

Mapua Boat Ramp Trust – Council Meeting with Trust Members

6 June 2024

Present: Mayor King, Deputy Mayor Bryant, Councillors Chris Hill, Kit Maling, Celia Butler, Christeen Mackenzie, Dan Shallcrass, Jo Ellis, Mike Kininmonth, Trindi Walker and Glen Daikee

Staff: Leonie Rae, Renee Thomas, Darryn Palmer, Marie Callander, Richard Kirby, Rob Smith and Robyn Scherer

Mapua Boat Ramp Trust: **Section 7(2)(a) - Protection of Privacy**

Section 7(2)(a) - Protection of Privacy

Boat Ramp Trust is requesting further funding of **Section 7(2)** to progress the resource consent to the hearing stage. We know the Trust will be able to raise the funds. Have already put in 29% of costs so far. Delays and requests for information have incurred more costs than envisaged. Stantec **Section 7(2)** for RC, design cost **Section 7(2)**.

Councillor Mackenzie

Referred to the Trust's comparison of the Council's requirements for the proposed Motueka Swimming Pool versus a boat ramp? She noted that they are completely different projects, the pool is owned by the Council and will be sited on Council land. Christeen spoke about the option of the Trust having pre-meetings with people who have submitted against the consents.

Section 7(2)(a) - Protection of Privacy

The Trust is in a Catch 22 position. We don't have a product to sell until we have a RC. Plenty of indication that we will get the necessary funding through fund raising.

Section 7(2)(j) - to prevent the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or improper advantage.

The option of the Trust holding a public meeting to discuss the issues was discussed. Has the Trust identified the elements that objectors are objecting to. Do you have any plans to phase the project. Yes, we have staged process.

Why don't you explain things to them for example, lowering the height of the building, dropping a bay from the building? **Section 7(2)(a) - Protection of Privacy** said the Trust could consider that option. Take time to tell people about the ramp being a normal ramp, nothing grandiose.

Deputy Mayor Stuart Bryant

What expertise have you used. Davis Ogilvie, information in RC, originally **Section 7(2)** but now blown out. Council requirements have meant more information has been required, rules have changed.

Waiting for the Council to advance further funding. Low of **Section 7(2)** to take to hearing plus our own fees and legal fees.

Mayor Tim King

Section 7(2)(j) - to prevent the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or improper advantage.

Section 7(2)(j) - to prevent the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or improper advantage.

Councillor Kininmonth

Section 7(2)(j) - to prevent the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or improper advantage. There will still be significant costs for the Trust. Discussions with those against the boat ramp – informal, formal. Up to the Trust to work out how they do that.

If the Council doesn't agree to more funding, what is your plan B?

Section 7(4)(a) - Protection 2

We cannot continue in my view, not prepared to put more money in at this point. Nervous that you haven't understood all the requirements of the RC process.

Councillor Mackenzie

The extra \$250k, how much is for the Council's processes and costs versus other consultants or lawyers. Response - Section 7(4) for the Council consent.

Section 7(4)(a) - Protection 2

We do have a funding plan and programme. Tasman Coastal Ocean Rowing Club, have a beneficiary to provide Section 7(4). Rata Foundation, NZ Lotteries, Community Trust, Community Development fund, raffles, silent auctions, naming rights for sponsors, individual private funders, like mind sporting clubs and businesses potentially.

Section 7(2)(a) - Protection 2

Key question is whether there is a ramp at Māua or not. That is the important question. The ball is in the Council's court.

Meeting closed at 12.24 pm.

Mapua Boat Ramp Trust – Council Meeting with Trust Members

6 June 2024

Present: Mayor King, Deputy Mayor Bryant, Councillors Chris Hill, Kit Maling, Celia Butler, Christeen Mackenzie, Dan Shallcrass, Jo Ellis, Mike Kininmonth, Trindi Walker and Glen Daikee

Staff: Leonie Rae, Renee Thomas, Darryn Palmer, Marie Callender, Richard Kirby, Rob Smith and Robyn Scherer

Mapua Boat Ramp Trust: **Section 7(2)(a) - Protection of Privacy**

Section 7(2)(a) - Protection of Privacy

Boat Ramp Trust is requesting further funding of **Section 7(2)** to progress the resource consent to the hearing stage. We know the Trust will be able to raise the funds. Have already put in 29% of costs so far. Delays and requests for information have incurred more costs than envisaged. Stantec **Section 7(2)** for RC, design cost **Section 7(2)(b)**

Councillor Mackenzie

Referred to the Trust's comparison of the Council's requirements for the proposed Motueka Swimming Pool versus a boat ramp? She noted that they are completely different projects, the pool is owned by the Council and will be sited on Council land. Christeen spoke about the option of the Trust having pre-meetings with people who have submitted against the consents.

