Submission received on the Draft Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy 2022 – 2052 – sorted by question¹

| ID | Submitter | Opinion | Summary |
|------|--|---------|--|
| | lease indicate whether y grating land use transpo | | ort or do not support Outcome 1: Urban form supports reductions in GHG emissions by explain your choice: |
| 3111 | L5 Mr DAVID ROGERS | Agree | THE COUNCIL HAS TO ASK ITSELF THE VERY BASIC QUESTION "WHY DO YOU WANT TO EXPAND AND DEVELOP A REGION THAT HAS SUCH A WONDERFUL CHARACTER AS IT DOES TODAY WHERE THERE IS A STRONG AGRICULTURAL AND MARITIME BASE TO ITS ECONOMY" ADDING THE NUMBER OF HOUSES AND PEOPLE DEFEATS ALL ATTEMPTS AT GHG REDUCTION. MY MESSAGE IS PLEASE KEEP TASMAN AND WHAT IT OFFERS AS IT IS. |
| 3111 | L8 Ms Sarah Varey | Agree | |
| 3114 | 10 Ms Karen Gilbert | Agree | |
| 3114 | 12 Mr Robin Whalley | Agree | |
| 3117 | 73 Mr Roderick Watson | Agree | |
| 3117 | 74 Ms Alison Westerby | Agree | |
| 3121 | L5 Mr Glen Parsons | Agree | |
| 3122 | 27 Ms Lee Eliott | Agree | |
| 3123 | 32 Mrs Margaret Meechang | Agree | |
| 3124 | 10 Michael Markert | Agree | |
| 3124 | 18 Mr Will Bosnich | Agree | |
| 3125 | 3 Ms Karen Kernohan | Agree | |
| 3126 | Ms Vivien Ann Peters | Agree | |

¹ Detailed submissions are referenced but not included within this document. Refer to the separate document 'All detailed submissions sorted by submission ID#'.

| 31262 Mr Martin John Shand | Agree | Any reduction has to be healthy, and the sooner the better. |
|---|-------|---|
| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | Agree | But this implies comprehensive public transport which will never exist between, say, Motueka and Richmond. Population numbers will never support that. |
| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | Agree | |
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | Agree | We need to do much more to combat the effects of climate change. Subsidising electric vehicles is just a start. What about solar panels on roofs? |
| 31280 Jenny Knott | Agree | |
| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | Agree | |
| 31284 Mr Jarmo Saloranta | Agree | |
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | Agree | It makes sense to me to encourage the reduction in vehicle use by having adequate and plentiful housing options close to where most people work. |
| 31309 Mr & Mrs Rose & Phillip Windle | Agree | Good bus services and cycleways. Infrastructure is presently not meeting requirements for population growth. |
| 31318 Mrs Isobel Mosley | Agree | |
| 31322 Mrs BARBARA AND TIM ROBSON | Agree | These are of course closely linked but there are many other ways to reduce emissions. |
| 31325 Dr Ann Briggs | Agree | I agree with the principle. For the outcome to be achieved, commitment to low-cost accessible public transport, EV charge points and cycleways would be essential. Otherwise any development results in increased non-EV car use and higher GHG emissions. |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | Agree | |
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | Agree | We need to take climate action urgently. However, I'm not sure that this strategy really reflects this urgency. The proposal appears to include a lot of greenfield developments for stand-alone houses far away from anywhere to work. I expect that this will make us drive our cars more - not less. It also means that people who could be living more centrally, with a comparatively small carbon footprint, may now buy a house on the edge of town instead to live a more carbon intensive commuting lifestyle. Stand-alone houses do not support reductions in GHG emissions. More multi-unit compact and low carbon residential developments should be prioritised. |
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |

| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | Agree | Within the last decade priorities have changed, and during the time period under discussion, many things will change radically, often beyond current legislation reach. Our towns have been car-centric low rise, this needs to change rapidly to high-rise and no-cars-in-centres. "Reduction in GHG emissions" needs to be an action not just an over-used phrase. With the latest IPCC report, there is very little time to radically reduce GHG emissions - that means cars planes concrete and steel, so all "urban-form" needs to work fast towards cutting these right out of our ways of living, as fast as possible. |
|------------------------------|-------|---|
| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | Agree | Integrating land transport is one option - not sure there is enough scale to support public transport that would make a difference |
| 31360 Ms Thuy Tran | Agree | |
| 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | Agree | We should be planning for the reduction of GHG emissions and addressing the effects of climate change. |
| 31364 Mrs Christine Tuffnell | Agree | However, recognise that the relevant gas here is carbon dioxide - methane and nitrous oxide come mainly from agriculture and industry. Unfortunately housing intensification does away with our traditional home gardens - the source of plants and trees that mitigate carbon dioxide levels in the air. The majority of transport related carbon dioxide gas comes from air and sea transport - again due to industry. |
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | Agree | Any reduction in GHG is essential to help combat climate change |
| 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer | Agree | |
| 31384 Mr Jace Hobbs | Agree | personal trip reduction and intermodal transport is the key |
| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | Agree | |
| 31403 Mr Richard Deck | Agree | |
| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | Agree | the nature of the district and employment dictate necessary transport and inevitable GHGe |
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | Agree | |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | Agree | |
| 31422 Mrs Marga Martens | Agree | Agree, but this strategy doesn't reflect that. Green field developments far away from work just cater for more commuter traffic. |
| 31430 Muriel Moran | Agree | The more closely people live to work opportunities supported with efficient transport options the fewer GHG emissions are likely to occur. |
| | | |

