with option three

Based on all responses to this part of the question, challenges of focusing growth in new settlements from most challenging to least are:

- Cost and investment required
- Cost of new infrastructure
- Do not agree with this approach
- Traffic congestion/ poor road infrastructure
- Distance from existing centres and/or amenities
- Community resistance
- Council red tape and developer ideologies
- Loss of productive land and/or green space
- Acquiring suitable land
- Loss of character/lifestyle/community
- Lack of affordable options
- Unstategic/ad-hoc development

8.4.4 Ways to overcome challenges associated with option three

Based on all responses to this part of the question, ways to overcome challenges of focusing growth in new settlements from greatest opportunity to least are:

- Investing in good public transport, cycling and walking options
- Ensuring infrastructure meets current and future needs
- Opportunity to provide well integrated services and amenities (including work and school)
- Ensuring good and innovative urban design and planning
- Innovative ideas eg: green technologies (solar, rain water collection), smaller sections, tiny...
- Opportunity for a range of housing options (including affordable options)
- Protecting and retaining productive land and/or green space
- Taking into account climate change and sea level rise
- Intensification including mixed use and higher density development
- No challenges to this option
- Development incentives eg: higher density, building on hills etc
8.4.5 Location of new settlements associated with option three

Based on all responses to this part of the question, the most commonly identified areas for new settlements (which were identified by 2 or more respondents) in alphabetical order are:

- Brightwater (4)
- Cable Bay (2)
- Dovedale (2)
- Golden Bay (3)
- Hira (5)
- Hope (4)
- Mahana (3)
- Mapua (7)
- Marahau (2)
- Motueka (7)
- Moutere (8 Moutere hills, 6 Upper Moutere)
- Nelson (7 north of Nelson, 2 surrounding area)
- Richmond (7)
- St Arnaud (4)
- Tasman (4)
- Taupawera (4)
- Waiti (2)
- Waimea (2)
- Wakefield surrounding area (10)
- Wakapuaka (2)

In terms of non-specific locations, 22 respondents mentioned that hills and/or higher ground should be the location of any new settlement, whilst 2 respondents specially mentioned that hills should be avoided. 8 respondents specified that any new settlement should be inland and/or away from the coast. Overall, climate change and resilience was a key reason.
8.5 Other growth options and comments

Question 11: Are there other options we should be considering and why? Please outline your ideas.

The main categories of responses were in relation to:

- Limiting or controlling growth (20)
- A desire for ‘tiny houses’ and/or the need for smaller houses (18)
- A desire for housing to be affordable (15)
- Taking into consideration the ageing population and retirement developments (14)
- A desire for mandatory solar and/or rainwater collection technologies (12)
- Taking into consideration the impacts of climate change (7)