Section 7(2)(a) - Protection of Privacy

The Trust is in a Catch 22 position. We don't have a product to sell until we have a RC. Plenty of indication that we will get the necessary funding through fund raising.

Section 7(2)(j) - to prevent the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or improper advantage.

The option of the Trust holding a public meeting to discuss the issues was discussed. Has the identified the elements that objectors are objecting to. Do you have any plans to phase the project. Yes, we have staged process.

Why don't you explain things to them eg lowering height, dropping a bay from the building? **Section 7(2)**
Section 7(2) said the Trust could consider that option. Take time to tell people about the ramp being a normal ramp, nothing grandiose.

Stuart – what expertise have you used. Davis Ogilvie, information in RC, originally **Section 7(2)** but now blown out. Council requirements have meant more information has been required, rules have changed.

Waiting for council to advance further funding. Low of **Section 7(2)** to take to hearing plus our own fees and legal fees.

Section 7(2)(j) - to prevent the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or improper advantage.
– suggestion - **Section 7(2)(j) - to prevent the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or improper advantage.**

Section 7(2)(j) - to prevent the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or improper advantage.

Mike Kininmonth – Section 7(2)(j) - to prevent the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or improper advantage.

There will still be significant costs for the Trust. Discussions with those against the boat ramp – informal, formal. Up to the Trust to work out how they do that.

If the Council doesn't agree to more funding, what is your plan B? Section 7(2)(a) - Pres we cannot continue in my view, not prepared to put more money in at this point. Nervous that you haven't understood all the requirements of the RC process.

Christeen? – extra Section 7(2), how much is for the Council's processes and costs versus other consultants or lawyers. Response – Section 7(2)(b) for the Council consent.

Section 7(2)(a) - Protection – we do have a funding plan and programme. Tasman Coastal Ocean Rowing Club, have a beneficiary to provide Section 7(2)(b). Rata Foundation, NZ Lotteries, Community Trust, Community Development fund, raffles, silent auctions, naming rights for sponsors, individual private funders, like mind sporting clubs and businesses potentially.

Section 7(2)(a) – key question is whether there is a ramp at Mapua or not. That is the important question. The ball is in the Council's court.

Meeting closed at 12.24 pm.

Christeen MacKenzie & Dan Shallcrass.

Thank you both for coming to meet us on 14th May 2024 to discuss the boat ramp.
Here is our information you requested.
Background.

The replacement boat ramp for Mapua has been an ongoing project since before 2002, It's been a very prolonged and difficult road. Clearly, there are people in Mapua **and** within Tasman District Council (TDC) who are opposed to any new boat ramp in Mapua. This may be unpalatable to some, but facts are facts. Below is evidence of this. However, due to the recent councillors' willingness to listen to the boat club requests, eventually, those councillors voted to allocate [REDACTED] to a joint venture project in May 2021.

Since that time, the Trust has employed Davis Ogilvie Ltd (Engineers) who in turn have used experts to prepare a resource consent. These costs are considerable. And due to the complex rules of the RMA. The Trust conducted a house to house survey in January 2023 to gauge the attitudes of the community. The results are in our consent application and on our website. Around 90 % (about 1054 out of 1110) supported the boat club and signed the survey. Some criticism has been aimed at the reliability of the survey, but the person who has analysed the data says *that she was "Survey data analyst for AJH and a former Health System Improvement Advisor" and is confident with the conclusions.* In January 2024, the consent was publicly notified by the TDC and submissions received were 111 opposed, (63 wished to be heard) & 212 for. (23 wished to be heard).

This means there will need to be a Hearing. A suggestion has been made to have a "pre meeting" with those objectors, presumably run by TDC staff.

Having a pre meeting with them is very unlikely to resolve their issues. Unfortunately, most of the nays are totally unwilling to compromise. We personally know some of them. The Trust is against this suggestion as it will be quite expensive and its very unlikely that this will avoid the need for a hearing, so we will be paying for 2 "hearings".

The only fair way to move forward will be to have a Hearing with a commissioner. Council have advised the costs to the Trust. This is the reason the Trust is asking for a further advancement of the allocated funds.