| 31435 Mr Alan Eggers | Agree | Nelson Tasman needs growth around existing transport routes that help make public transport more viable. |
|---|-------|---|
| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn Ball | Agree | Regular bus services provided |
| 31473 Mr Andrew Downs | Agree | |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | Agree | |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | Agree | |
| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | Agree | Less travel = less GHG, less congestion, less transport expenses. |
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | Agree | |
| 31492 Anton, Benni, Shalom, AJ Bank, Bonnin, Shalom Davis | Agree | I strongly support outcome 1 seeing the close ties between the urban form and transport emissions. However, this feels like only one way and there are many important ways to cut emissions. |
| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | Agree | I agree with that outcome but I don't see how creating more developments in places like Mapua and Tasman far from places of work will achieve it. |
| 31502 Ms Caroline Jones | Agree | |
| 31516 Mr Peter Lole | Agree | We all have to play an increasing role in lessening GHG emissions. Local government needs to step up proactively to encourage public transit. |
| 31517 Mr Wim van Dijk | Agree | Denser housing -> fewer trips by vehicles -> less CO2. |
| 31521 Mrs Marie Waterhouse | Agree | |
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | Agree | Climate change is urgent. However the proposal appears to lack urgency and instead include many greenfield developments for stand-alone houses far away from work places creating a more carbon intensive commuting lifestyle. More multi-unit compact and low carbon residential developments should be prioritised. |
| 31529 Mr Steven King-Turner | Agree | |
| 31533 Wendy Trevett | Agree | Homes should be built on existing developed areas and not using undeveloped land. |
| 31551 Mrs Jo Kitchen | Agree | |
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | Agree | |
| 31572 Mr David Todd | Agree | |

| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | Agree | Housing development should be close to work and shopping with good public transport or cycle way connections |
|--------------------------------|-------|--|
| 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz | Agree | |
| 31595 Gary Clark | Agree | Good urban design with a mix of residential properties and commercial areas provides a strong community and reduces travel demands. |
| 31614 Mr mark Morris | Agree | See attached attached submission. Summarised - T-112 Residential Intensification Future Development Area on the church property at 123 Salisbury Road, Richmond. |
| 31622 Peter Butler | Agree | |
| 31628 Mr Daniel Levy | Agree | |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | Agree | |
| 31634 Ms Josephine Markert | Agree | |
| 31635 Mr Joe Hay | Agree | The goal of reducing GHG is good. |
| 31647 Mrs Rebecca Parish | Agree | |
| 31651 Dr Patrick Conway | Agree | |
| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | Agree | Definitely. There is too much traffic already, and we need to make easier transport for a wide range of people. Car emissions are so bad for our societies and people environmentally, financially and socially. |
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | Agree | Intensification around existing key retail and commercial hubs should be the priority |
| 31697 Robert King-Tenison | Agree | |
| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | Agree | |
| 31703 Ms Paula Holden | Agree | |
| 31704 Mr Paul Bucknall | Agree | |
| 31744 Mrs Lorna CRANE | Agree | Integration of transport could be applied to the Murchison area. Public transport is not available but School buses run regularly. If rules were changed to allow adult residents in country areas to use these facilities it would improve access for rural dwellers and reduce fuel consumption. |
| 31748 Jo Brooks | Agree | |
| 31759 Mr Damian Campbell | Agree | |
| 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | Agree | |

| 31769 Ms Jo Gould | Agree | I think investment in dedicated and safe cycle routes is important to reduce GHG emissions, ideally separated from vehicles |
|---------------------------|----------|---|
| 31782 Greig Caigou | Agree | |
| 31114 Ms Jill Rogers | Disagree | This statement does not make sense and needs to be further clarified - needs to be more specific |
| 31186 Mr Gary Scott | Disagree | Any greenhouse emissions we reduce will be undone by one volcanic eruption anywhere in the world, so the cost of reducing the and the financial burden of doing so is IMHO a waste of money. |
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | Disagree | |
| 31358 George Harrison | Disagree | |
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | Disagree | the strategy is focused primarily on increasing housing numbers. It doesn't present strategy on changing dependence on private vehicles or include alternative transport options or methods to reduce journey numbers |
| 31449 Mr John Chisholm | Disagree | |
| 31452 Mr David Bartle | Disagree | Scientific evidence shows this proposition applies in certain situations but not in others, such as ribbon development or satellite towns |
| 31484 Mr Gavin Brent Cook | Disagree | |
| 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | Disagree | Of course urban growth will cause less GHG emissions than rural growth. But far more important is the fact that growth, including the urban form, in itself is very bad for GHG emissions. So urban growth is not good for GHG emissions. I don't think growth is a good thing for Nelson and Tasman and it will be especially bad for GHG emissions. |
| 31518 Mr Ian Faulkner | Disagree | |
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | Disagree | Nelson Tasman needs more urban intensification, more different housing concentration along centres and not only a spread around Highway 6. |
| 31693 Carolyn Rose | Disagree | Co2 is required for plant growth and in return those plants give us oxygen. |
| 31739 Philippa Hellyer | Disagree | I automatically disagree because I have no confidence that any of the proposals will be explained honestly and have the interests of the real people at their core. |
| 31761 Karen Steadman | Disagree | we don't have public transport in Murchison. |
| 31774 Mrs Jane Sutherland | Disagree | Long term I believe land use transportation will become more sustainable through developments in technology and focus on clean energy. |
| 31122 Mr Johan Thomas | Don't | |