8.5.1 Summary of groups and organisations responses

The following table provides a summary of the key points raised in detailed submissions. Based on the submissions, an assessment is made as to whether the submission supports a particular approach to growth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/ Organisation</th>
<th>Key comments</th>
<th>Preferred growth option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chorus New Zealand Ltd</td>
<td>Must ensure that there is sufficient capacity in infrastructure networks to provide for new developments.</td>
<td>DNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Transport Agency</td>
<td>Ensure FDS aligns with Governments national priorities- connect new and existing areas with resilient fit-for-purpose transport system across all modes. Enable a just transition to sustainable zero-carbon economy, with vibrant, liveable, accessible areas that recognise innovation and technology to delivery infrastructure and support growth. Respond to impacts of climate change and natural hazard risks.</td>
<td>DNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMDHB Public Health Service</td>
<td>Supports intensification of existing centres- sustainable use of land and infrastructure, compact walkable neighbourhoods promoting incidental exercise and social interactions, more affordable housing for smaller household sizes can lead to improved community health and wellbeing outcomes. Need to consider affordable housing, diverse housing range for ageing population, those living with disabilities, and those requiring social housing.</td>
<td>Option 2- intensify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Forest &amp; Bird Protection Society of New Zealand (Forest &amp; Bird)</td>
<td>People should be able to live, work (and study) within close proximity of where they live- this should be supported by appropriate public transport and off-road travel routes. Prevention is better than cure. Councils should do what they can to ensure they make their activities carbon neutral. We do not support development onto productive land - the transition to a zero-carbon economy is going to require a much more integrated, localised and resilient food production economy. Envisions community living on shared productive land, tiny sections for tiny homes, city apartment living, and encouraging Transition Towns e.g. <a href="https://transitionnetwork.org/">https://transitionnetwork.org/</a></td>
<td>Option 2- intensify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Tasman Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>The Chamber supports the approach of focusing growth in and around existing settlements, and in principal supports growth on the outskirts of existing settlements provided there will be adequate transport networks and development infrastructure to cope with the additional growth. The Chamber would be interested in sharing with its members how both</td>
<td>Option 2- intensify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Tasman Housing Trust</td>
<td>We want to see more focus on growth within existing centres, to keep housing near other services. We don’t think the growth pressures in this region merit the costs of new settlements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimea Irrigators Ltd</td>
<td>“Flat” food producing areas should be preserved at all cost. WIL shareholders have invested in the Waimea Community Dam on the basis that food production will be maintained in what is a unique climate for horticulture. There is ample land on the outskirts of low productive value but slopes will increase building cost. Mindfulness needs to be given to areas where fire can be a threat particularly where reticulated water is not available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Forests Ltd</td>
<td>Ensure that the cost benefit analysis for any proposed option recognises reverse sensitivity costs and also enables a compensation matrix for the loss of the use of the land. As an example, if housing was to move into a plantation forest area, the plantation forest could be set back, but there are costs under the Climate Change Response Act - Emissions Trading Scheme and loss of use of productive land that must be compensated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Nelson Haven &amp; Tasman Bay (Inc)</td>
<td>Intensification of occupation of town/urban areas that are not susceptible to sea level rise. The need for infrastructure (water/sewerage/services/work opportunities and including transport, school, medical care) needs to be at the forefront of planning as well as preservation and protection of the natural environment and values including coastal and estuarine areas. The region MUST retain all the values that mean that this region is the best place to live (and work and be educated).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Youth Council</td>
<td>Need to consider infrastructure, accessible convenient housing to reduce transport difficulties and commuting delays whilst increasing safety. Encouraging community education of why specific changes have been made and how they will benefit us in the long term- ie: smaller dwellings, development upwards. Need for parks and reserves to ensure positive and healthy community outcomes. Evaluate public transport and improve infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Cohousing</td>
<td>Encourage local housing initiatives, like cohousing, to make the community in the model that they wish to live in. This breeds healthier, longer residing citizens and great places for kids to grow up. Change the premise under which we have disenfranchised the young and working poor. We need to change our outdated model of development. Stop speculation and encourage self-development of communities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero Carbon Nelson Tasman</td>
<td>Intensification of urban residential areas will save costs in infrastructure, active transport will improve health/fitness, medium density housing is a favourable setting for social cohesion, smaller houses and limiting the upper size of houses close to the urban centre promotes equity, as does affordable housing, passive solar arrangements and good home insulation create a healthier environment for people, reducing urban sprawl increases biodiversity and landscape beauty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1: Public consultation document
WHERE DO WE GROW FROM HERE?

Have your say.

HAVE YOUR SAY ON THE NELSON TASMAN FUTURE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

Nelson and Tasman are growing fast and we continue to need more houses for people to live in, places for people to work and earn a living, and spaces for relaxation, exercise and community events.

Nelson City Council and Tasman District Council are working together to plan for and manage urban growth over the next 30 years.

The Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy will determine whether we keep growing our city and towns in the same way we have in the past, or if we take a different approach.

As well as planning for the extra homes and businesses our region will need, we must be aware that business needs are changing, new housing needs to be affordable, and the make-up of our communities will change over time.

This is an important conversation for our community, and we want to hear your views. Thank you for taking the opportunity to play a part in planning for the future of Nelson-Tasman.

WHAT IS A FUTURE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY?

Councils with growing populations (like Nelson and Tasman) are required by central government under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity to:

- assess how much demand there will be for housing and business over the next 30 years,
- make sure there is enough land and development opportunities available to meet this expected demand, including a buffer of ‘spare capacity’ to meet unforeseen changes.

The Future Development Strategy will set out how and where we will accommodate housing and business growth across the region, with a focus on how the Nelson urban area (including Richmond) and other Tasman townships will grow.

The Future Development Strategy is a great opportunity to ensure the growth of our city, towns and rural settlements is well-planned to maximise opportunities, avoid risks and hazards, and to create high quality living environments.

The Future Development Strategy will input into the reviews of Nelson and Tasman’s planning rules, as well as expansion and upgrades of infrastructure such as roads, water supplies, sewerage reticulation and open spaces. The strategy will be regularly reviewed.
THE CHALLENGES

Currently, Nelson and Tasman jointly have around 50,000 dwellings. To keep up with existing population growth trends we need to plan for between 10,000 and 20,000 new dwellings over the next 30 years. We also need to consider the possibility our population will grow faster than current forecasts – as has happened over the past decade.

Our analysis indicates that, overall, there is enough zoned residential land available to accommodate the next 10 years of growth. Analysis also suggests there is enough business land to meet short- and long-term demands but this needs to be further tested. The Future Development Strategy aims to ensure both Councils provide sufficient zoned land and infrastructure to accommodate growth over the next 30 years.