The mayor made a comment that it seemed *"wrong to be supporting one side and not the other. We say, by TDC funding the hearing, both sides get to have their case heard in a fair way.* [REDACTED] Section 7(2)(j) - to prevent the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or improper advantage Either way, the Trust is funding the hearing as it's using up the [REDACTED] Section 7(2)(j) - to prevent the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or improper advantage

It will be useful for you to have more information about what the boating community has been going through and how long it has taken to get this far. It is time for the council to bring it to a conclusion.

At the 2 May 2024 council meeting, video shows some Councillors asked for more information and some clarifications from the trust.

1. Cr Maling asked "Did the TDC ever promise a new boat ramp?" The answer to that is resoundingly yes. The mayor Cr King, Mr Kirby & Mr Drummond said they could not find any reference or could not recall. Actually, there are many references given over previous years. Various councillors and some staff have made statements both privately, and publicly. See the section on starting page 4 below **Evidence of support.** These are from Mayor Kempthorne,

Mayor King, Cr Norris, Cr Anne Turley, Mr Simpson, CEO Lindsay McKenzie. (Evidence provided below). Also attached is a TDC pamphlet from 2002 outlining the need to replace the existing ramp.

2. Did the TDC oppose the new ramp ? Yes, see below **TDC opposition**. P8.
3. Questions were asked about the Trust's ability to fund the project. Staff have already been provided with this information. A list was provided to Mr Kirby in 2023. This was not presented to councillors. We are not able to mention individual donors as it's commercially sensitive and totally inappropriate in a public forum. The Trust is composed of mature business people who have spent their careers in business. They have put their own money into the project. We don't consider ourselves naive when it comes to money. If the consent is issued, the Trust will not commence constructing until the money is secured, as trustees, we can not commit to a project unless funding is secured. The Trust will have a number of years to complete the project.
4. If the councillors decide to advance more funding, and if a consent is not granted, councillors can be satisfied they did all in their power to help this community get the best outcome. TDC limit will be [redacted]. The writer would ask, were guarantees sought for the Motueka pool, or the Wakefield facility? We understand they were not.
5. There were comments about the magnitude of the money required being so large. This is caused by the Resource Management Act. In fact, the size of the council's contribution is actually quite small in comparison. The Trust has a number of contractors who have promised discounts on materials such as concrete, gravel, rocks, steel; these discounts wouldn't be available if the TDC were building the ramp. Our plan is to concentrate on the ramp first. The building is stage 2.
6. Aspersions were cast on the experience of our engineers by staff. Our engineers, Davis Ogilvie, are highly qualified and have access to world knowledge. One could speculate why these comments were made, to throw doubt on the project. We take these comments seriously and felt they were highly unprofessional.
7. Questions and doubts were raised about the consent being approved and the implications if not approved. Is this a question the councillors should be considering? A legal process is in place, we need to let the process continue. Some unfavorable consequences of a negative outcome are; Grossi Pt remains a launching area, Sea scouts with inadequate facilities, Kite park with land for sale.
8. TDC fully funded a RC (Pakawau rock wall) which did end up failing. Considering how long this project has been unresolved, perhaps it's just time to get on with it.
9. This application for a RC is a big thing for Mapua and is supported by a very large portion of the village. It is the culmination of work since 2003. The Trustees want it to be an open process where individuals can make their case.
10. Funding. If agreed, the new limit is [redacted]. This needs to be spread over the lifetime of the ramp (100 years?). We are asking for [redacted] to be part of the consenting process. This includes a **deposit of** [redacted] which staff have advised is required prior to setting a hearing date. (see page 9). (This is interesting, because when [redacted] mentioned asking for a bond from the objectors should the consent be approved, some staff and councillors took exception to this including the mayor who called it bullish (bullying), and Leif said he it "occurred in rare cases, but not common".)
11. Mention was made of a possible appeal of a decision costing [redacted]. [redacted] It wouldn't be the first time that a bond is required for an appeal. The TDC is asking for the Trust to

put up a deposit (bond) of [Section 7(2)(b)] for this Resource Consent hearing. There's no bullying about this, it's simply laying out the possibilities.