| Wahlgren | know | |
|------------------------------|---------------|---|
| 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | Don't | |
| 04005 44 5 44 1 | know | |
| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | Don't know | |
| 31369 Mr Joseph Blessing | Don't | |
| 31303 Wil 103cpii bic33iiig | know | |
| 31406 Ms Floortje van Lierop | Don't | I dont fully understand the wording of the statement. |
| | know | |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas | Don't | |
| Hollyman | know | |
| 31454 Mrs Tracey Koole | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | Don't | I do not know what GHG is |
| | know | |
| 31481 Mrs Lucy Harrhy | Don't know | |
| 31483 Debbie Hampson | Don't | |
| 21402 Dennie Hallihanii | know | |
| 31554 Wendy Barker | Don't | Question is unclear. I don't understand what is meant by urban form or by integrating land use transport. |
| | know | Your questions need to be clear and coherent for proper consultation to take place. |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | Don't | |
| | | |

| | know | |
|---------------------------------|-------|--|
| 31570 Ms Annabel Norman | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31598 Mrs Nicola Worsfold | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31623 Ms Lucy Charlesworth | Don't | I am wary of answering this question as I cannot be sure of how my answer will be interpreted. So I will |
| | know | state - I do not agree with developing green spaces. These spaces need to be reserved and protected to |
| | | allow for sustainable biodiversity and for future generations. Intensification within Nelson CBD needs to |
| | | be a priority. I do not agrees with building on Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. I do not agree with housing development on green fields. There is a climate emergency. Remove these areas from the FDS. |
| | | development on green neits. There is a climate emergency. Remove these areas from the 105. |
| | | |
| 31641 Mr Stephen (Steve) Hayden | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31643 Inge Koevoet | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | Don't | Terrible wording and not useful for the layman!!! |
| | know | |
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31712 Caroline Blommaert | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31717 Mr Frank Ryan | Don't | Not relevant to where i live |
| · | know | |
| 31720 Ms Rainna Pretty | Don't | What are GHG emissions? |
| • | know | |
| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | Don't | Not answering any of these leading questions |
| | | |

| | know | |
|---------------------------|---------------|---|
| 31784 Ms Teresa James | Don't know | |
| 31830 K.M. McDonald | Don't know | Please see attached Reduction in greenhouse gas emissions is not achieved by population growth (rapid, or major), nor by depleting resources needed to support this. A jargon filled, loaded, leading proposal. |
| 31363 Mr Steve Cross | N/A | I reject the premise of this question |
| 31617 Ms steph jewell | N/A | Sorry I'm not sure what "land use transport" is. If you mean public transport I'm strongly in favour. |
| 31129 Mrs Gaynor Brooks | Neutral | |
| 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward | Neutral | |
| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | Neutral | |
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | Neutral | |
| 31250 Mr Richard Wyles | Neutral | |
| 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman | Neutral | I strongly agree that urban intensification can support active transport and reductions in energy use for travel. However, the proposals in the FDS do not do this. The FDS continues the idea of satellite 'dormitory settlements' and commuting. People using active transport for access to work do not want to use a route designed for tourists viewing the countryside. They want a direct route. At present, rubbish collection bins and rubbish bags are freely deposited on pavements, forcing pushchairs, mobility scooters etc. into the road. |
| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | Neutral | |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | Neutral | |
| 31278 Wendy Ross | Neutral | |
| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | Neutral | If we really do have to increase the number of dwellings then I feel it does make sense that they be mostly urban. |
| 31316 John Heslop | Neutral | |
| 31347 Ms Paula Baldwin | Neutral | Urban densities may mitigate local contributions to climate change, but in relevant areas there's absolutely no point building (a few/some/too many) 3+ storey high buildings in an area far away from the |

occupants destinations for employment, and claim "look at us, what a wonder council we are, we've increased urban densities to reduce car dependency". Both offices and retail are in Nelson CBD, not Tahunanui.