The type of housing that people will need over that period is likely to change. Median house prices have increased substantially in Nelson-Tasman over the past 10 years, placing financial pressure on some households (whether renting or buying). Long term, if house prices are too high relative to incomes, then people may shift out of the area. The number of aged people will increase in the future, and their housing needs will be different.

We recognise housing affordability is an issue in Nelson and Tasman. Through the Future Development Strategy, both Councils are implementing their role in ensuring that supply of zoned land and infrastructure is not impacting housing affordability. Both Councils are actively investigating other tools and levers they can use to address this issue.

THE TASMAN SITUATION

Tasman District has the capacity to accommodate all of Tasman’s expected future demand for residential growth within the areas already identified for rezoning and infrastructure servicing. However, as priorities, opportunities and constraints change there may be a need to review where and how we grow. Tasman settlements have opportunities to intensify, and to avoid spreading onto productive land. In some locations there are constraints posed by natural hazards. There will also be a need for business land to support that growth.

THE NELSON SITUATION

Nelson City faces important choices in the long term as the ‘easy’ development opportunities currently available within the city’s boundaries are taken up over the next decade. It is estimated Nelson City will face a shortfall of zoned and serviced residential land for several thousand homes between 2028 and 2048 if no more land is provided.

If the homes were only accommodated through greenfields development, and with reasonably large sections, this could mean up to 250 hectares of rural land would need to be converted for housing. At the other end of the spectrum, those dwellings could be accommodated by intensification of 125 hectares of existing urban area if its housing density was doubled. There are many options between these two ends of the spectrum. There will also be a need for business land to support that growth.

1Based on scenarios compiled using Council and Statistics NZ data.
THE OPTIONS

We need to think carefully about where new development should be located and how best to invest in the services and infrastructure needed to support our existing and future communities.

The Nelson and Tasman communities face some important choices.

SPREAD OUT?

Much of the flat, easier land to develop for housing is in Tasman District. Current trends suggest some of its larger populated areas such as Richmond, Mapua/Ruby Bay and Motueka will continue to expand outwards. But in some places, this could see land with high productive value change from horticulture to roads and housing. There is sea level rise to consider, as well as upgraded infrastructure to pay for. Nelson City has some options to expand into the foothills on the eastern side of the city.

INTENSIFY?

We could accommodate growth within existing urban areas through infill housing, new town houses and terrace housing. This approach allows people to live near jobs, schools, community facilities, services and public transport. It will also lead to taller buildings, smaller properties and a more urban character overall. Existing infrastructure such as wastewater and stormwater systems and transport services would need to be upgraded.

Coastal living is attractive, but only if it is not affected by sea level rise or coastal erosion. Some rural residential areas in Tasman could be re-zoned for increased residential housing. Some existing urban areas may see more infill and redevelopment.

START FROM SCRATCH?

We could grow by creating new townships or suburbs, such as new or expanded neighbourhoods to the north of Nelson. Inland places in Tasman could expand into larger townships, rather than expanding existing urban areas. Elevated Coastal Tasman areas could also be considered. New townships need substantial infrastructure, including facilities such as schools and community halls, water infrastructure and much better transport and communication links back to main centres (for access to jobs and services). This requires a long term financial commitment from the councils.
HAVE YOUR SAY

The first round of consultation on the Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy is open from 23 January – 11 February 2019. Your input will help us draft a set of options for further consideration.

SOME QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER FOR NELSON AND TASMAN:

- Where should our growing population live and work?
- How do we best manage the risk from known natural hazards?
- Should we allow communities to grow through development on the flat productive farmland around existing settlements, or preserve it for productive purposes?
- How will we manage, protect and improve the environment as we grow?
- What kind of transport systems and infrastructure do we need to support our growing regions?
- Are there more opportunities for growth and intensification around our main centres?
- Should we focus development in our larger city, towns and suburbs? If so which ones?
- Or should we focus development in our smaller townships? If so, which ones?
- Should we establish new townships to absorb growth? If so, where?
- Are there townships or locations where we should not grow. If so, where?
- How should we respond to climate change effects? Such as sea level rise, coastal erosion and transport-related CO2 production)
- How do we encourage different housing styles and choices?

SUBMIT FEEDBACK

LET US KNOW WHAT YOU THINK:

- Request a feedback form at any Tasman District and Nelson City Council office or library
- Fill out the feedback form in this consultation document and email it to futuredevelopmentstrategy@ncc.govt.nz or info@tasman.govt.nz (with Future Development Strategy in the subject line)
- Hand it in at, or post to, any Tasman District or Nelson City Council office.