12. [Section 7(2)] was originally put aside for a boat ramp by council in 2017, but by the time councillors voted, it had become [Section 7(2)]. Some [Section 7(2)(b)] was used to purchase a regional boat ramp study.
13. A comment about the Trust "is unwilling to put more time and money into the project" was apparently in conflict with [Section 7(2)(a) Protection of] comments. *The point of the original comments* is that the trustees don't want to be strung along having hope, to find that actually, the councillors aren't prepared to support their original decision.
14. Financial. A total of [Section 7(2)(b)] has been received from TDC according to our records. TDC has paid some bills which relate to the project bringing the total to [Section 7(2)(b)].
15. The Trust has now received [Section 7(2)(b)] from donations and loans. We **haven't** included any "in kind" \$, **contrary to Mr Kirbys statement** (in the section Analysis and advice part 5 given as background information to the last council meeting on May 2.) He writes "*to date the Trust has justified its contribution by applying hourly rates to its volunteer efforts*" However it was mentioned to Mr Kirby that a large amount of unpaid time has been incurred, including digging for a pipeline which the council did not know its precise location. I am disappointed that unpaid, voluntary time from generous people within the community who are doing work for the public good is dismissed so easily. Have other projects offered "in kind" as contributions?
16. There was mention of concerns about **fighting language**, this project has been ongoing for over 20 years. It's been a difficult project, and people are **so** frustrated with the delays, fobbing off, sowing doubt and just plain misinformation that some firmer language may have been used. So we need your help, so we can get this over the line and get a resolution.

In summary, we ask that the councillors continue to support the process which is to go to a hearing, where all parties can make their case..

Evidence of support. From staff & Councillors

From a TDC pamphlet 2002 See attached. the wharf

"There are strong indications that additional retail on the wharf should be avoided as long as the boat ramp remains there as parking congestion has already reached excessive levels.

South Ramp

This option removes the ramp from the wharf congestion. Its feasibility may be questionable with the long length of ramp required which may have to extend in to the channel before it reaches depth. A further technical survey should be undertaken to clarify the situation. The open space amenity and pedestrian continuity along the beach will also be compromised. *Consideration should be given to the residence to the south.*

MDCA archives 14 Dec 2015

Presentation to public meeting Mapua by Martyn Barlow - Mapua Hall 6 Dec 2015. TDC Ward councillors, Engineering and commercial managers present. Outlines boat clubs position on closure of boat ramp and access restrictions for boat club and scouts. **Cr Trevor Noriss offered to work with the MBC on finding a solution.**

Monday September 12th 2016 MDCA Meeting Boat Ramp: Martyn Barlow reported that the **TDC has worked** with the Boat Club's concept plan for a new boat ramp. The Boat Club AGM endorsed the plan which can now be taken to the community via the Boat Ramp Working Party (Martyn to convene a meeting of the W/P). Further points made: The Waterfront Park is believed to be the only viable option for a Mapua Boat Club boat ramp The Sea Scouts have been involved in the planning process **Any proposal will require Resource Consent** and this will provide the opportunity for community input

18th June 2013

Commercial subcommittee meeting held 18th June 2013, ironically at the Mapua Boat Club where Mr Mike Drummond is recorded in the minutes; Mr Drummond noted "that Mr Clark said Council is not leveraging the maximum potential from existing buildings and a relocation of the boat club and museum would derive better income. In developing a proposal for the overall area those things need to be taken into account."

We note also from the minutes that both the **CEO Mr McKenzie** and deputy mayor **Tim King** were both present at that meeting.

1 Oct 2015

From Lindsay McKenzie CEO letter to Section 7(2)(a) - Probation 1 Oct 2015

The issues at Mapua have been evident for many years, although increasing. Unfortunately, the commercial precinct activities create high foot traffic and vehicle use of all types in this space **is** no longer safe for the family friendly environment the community seek. It is a case of recognising the conflict and working towards the best outcome for the greatest number of users. Council has consulted with the Mapua Advisory group in May and August, and made a formal decision to close the commercial precinct area for a number of valid reasons.

Council has raised funds in its Long Term Plan for locating and upgrading an alternate boat ramp in the area and Engineering department are tasked with that work.