And, for years, we've been asking for proper public transport in the Nelson/Tasman region. This would need to be in place to have any support of urban density in any area (but not Tahunanui) ... and it's not. Possibly, too many years have gone by to try and train the population to use public transport rather than their cars - but you would first need public transport as good as Sydney, Australia to even start to ask people to not use their cars.

| 31355 Mr Barney Hoskins | Neutral | |
|------------------------------|---------|--|
| 31365 michael monti | Neutral | |
| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | Neutral | |
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | Neutral | |
| 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon | Neutral | It depends on how soon public transport, pedestrian walkways and cycle lanes are provided to the housing areas. |
| 31480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | Neutral | N/A |
| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless | Neutral | |
| 31508 Mr Roger Barlow | Neutral | |
| 31523 Ms karen steadman | Neutral | |
| 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery | Neutral | |
| 31558 Mr Steve Jordan | Neutral | |
| 31574 Mr David Bolton | Neutral | |
| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | Neutral | |
| 31604 Mr Peter Moot | Neutral | |
| 31606 Mr Trent Shepard | Neutral | "Integrating land use and transport" is a vague concept. It seems to me that transport planning should always pay close attention to land use. |
| 31620 Mr Paul Baigent | Neutral | |
| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | Neutral | |
| | | |

| 31638 Mr steve parker | Neutral | |
|-------------------------------|---------|---|
| 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin | Neutral | |
| 31656 Mr brad malcolm | Neutral | |
| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | Neutral | |
| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | Neutral | |
| 31679 T R Carmichael | Neutral | |
| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | Neutral | |
| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | Neutral | |
| 31692 Mr Alasdair Gardiner | Neutral | |
| 31695 Christine Horner | Neutral | |
| 31711 Sara Flintoff | Neutral | |
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | Neutral | See attached submission. Summarised - no key points related to this outcome. |
| 31716 Mr Alan hart | Neutral | |
| 31718 Kathryn & Keith Quigley | Neutral | |
| 31721 Ms Jill Cullen | Neutral | |
| 31734 Eric Thomas | Neutral | Doubt its viable for public transport but make access under foot as best we can. |
| 31747 Mr (Tom) Neil BRETT | Neutral | Yes, intensification can reduce emissions. No, quality of urban life in NZ is drastically reduced. |
| 31751 Hazel Pearson | Neutral | I support reductions in green house gases by evidence based strategies. I don't know what you mean by 'urban form' or 'integrating' or 'land use transport'. |
| 31752 Jill Pearson | Neutral | |
| 31765 Mrs Lorna Ivy Cooper | Neutral | I am submitting this more to be involved with the project; thinking if I show no interest now, I may not be able to later. At this point it sounds like you are looking more for feedback; Objections/approval may be more relevant later. |
| 31775 Dr Thomas Carl | Neutral | |
| | | |

| 31777 Mr David Lucas | Neutral | |
|--------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31783 Mr Peter Jones | Neutral | Emissions will resolve themselves with uptake of electric vehicles in due coarse. A lot of work is happening in this area. No change to vehicle numbers will result however emissions will eventually reduce over time. |
| 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | Strongly agree | |
| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | Strongly agree | This is one of the biggest challenges facing the region and is an area I believe significant improvement is needed to make the region a move livable place. Having spent time in a number of other cities: Wellington, Melbourne, Amsterdam, the dependence that is placed on motor vehicles in the region is undeniably the biggest downside to living in this region. It is extremely pleasing that this issue has been listed first. The benefits from living with seamless transport across many facets of life. |
| 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | Strongly agree | Any Greenfield development must first have guaranteed public transport - funded for the first 5 years by the developer. It is an inherent cost of developing on greenfield sites to provide frequent (every 15 minutes) bus transport between 07:00 and 09:00, and 15:00 and 18:00 every weekday into the city centre (ie Bridge St/Trafalgar St). No new dwelling should be more than 300m from a bus stop. N-106 & N-032 turn rural into residential - developer-funded public transport must be mandated. |
| 31130 Trevor James | Strongly agree | |
| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson | Strongly agree | |
| 31145 Ms Maggie Sweetman | Strongly agree | |
| 31185 Myfanway James | Strongly agree | |
| 31247 Mr yuri aristarco | Strongly agree | This is simply vital for our future and the future of our kids. |
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | Strongly agree | Intensification is vital, especially in urban areas where high rise buildings already exist. |
| 31257 Mr Kent Inglis | Strongly | Higher density housing within proximity of 'center's' (ie City Centre or Richmond Township), will reduce |

| 31261 Mr John Weston | Strongly agree | The Problem for Global Warming must be at the forefront of planning in the FDS. |
|----------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | Strongly agree | The latest report from IPCC released today $(4/4/2022)$ states that we must reduce our GHG emissions by 43% by 2030 so integrating land use transport is imperative |
| 31285 Dr Hamish Holland | Strongly agree | I refer to the settlement based on Tasman Village which incorporates a proposal to develop more than 200ha of Rural 1 agricultural land for housing (T136). There are few local work opportunities, no amenities and no public transport; any significant housing development will inevitably result in very large fuel demands and increased GHGs. |
| 31286 Mr David Short | Strongly agree | I think that residents should live as close to where they work as possible to reduce GHG's |
| 31298 Mr Duncan Macnab | Strongly agree | Yes - I strongly agree. We need to have consolidation and intensification in urban areas. We simply canno continue to gobble up good pastoral and horticultural land with 1/4 acre pavlova paradises. We need the efficincies that consolidation brings so we can have effective and efficient public transport, sewerage and water services |
| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | Strongly agree | Reduction of GHG is paramount for any future plans and for our future generations |
| 31306 Mr Jaye Barr | Strongly agree | |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | Strongly agree | |
| 31328 Ms Karen du Fresne | Strongly agree | Transport emissions are currently a major issue in Nelson Tasman. All development must reflect the need to drastically reduce these. |
| 31334 Diane Sutherland | Strongly agree | Yes there is a close tie between urban form and transport emissions. NOW is the time for URGENT ACTION on IMMEDIATE DRASTIC cuts in fossil fuel use. Does this strategy really reflect that urgency - NO! Any support of urban development that will only increases GHG emissions is morally reprehensible. The inclusion of Greenfield development for stand alone housing that is distanced from workplaces WILL increase carbon intensive commuting lifestyles. More multi-unit compact and low carbon residential developments must be prioritised. |
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | Strongly | I support the outcome, BUT do not see how your current plan/strategy does achieve this fully. You should |
| | | |