Post your completed feedback form to:

- Future Development Strategy
  Tasman District Council
  Private Bag 4
  Richmond, Nelson 7050
- Future Development Strategy
  Nelson City Council
  PO Box 645, Nelson 7040

TIMELINE

- January/February 2019 – Public feedback on high-level scenarios and ideas
- March 2019 – shortlisting options and analysis
- April/May 2019 – public consultation on draft strategy
- June 2019 – finalise the strategy following consultation.

The Future Development Strategy is a very high level document that will guide and inform the more detailed proposals and processes that will follow.
FEEDBACK FORM NELSON TASMAN FUTURE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

Nelson and Tasman are growing fast and we continue to need more houses for people to live in, places for people to work and earn a living, and spaces for relaxation, exercise and community events.

Nelson City Council and Tasman District Council are working together to plan for and manage urban growth over the next 30 years.

The Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy will determine whether we keep growing our city and towns in the same way we have in the past, or if we take a different approach.

As well as planning for the extra homes and businesses our region will need, we must be aware that business needs are changing, new housing needs to be affordable, and the make-up of our communities will change over time.

This is an important conversation for our community, and we want to hear your views. Thank you for taking the opportunity to play a part in planning for the future of Nelson-Tasman.

CONTACT DETAILS:

Name

Company organisation: (if applicable)

Telephone    Email:

Age:  0-17 / 18-24 / 25-34 / 35-44 / 45-54 / 55-65 / 65-74 older / 75 or older / I'd rather not say

Do you live in   ☐ Nelson   ☐ Tasman   ☐ Other (please specify)

Which of the following are most important to you in considering urban settlement and growth in the region?

Please pick your top 5.

☐ Preservation of flat productive land
☐ Diverse housing choices
☐ Affordable housing (such as lowering land costs)
☐ More and better public places
☐ Preservation of natural landscapes
☐ Being close to beaches, shops and activities
☐ Better road/transportation connections
☐ More frequent and efficient public transport
☐ Improved walking and cycling opportunities
☐ Being able to live close to work opportunities
☐ Ensuring that new development does not place people at risk from natural hazards, like flooding

☐ Resilience to sea level rise and coastal erosion
☐ Climate change responsiveness and CO2 reduction
☐ Smart infrastructure/technology enabled
☐ Other – please specify:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Nelson and Tasman are growing fast and we continue to need more houses for people to live in, places for people to work and earn a living, and spaces for relaxation, exercise and community events.
Which growth scenario do you prefer?

We're considering three growth scenarios - spreading out, intensifying existing centres, or starting new settlements from scratch. Continue with our survey to tell us what you think about these scenarios.

**SPREADING OUT**

Much of the flat, easier land to develop for housing is in Tasman District. Current trends suggest some of its larger populated areas such as Richmond, Mapua/Ruby Bay and Motueka will continue to expand outwards. But in some places, this could see land with high productive value change from horticulture to roads and housing. There is sea level rise to consider, as well as upgraded infrastructure to pay for. Nelson City has some options to expand into the foothills on the eastern side of the city.

Should we focus growth on the outskirts of existing urban areas and settlements?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Why/why not?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

What do you see as the main challenges of taking this approach and how could we overcome these?

**INTENSIFYING DEVELOPMENT WITHIN EXISTING CENTRES**

We could accommodate growth within existing urban areas through infill housing, new town houses and terrace housing. This approach allows people to live near jobs, schools, community facilities, services and public transport. It will also lead to taller buildings, smaller properties and a more urban character overall. Existing infrastructure such as wastewater and stormwater systems and transport services would need to be upgraded. Coastal living is attractive, but only if it is not affected by sea level rise or coastal erosion. Some rural residential areas in Tasman could be re-zoned for residential housing. Some areas may see more infill and redevelopment.

Should we focus growth in and around existing centres? Why or why not?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Why/why not?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
What do you see as the main challenges to taking this compact growth approach and how could we overcome these?

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

STARTING FROM SCRATCH

We could grow by creating new townships or suburbs, such as new or expanded neighbourhoods to the north of Nelson. Inland places in Tasman could expand into larger townships, rather than expanding existing urban areas. Elevated Coastal Tasman areas could also be considered. New townships need substantial infrastructure, including facilities such as schools and community halls, water infrastructure and much better transport and communication links back to main centres (for access to jobs and services). This requires a long term financial commitment from the Councils.

Should we focus growth in new settlements?  

☐ Yes  ☐ No  Why/why not?  Where should they be?

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

What do you see as the main challenges of taking this approach and how could we overcome these?

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

OTHER GROWTH SCENARIOS

Are there other options we should be considering and why?  

☐ Yes  ☐ No  Please describe your options.

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Do you have any other comments on how we should grow?

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Any other comments? Please attach a separate sheet.

☐ Please tick here if you’d like to receive further information about the Future Development Strategy?

☐ Please tick here if you are interested in participating in more in-depth discussions with Council about the Future Development Strategy