Yours sincerely

Lindsay McKenzie Chief Executive

17 Feb 2017 External email Simpson background

FROM Simpson to Cooper, Wilkes, McPherson "Firstly, it was evident in consultation, and **remains, important that there are suitable boat ramp facilities** and rooms for the sea scouts at Mapua." "I **prepared drawings for a new boat ramp in the park** which were sent to TDC 23 Sept 2008 Meeting - Option #1 on the leased road reserve currently occupied by the Smokehouse shelter & Option #2 down the southern boundary. Commercial arrangements precluded #1. The boat club decided against #2 due to the length of ramp required, situation that would occur making ramp unusable & constraints on cutting into contaminated land. **Should these technical difficulties be overcome this could still be worth reinvestigating.**"

Tasman District Council

2016-17 Project Brief - Mapua

Other wharf related issues involve the Boat Club and Sea Scouts group which currently lease buildings on the Mapua Wharf. They have noted their requirement for a boat ramp facility to continue their core Activities. Both groups have been in discussions with Council and the community over the past several months to find an alternative boat ramp location. There is currently a proposal to put the boat ramp and associated parking in the adjacent Waterfront Park. There are several concerns with this proposal including the need to dig into the capped contaminated land and also loss of the green community space. No application for this proposal has yet been received by Council.

17th May 2018

Meeting with Mayor Kempthorne

Notes of meeting held in the Mayor office Tasman District Council 2pm 17th May 2018

Those in attendance:- Tasman District Council - **The Mayor Richard Kempthorne** Tamaha Sea Scouts - Section 7(2)(a) - Protection of Privacy Mapua Boat Club - Section 7(2)(a) - Protection of Privacy as note taker)

Following is a summary of notes taken at the meeting.

Section 7(2)(a) - Protection of Privacy opened the meeting by thanking the Mayor for the meeting. Outlined the reasons that led to the meeting and stated the MBC's and TSS's belief that Council staff had placed their own interpretation on the results of the Mapua Waterfront Master Plan consultation and thus provided the Councillors with **incorrect information** to make a decision. Section 7(2)(a) - Protection of Privacy reiterated that there was significantly more submitters in favour than opposed, that the 400+ strong petition supporting a boat ramp at the Waterfront Park was ignored and in presenting and reading out the report to a full Council meeting, Section 7(2)(a) - Protection of Privacy left out this vital information. Section 7(2)(a) - Protection of Privacy stated that he wanted to put this aside and move on with the Mayor to find a solution for a replacement boat ramp for Mapua. This was agreed to by all.

The Mayor agreed that the existing boat ramp was now rendered useless and not fit for purpose - that something had been taken away from the Community and that the Boat Club and Sea Scouts had be severely disadvantaged. The Mayor stated he wanted to find an alternative in Mapua. He felt the majority wants to find a solution for a Mapua replacement boat ramp and that Councillors and staff would be very happy with this outcome.

The meeting then moved onto the potential issues found in Section 7(2)(a) - Protection of Privacy Waterfront Area Masterplan for not

including a boat ramp at the Waterfront Park.

1. Parking. - Mayor stated this was not an issue and easily overcome 2. Contamination - [REDACTED] requested that the Mayor and staff again make themselves aware of the the MBC design plans which show that the cap over the contaminated land would not need to be broken. 3. Sewer/waste water pipe - Mayor stated this was an issue and was the most compelling reason for saying no to the boat ramp at the WFP. (Waterfront Park) Mayor stated that council and staff want to find a solution as well. Discussed a replacement in a different location. [REDACTED] explained we had investigated that and the WFP was the best option and outlined the reasons.

[REDACTED] stated that he felt a design solution could be found to overcome the waste water pipe issue. The Mayor then suggested he meet with [REDACTED] to find a suitable solution to resolve the sewer line issue.

Mayor stated he supports a boat ramp, recognised the loss of the boat ramp and wants to find an alternative. When asked if these comments could be used publicly, he said yes. He also offered use of his cell number for contact for more immediate contact as opposed to email etc. The Mayor was asked if he had heard of the Friends of the Waterfront Park - stated no. He suggested they were a vocal minority and accepted that these issues can be overcome for the benefit of the majority. [REDACTED] stated that feedback was strong and there was strong community support for a replacement boat ramp. The Mayor recommended the MBC and TSS sets its own course and not get tied up with other issues. The Mayor suggested we talk with Tim King regarding the Friends of the Waterfront Park.

David outlined the background of the TSS, advised a membership of 48 with a waiting list of approx 28. That the Wharf is no longer a practical option for them and it is holding back their ability to increase membership numbers and purchase 2 new cutters. David raised his concern over health and safety issues which fall directly on his shoulders.

Mayor agreed the TDC needs to provide for locals "as soon as".