| | agree | not develop new hubs in Tasman and Braeburn, which will undoubtedly not have a shopping centre, and high school, if the facilities in Motueka (shops, swimming pool for the community) are struggling because people go to Nelson and Richmond for these things. You should build within cycling distance of existing shopping and schooling hubs. |
|------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | Strongly agree | |
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | Strongly agree | We should always try to reduce GHG emissions. |
| 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | Strongly agree | It is paramount that we take climate action. Currently this is not reflected in this strategy as there is a lot of greenfield developments for stand-alone, larger houses away from work and school locations. This will create more traffic. We need more multi-unit compact developments. |
| 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | Strongly agree | Proceed without delay. The planet cannot wait much longer. |
| 31346 Martin Hartman | Strongly agree | Currently this is not reflected in this strategy as there is a lot of greenfield developments for stand-alone, larger houses away from work and school locations. This will create more traffic. We need more multi-unit compact developments. |
| 31349 Laurien Heijs | Strongly agree | Endorse NelsonTasman2050 submission. It's not clear how the strategy is achieving this. |
| 31356 Stephen Williams | Strongly agree | Being able to live close to where you work reduces the impact on the environment and increases one's quality of life through reduced commuting and closer community ties. |
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | Strongly agree | Strongly agree with the objective. We need to take climate action urgently. However, I'm not sure that this strategy really reflects this urgency. The proposal appears to include a lot of greenfield developments for stand-alone houses far away from anywhere to work. I expect that this will make people drive their cars more - not less. It also means that the ones who could be living more centrally, with a comparatively small carbon footprint, may now buy a house on the edge of town instead to live a more carbon intensive commuting lifestyle. Stand-alone houses do not support reductions in GHG emissions. More multi-unit compact and low carbon residential developments should be prioritised. |
| 31373 Ms Jenny Daniell | Strongly agree | |
| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | Strongly | Need to improve efficiencies of transport corridors for energy conservation, carbon use reduction and |
| | | |

| agree | improvement of urban living conditions. |
|-------------------|---|
| Strongly agree | |
| Strongly agree | There is no Choice. Reduce Green house gas emissions or die. |
| Strongly agree | |
| Strongly agree | There is a link between urban land use and transport emissions. The further out people live, the more driving they are committed to. |
| Strongly agree | |
| Strongly agree | We need to take climate action urgently. However, I'm not sure that this strategy really reflects this urgency. The proposal appears to include a lot of greenfield developments for stand-alone houses far away from anywhere to work. I expect that this will make us drive our cars more - not less. It also means that people who could be living more centrally, with a comparatively small carbon footprint, may now buy a house on the edge of town instead to live a more carbon intensive commuting lifestyle. Stand-alone houses do not support reductions in GHG emissions. More multi-unit compact and low carbon residential developments should be prioritised. |
| Strongly agree | Compact urban form has the potential to reduce the use of oil-based transport emission |
| Strongly agree | Strong support. There is undisputed linkage between urban form & transport emissions. But, it's hardly the only strategy needed to reduce emissions sufficiently. |
| Strongly agree | We need to reduce car use to reduce carbon emissions. |
| Strongly agree | The climate emergency demands that we take action to reduce the requirement for so much use of private vehicles. I would like to see more emphasis on the prioritising of excellence in urban design with a focus on intensive housing, not urban sprawl. |
| Strongly agree | Tapawera and Districts consists of a network of river valleys. These are subject to flooding. Extreme rain events are predicted to increase due to climate change. Everyone, including TDC, have an obligation to reduce GHG emissions. The TDC outcome 2 supports intensification but the overall proposal appears to include alot of "ribbon development" on green field sites. The FDS needs to make it much clearer how the |
| | Strongly agree |