The licence of the building was discussed and the Mayor suggested the TSS write to Andrew Ellis at the TDC requesting security of tenure. Suggested copying in himself and Tim King. MBC's licence was Mayor recommended [REDACTED] should be involved also discussed with the Mayor suggesting the same pathway.

[REDACTED] raised funding. Mayor felt funding was only important once all other issues were sorted. [REDACTED] outlined our perception of [REDACTED] and our lack of trust. Mayor stated that any meeting with MBC-TSS and [REDACTED] would include himself and/or Tim King.

Mayor suggested to start the process in the first instance [REDACTED] to meet with [REDACTED]. We would meet again in 2 months time. That meeting to include Tim King and Janine Dowding, the new CEO. He requested we make contact with his PA to arrange a time and date.

Mayor also suggested a meeting if needed to get engineering plans done to deal with any costs.

Mayor stated that until a solution was found boats would still be able to access the water at Grossi Point. He also stated Iwi were not happy with digging at either Grossi or the land in front of the Golden Bear.

Regional ramp. Mayor stated he was interested in finding a solution for Mapua and that this was separate from the regional study. He also stated that if this was achieved, a regional boat ramp mightn't be necessary. "If this can be achieved he was going off a regional boat ramp". the Mayor stated his support for a replacement ramp and recognises that we have lost a boat ramp and wants to find a replacement solution.

Meeting finished approx 3pm.

FROM **Dan Cairney (Harbourmaster)** to MBC members - "I am very keen to see separation between swimmers and boats (at Grossi) so I agree with point 7 in the context that a well-managed ramp at Waterfront Park could offer a solution to the problem of swimmers and boats sharing the water at Grossi Point.

From: Richard Kirby [mailto:Richard.Kirby@tasman.govt.nz]

Sent: Monday, 7 March 2022 5:37 pm

To: **Section 7(2)(a) - Protection of Privacy**

Cc: Graham Rimmer <Graham.Rimmer@tasman.govt.nz>; Mike Drummond <Mike.Drummond@tasman.govt.nz>; Dennis Bush-King <Dennis.Bush-King@tasman.govt.nz>

Subject: RE: Mapua Boat Ramp project and inclusion of Tamaha Sea Scouts

Hi **Section 7(2)(a)**

I met with Mike Drummond and Dennis Bush-King this morning regarding the boat trailer parking and the potential use of the remediated land zoned residential.

I raised the option that I discussed with you, **Section 7(2)(a) - Protection of Privacy** at our meeting Friday 11th February. That was the option of progressing with reviewing the Mapua Waterfront Plan to include the wider area including the need for boat trailer parking.

I briefed Mike D and Dennis on this and we discussed the pros and cons of reviewing the overall Mapua Waterfront Plan and the resource consent for the boat ramp – which one should happen first? Both are co-dependent. It is a 'chicken and egg' situation.

At this stage, we believe that going through with the Waterfront Plan review contemplating the boat ramp and the boat trailer parking might be more of a risk than going through the resource consent process for the boat ramp. **The outcome of our discussions were that it would probably be better for the Mapua Community Boat Ramp Trust (MCBRT) to progress** with its resource consent application and determine the area (m2) of parking that would probably be needed for boat trailer parking. Then in the consent application recommend that a condition be included that requires boat trailer parking be finalised and implemented prior to the opening of the boat ramp. This type of condition **can allow the consent process to be progressed with some degree of certainty** - essentially a conditional consent. This could reduce any risk of the consent being declined, however there may be other factors that increase that risk. Nevertheless, if the evidence in the consent application is clear and there are no fatal flaws then a conditional consent is more likely outcome, though not guaranteed. Any consent is likely to have other conditions that will also require implementation.

There is general acceptance within the office here that developing housing on the remediated land zoned residential is not likely to be accepted within the community. However this view probably still needs to be tested with the community. The sections fronting Aranui Road and Tahi Street that are zoned commercial are very likely to remain and there is opportunity for them to be developed and a commercial return obtained.

If the remediated land zoned residential is not developed for residential housing then the question is what could it be used for? It is currently open space and community preference is likely to be for it to remain open space. It could be developed as open space with specific areas for carparking, including boat trailer parking. From a commercial perspective this land is valuable. The district has invested around **Section 7(2)(b)(i)** for its remediation as residential and it is viewed as an investment. The **Section 7(2)(b)(i)** loan has been funded by the whole district through a district rate. The wider community probably wants a return on that investment. How that return is generated is open for further discussion.

Most of the boat ramps around the region either have ramp charges or boat trailer parking charges. Nelson City Council has a parking charge for all trailers and cars parked at the marina boat ramp at Nelson Port. Motueka Boat club has a charge for use of its boat ramp and parking. Kaiteriteri also has a boat ramp charge and areas for parking trailer but no charges for trailer parking. So the MCBRT will need to give some thought as to options on how it could help raise revenue to pay for any of the remediated 'residential' zoned land used for boat trailer parking.

These are our thoughts on a way forward at this stage – happy to discuss this further.

Regards
Richard Kirby

TDC opposition

Did the TDC oppose the new ramp. Yes, see below.

Feb 2015

Minutes from TDC committee meeting, held at Mapua Boat Club, where Mapua Wharf development was discussed and there is the following quote. "Mr Drummond noted that M Clark said Council is not leveraging the maximum potential from existing buildings and a relocation of the boat club and museum would derive better income. In developing a proposal for the overall area those things need to be taken into account. Feb 2015 Mapua Wharf Closure and parking improvements approved by TDC

LGOIMA REQUESTS

The boat club used logima requests to find out what was actually going on within council after the council declined the Waterfront park proposal in 2017.

letter FROM [REDACTED] to Robyn Scherer Thanks Robyn – who is dealing with this at your end? Could someone please brief me next week on where this is at, as we about to put out a survey monkey to the community asking a number of questions about the waterfront area with this as one of the issues.

Also just trying to let contract for the strategic plan as well. I read in the coastal news that MDC passed a motion to support in principle a boat ramp – assuming it was in the waterfront park?? but can't be sure?

This is not a location we would support at all given all the environmental issues that would go with it not to mention loss of recreational space and the [REDACTED] it cost to cap the thing!.....

And FROM [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] emailing a copy of the above email [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] stating - "[REDACTED] was keen for us to include the information into the document in terms of difficulty of locating boat ramp over the mains and opposition/no support by council engineers for this to go ahead. **we may be able to do that in a way to councillors which outlines difficulties/challenges** (TRUST question; please explain what is the intent with this?)

Letter to council from BOAT CLUB following from 5 yr plan decision

From 22nd December 2017 Tasman District Council Private Bag 4 Richmond 7050 Attention: Richard Kempthorne – Mayor richard.kempthorne@tasman.govt.nz
Lindsay McKenzie – CEO lindsay.McKenzie@tasman.govt.nz

Dear Sirs

With regard to the Mapua Waterfront Master Plan report that council adopted in November, to say the Mapua Community and the Mapua Boat Club are disappointed, is more than an understatement.

The report was unbalanced in that it failed to acknowledge, mention or supply any information submitted by the Mapua Boat Club and other submitters supporting the replacement community boat ramp at the waterfront park.

Council undertook a yearlong consultation process and the resulting report is a poor reflection on the efforts and contributions of those who participated; it was clearly a report to support a predetermined position.

The council has had an agenda to remove the Boat Club from the wharf to cater for the TDC to achieve its commercial aspirations as evidenced in the minutes of a commercial subcommittee meeting held 18th June 2013, ironically at the Mapua Boat Club where Mr Mike Drummond is recorded in the minutes;

Mr Drummond noted “that [REDACTED] said Council is not leveraging the maximum potential from existing buildings and a relocation of the boat club and museum would derive better income. In developing a proposal for the overall area those things need to be taken into account.”

We note also from the minutes that both the CEO Mr McKenzie and deputy mayor Tim King were both present at that meeting.

Both the Mayor and all Waimea ward councillors prior to the 2016 local body elections stated in a public forum **“if the community supports the replacement ramp proposal, I will support it, if that is what the community wants.”**

There were 30% more submissions supporting the replacement boat ramp proposal than those against, and in addition, the MDCA submission had 125% more members of the MDCA in favour of the ramp proposal. The MDCA did present the views of those both for and against, as it felt obliged to do, but it is clear more were in favour. In the MBC submission there were 403 individual community members signatures in support of the proposal. These facts clearly demonstrate widespread community support for the proposal.

This issue is not going away – the community are determined to fight for a replacement community ramp in Mapua and our community overwhelmingly supports this aim as evidenced at the MDCA monthly meeting in December.

Following the adoption by council of the master plan, media releases and the council’s own Newsline have stated “almost half of submitters were strongly opposed to the replacement ramp proposal”.