| | | latter approach will help reduce GHG emissions. |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors | Strongly agree | |
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | Strongly agree | I agree that development must be structured in such a way that GHG emissions are minimised. The Greenfield development in the proposal does not even attempt to do this. Greenfield development necessitates the use of cars as people live further and further away from their place of work and shops/facilities. Also food production is pushed further and further away from the towns and has to be transported further. |
| 31423 Mr Roger Frost | Strongly agree | |
| 31431 Katerina Seligman | Strongly agree | Climate change mitigation is the most important thing that needs attention right now. |
| 31441 Mr Chris Head | Strongly agree | I agree, but it is difficult to tell from the document how transport could evolve to support GHG reductions given the planned expansion as far out as Hira, Wakefield and Tasman. Cycling and walking into Nelson isn't going to be a viable option for many people living that far out so how is frequent, efficient and reliable public transport going to be expanded to circumvent the current reliance on private transport? |
| 31443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | Strongly agree | In particular a focus on a save, convenient and pleasant active transport infra structure. |
| 31457 Mr J Santa Barbara | Strongly agree | GHG reductions should be an overriding goal of all development activities. There are many aspects of development that traditionally contribute to emissions. These should be identified and reduced significantly, at least in line with the Zero Carbon Act. |
| 31460 Kris Woods | Strongly agree | Public transportation is desperately needed. The amount of traffic for a small town is ridiculous |
| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | Strongly agree | I strongly support outcome 1 as there is a close tie between urban form and transport emissions. However, it is far from the only strategy needed to reduce emissions as we must. |
| 31472 Dr David Briggs | Strongly agree | This is a terribly poorly worded question because it's not 'urban form' that has these effects, but the way in which urban form is developed and desgined. Poorly designed urban forms, as we have now, and as usually develops under the current developer-led process, inevitably increases GHG emissions. Good urban form - with locally integrated services, urban areas designed to fit with public transport, and carefully structured to encourage walking and cycling, and using low emission materials (e.g. not concrete), and regulated to require use of non-fossil domestic fuels - will obviously help to reduce GHG |

| | emissions. The question is how you are going to achieve that. Everything that has happened in recent years and all the developments and rezoning currently in the pipeline is NOT designed, so will make matters much worse. |
|-------------------|--|
| Strongly agree | It is important to reduce GHG emissions to help support the government's requirement as part of the Paris Agreement. I think it is important for this to be considered in all new development strategies. We need to be sustainable in our development of the area and not put future generations at risk. The developments proposed in Tasman and Upper Moutere will not support this need because of the distances required for travelling to work and schools. |
| Strongly agree | I strongly support this because urban form and transport emissions are closely linked. |
| Strongly agree | ALL FUTURE housing development needs to be much less spread out to reduce emissions by creating shorter distances to get to work, and places of activity. PROHIBIT all further greenfield development. STAND UP to the developers who transform productive land to large, low density, one-size-fits-all, housing suburbs. |
| | TDC's very positive walking and cycling strategy document gives me hope. |
| Strongly agree | |
| Strongly agree | We need to take climate action urgently. However, it does not appear that this strategy really reflects this urgency. The proposal appears to include a lot of greenfield developments for stand-alone houses far away from anywhere to work. I would expect that this will make people drive their cars more - not less. It also means that people who could be living more centrally, with a comparatively small carbon footprint, may now buy a house on the edge of town instead and therefore live a more carbon intensive commuting lifestyle. Stand-alone houses do not support reductions in GHG emissions. More multi-unit compact and low carbon residential developments should be prioritised. |
| Strongly agree | See Attached. Strategy does not reflect urgency of climate change action. Strategy will make people drive cars more not less. prioritise multi-unit compact and low carbon residential developments |
| Strongly agree | Climate action is needed urgently. This proposal includes a lot of greenfield developments for stand-alone houses far away from anywhere to work. This will make us drive our cars more - not less. It also means that people who could be living more centrally, with a comparatively small carbon footprint, may now buy a house on the edge of town instead to live a more carbon intensive commuting lifestyle. Stand-alone houses do not support reductions in GHG emissions. More multi-unit compact and low carbon residential |
| | Strongly agree |

| | | developments should be prioritised. |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31496 Mrs Petra Dekker | Strongly agree | Refer attachment: I fully support urban development over sprawl into rural/greenfield developments, because of the URGENCY that's needed for ACTION on Climate Change. |
| 31496 Mrs Petra Dekker | Strongly agree | refer to attachment for Q29-40 |
| 31499 Ms Jane Fisher | Strongly agree | |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne | Strongly agree | |
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | Strongly agree | we need to take climate action urgently. Stand-alone houses in greenfield developments far away from jobs create more traffic though. Does this development consider climate reduction? |
| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | Strongly agree | Urban form and transport emissions are closely related. |
| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | Strongly agree | Strongly agree. NMH continues to advocate for a compact urban form as this reduces the need for long car journeys which contribute to carbon emissions. |
| 31515 Geoffrey Vause | Strongly agree | Integrating transport and land use is essential. The problem is the FDS is internally contradictory in this regard as it includes a significant volume of greenfield stand-alone house development remote from employment locations, remote developments that do not have planning for public low carbon footprint transport. |
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers | Strongly agree | we need to achieve a reduction faster |
| 31520 Andrew Stirling | Strongly agree | |
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | Strongly agree | We simply MUST reduce greenhouse gas emissions & therefore take steps required to assist this. More concentrated urban living is therefore essential. |
| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard | Strongly agree | What is 'land use transport'? I agree that a compact urban form is important for reduced GHG emission because it will enable active transport. |
| 31549 Mr Ian McComb | Strongly agree | Integrated transport and housing obviously provides benefits to lifestyle, well-being and environment. |

| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | Strongly agree | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31560 Ms Steph Watts | Strongly agree | |
| 31562 Grant palliser | Strongly agree | however, proposal seems to support greenfield development(Berryfields a case in pointdisgusting!!) Similar developments of stand alone housing suburbia a long way from employment and facilities misguided and poor pla miningtakes no account for community and quality of living beyond the house. |
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | Strongly agree | Strongly agree with the objective. We need to take climate action urgently. However, I'm not sure that this strategy really reflects this urgency. The proposal appears to include a lot of greenfield developments for stand-alone houses far away from anywhere to work. I expect that this will make us drive our cars more - not less. It also means that people who could be living more centrally, with a comparatively small carbon footprint, may now buy a house on the edge of town instead to live a more carbon-intensive commuting lifestyle. Stand-alone houses do not support reductions in GHG emissions. More multi-unit compact and low carbon residential developments should be prioritised. |
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | Strongly agree | We need to take climate action urgently. However, I'm not sure that this strategy really reflects this urgency. The proposal appears to include a lot of greenfield developments for stand-alone houses far away from anywhere to work. I expect that this will make us drive our cars more - not less. It also means that people who could be living more centrally, with a comparatively small carbon footprint, may now buy a house on the edge of town instead to live a more carbon intensive commuting lifestyle. Stand-alone houses do not support reductions in GHG emissions. More multi-unit compact and low carbon residential developments should be prioritised. |
| 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett | Strongly agree | I agree that reducing GHG emissions should be a priority for the FDS but I think that it is relatively tokenistic in it's use throughout the current plan. I support all new housing stock to be intensified and do not support new greenfield development, I believe to truly reduce GHG and to adequately reduce our emissions in Nelson/Tasman than there needs be a more urban approach which includes intensifying in areas that are appropriately connected with public transport and active transport networks while ensuring that we protect as much productive and fertile land as possible. |
| 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham | Strongly agree | There should be a strong prority on public transport and active modes over private or commercial motor vehicles |

| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | Strongly agree | Not only do we need very strong incentives to the use of public transport and low-carbon transport, the council should indeed also promote reductions of GHG emissions by integrating land use transport. Part lowering GHG emissions can by done by intensifying housing development in urban centers. Having more people living closer together, with access to cycle paths and public transport (and a car-free urban center) will mean less travel is required and public transport becomes more efficient. |
|----------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31579 Jane Tate | Strongly agree | |
| 31580 Jenny Long | Strongly agree | I absolutely support designing urban areas to reduce GHG emissions, but am not clear on what you mean by "integrating land use transport". I am firmly for building multi-storey apartments in the very centre of towns, for making cycling, walking and public transport convenient and safe, and for making personal car use less convenient to help our society move on from our current car-dependency. I am firmly against greenfields expansions, as these inevitably result in more commuter traffic and the associated emissions, as well as reducing green spaces - and recent developments on the plains have used the land very inefficiently, with sprawling single-story or at best two-storey dwellings. |
| 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | Strongly agree | Yes, we certainly need to address climate change however with lots of greenfield developments for stand alone houses not close to employment opportunities adds to GHG not reduce. |
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins | Strongly agree | I strongly agree that urban form is a key determinant in greenhouse gas emissions. I support outcome 1 as there must be well designed urban form to reduce transport emissions. However it is far from the only strategy needed to reduce emissions to an acceptable level for our regions long term economic sustainability. |
| 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | Strongly agree | Strongly agree with the objective. We need to take climate action urgently. But I dont think this strategy really reflects this urgency. The proposal appears to include a lot of greenfield developments for standalone houses far away from anywhere to work. I expect that this will make us drive our cars more - not less. It also means that people who could be living more centrally, with a comparatively small carbon footprint, may now buy a house on the edge of town instead and live a more carbon-intensive commuting lifestyle. Stand-alone houses do not support reductions in GHG emissions. More multi-unit compact and low carbon residential developments should be prioritised. |
| 31593 Mr William Samuels | Strongly agree | We need to take climate action urgently. However, I'm not sure that this strategy really reflects this urgency. The proposal appears to include a lot of greenfield developments for stand-alone houses far away from anywhere to work. I expect that this will make us drive our cars more - not less. It also means that people who could be living more centrally, with a comparatively small carbon footprint, may now buy |