This is clearly untrue, therefore the Mapua Boat Club asks for a public apology from Council for both of the omissions in the report. We also demand a retraction of the comments in the press release and Newsline for untrue and misleading statements supporting the Council decision. *(TRUST comments over 80 school children were asked to put in a negative submission and these were used as opposition. Compare this to only 1 submission counted from the boat club)*

In addition, the Mapua Boat Club requests the removal as soon as possible of the lamp post located directly in front of the existing Mapua boat ramp at the wharf. This was placed with no thought or consideration to ramps users. We remind you this ramp is still open for use and having that lamp post

placed is a direct affront to ramp users and is not only a manoeuvrability hindrance but creates a health & safety issue.

We look forward to receiving your apology and retraction along with advice for the removal of the lamp post.

The boat club had a sign at the boat ramp which was removed by council or its contractor's two and half years ago, can you please track this down and have it returned.

Also the club wishes to reinstall the post it had for many years that collected ramp fees from casual users, this was removed by the club when development work was underway and the club still has possession of it and wishes to reinstall it in its previous location. Can you please acknowledge this is acceptable as soon as possible? Regards

Clare Kininmonth
Mapua Boat Club Secretary

Other correspondence

11 APRIL 2024

LETTER SENT TO R. KIRBY FOR FURTHER FUNDING 11 APRIL 2024

Dear Richard.

On Tuesday, 9 April 24, the Boat Ramp Trust met with members of the Resource Consent team at TDC to gain an understanding of the process to follow to achieve a favourable resource consent hearing outcome and the likely costs of progressing the application for the proposed boat ramp.

You will be aware that there were approx 111 submissions against, and 212 in support, with 6 neutral. 88 wish to be heard.

It became apparent that significantly more funds are needed to progress the resource consent process. We have been advised by Council staff that we need to produce additional reports to offset and counter the key issues brought up during the notification process.

The trust acknowledges that it signed an agreement with council regarding the funding and any more cash advanced by the council would necessitate more contribution from the Trust.

However, until a resource consent is granted, fundraising capability is very restricted and the Trust simply cannot raise further funds from its own resources for a community boat ramp without further advances from the SECTION 7(2)(B)(3) agreed by councillors in May 2021. Funders have indicated that they require a consent before they can make a grant. **Trustees are no longer willing to put their time and money into this project without a Resource Consent.** The fact is, the resource consent process is the reason the project is requiring further large amounts of money. However the Trust is grateful for the assistance given so far by Council.

Therefore the Trust is asking the Council to advance further funds out of the SECTION 7(2)(B)(3) so that we can take this project to the next stage; gathering additional reports, then proceeding to a hearing. Our enquiries estimate a hearing could be in the region of SECTION 7(2)(B)(3) to SECTION 7(2)(B)(3), and again, this is simply

unobtainable given our situation. We remain extremely confident that once resource consent is in place we will have little difficulty raising the Trust's share of costs to complete the construction of the facility. So far, the TDC have advanced [redacted] out of the original [redacted] and the Trust has obtained loans and donations of [redacted]. None of the Trustees, nor members of the community have billed the Trust for their time which has been, and continues to be, significant.

As of today we don't know the final funding requirement, but as an indication, it is likely to be between [redacted] to [redacted] for the hearing, [redacted] for further reporting and [redacted] other, which would include legal representation. This amounts to [redacted].

We appreciate these numbers are significant and estimates only, but without assurance from the TDC, the Trust is unable to commit to further expenditure of this nature without the assurance of knowing how these costs will be met.

The Trust recognises and appreciates the work that those involved have already done and seek the understanding and commitment of the TDC that we can be put in a position to enable a successful resource consent outcome.

LETTER TO DAVIS OGILVIE from Staff.
RE COSTS FOR HEARING deposit REQUIRED

To proceed with a hearing, Council does require a **deposit of** [redacted] (reflecting the 'low' estimate), this covers for instance: reporting planner and specialist time in preparing their reports and tech memos, review of evidence, the arrangement and management of the hearing process and evidence exchange timetable, and the cost of decision makers who have to prepare for and attend the hearing, visit the site, deliberate and write their decision.

If you confirm you wish to go ahead, I'll get the invoice raised. Please note that we cannot make formal arrangements for the hearing **until the deposit is paid** (see section 36AAB of the RMA).

Kind regards, [redacted]

578 households out of estimated 991 households were surveyed in January 2023
1054 people were in support.

Mapua Boat Ramp Survey Household Results