| | a house on the edge of town instead to live a more carbon intensive commuting lifestyle. Stand-alone houses do not support reductions in GHG emissions. More multi-unit compact and low carbon residential developments should be prioritised. |
|-------------------|---|
| Strongly agree | We need to take climate change seriously and focus on the reduction of GHG emissions. However I feel the FDS indicating so many new greenfield sites away from jobs will support the opposite. It also encourages people to follow their in-built desires for a stand alone house rather than thinking of better ways to live in the future. I believe local government needs to take responsibility in changing these out dated desires to build a sustainable future. |
| Strongly agree | We need to take climate action urgently. However, I'm not sure that this strategy really reflects this urgency. The proposal appears to include a lot of greenfield developments for stand-alone houses far away from anywhere to work. I expect that this will make us drive our cars more - not less. It also means that people who could be living more centrally, with a comparatively small carbon footprint, may now buy a house on the edge of town instead to live a more carbon intensive commuting lifestyle. Stand-alone houses do not support reductions in GHG emissions. More multi-unit compact and low carbon residential developments should be prioritised. |
| Strongly agree | We need to take climate action urgently. However, I'm not sure that this strategy really reflects this urgency. The proposal appears to include a lot of greenfield developments for stand-alone houses far away from anywhere to work. I expect that this will make us drive our cars more - not less. It also means that people who could be living more centrally, with a comparatively small carbon footprint, may now buy a house on the edge of town instead to live a more carbon intensive commuting lifestyle. Stand-alone houses do not support reductions in GHG emissions. More multi-unit compact and low carbon residential developments should be prioritised. |
| Strongly agree | Note: there are other reasons that urban form supports reductions in GHG. For example, reduced energy consumption of buildings with shared external walls, more efficient infrastructure. |
| Strongly agree | Looking at current population centres, and those proposed at Tasman and along SH6, light rail could be a very useful addition |
| Strongly agree | The greenfield development proposals on the edges of towns do not seem to be the best way of reducing emissions, many families will continue to have one car per driver. Subsidised public transport may assist. We have been impressed with some of the Christchurch rebuild projects in the area to southeast of CHC city centre with residential flats mingling with businesses and interconnecting green spaces and cycle ways. Could this style of redesign of town centres (or even greenfield areas) provide more efficient growth |
| | Strongly agree Strongly agree Strongly agree Strongly agree Strongly agree Strongly agree |

| | | with less emissions than solely residential greenfield developments on or beyond the edges of towns? |
|------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | Strongly agree | It's important that we take action. We've been told recently that we are in 'last chance saloon' to save ou world. This means thinking critically and for the long term. It also means getting people onboard with shared goals to get momentum. BUT does the strategy support this when there are proposals for development a long way out of town centres? It's going to encourage more car journeys not less, a 'commuter belt' or dormitory suburbs, more of a carbon footprint. It seems counter-intuitive. |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | Strongly agree | Strongly agree with the objective. We need to take climate action urgently. However, I'm not sure that this strategy really reflects this urgency. The proposal appears to include a lot of greenfield developments for stand-alone houses far away from anywhere to work. I expect that this will make us drive our cars more - not less. It also means that people who could be living more centrally, with a comparatively small carbon footprint, may now buy a house on the edge of town instead and live a more carbon-intensive commuting lifestyle. Stand-alone houses do not support reductions in GHG emissions. More multi-unit compact and low carbon residential developments should be prioritised. |
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | Strongly agree | I strongly agree that reducing GHG should be the main priority of this strategy and low carbon developments need to be prioritised. |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | Strongly agree | We need to take climate action urgently. However, I'm not sure that this strategy reflects this urgency. The proposal appears to include a lot of greenfield developments for stand-alone houses far away from anywhere to work. I expect that this will make us drive our cars more - not less. It also means that people who could be living more centrally, with a comparatively small carbon footprint, may now buy a house on the edge of town instead to live a more carbon intensive commuting lifestyle. Stand-alone houses do not support reductions in GHG emissions. More multi-unit compact and low carbon residential developments should be prioritised. |
| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | Strongly agree | Controlling climate change has now become critical with the latest IPCC report. |
| 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | Strongly agree | increasing frequent affordable public transport to nelson and encouraging use of electric vehicles. |
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | Strongly agree | |
| 31632 Ms Jacquetta Bell QSM | Strongly agree | We strongly support this outcome as there are close ties between urban form and transport emissions. As we improve active and public transport the Nelson City Council must ensure all waterways are protected |
| | | |

| | | and enhanced as they flow through our urban areas. |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31633 Ms Jacquetta Bell QSM | Strongly agree | The FDS does not go far enough to reduce carbon emissions by requiring developers to provide cycle and walkways, and it does not emphasise public transport enough. |
| 31636 Joanna Santa Barbara | Strongly agree | Nelson Tasman Climate Forum is concerned with rapidly and urgently reducing our region's greenhouse gas emissions, adapting to the impacts of climate change and ensuring that the needs of present and future people and all living things in this region are provided for in our transition to a sustainable, equitable and resilient society. Even though we see climate change as critical, we see it as part of an ever larger picture of human overshoot of ecological boundaries (too many people using too many natural resources and sinks). Encroachment on and pollution of the natural world and its biodiversity is inextricably part of the problem that needs to be solved, and curbing expansion of the human enterprise is a major part of that. SEE ATTACHMENT |
| 31637 Ms Frances Kemble Welch | Strongly agree | |
| 31640 Mr Ryan Brash | Strongly agree | We need to take climate action urgently. However, I'm not sure that this strategy really reflects this urgency. The proposal appears to include a lot of greenfield developments for stand-alone houses far away from anywhere to work. I expect that this will make us drive our cars more - not less. It also means that people who could be living more centrally, with a comparatively small carbon footprint, may now buy a house on the edge of town instead to live a more carbon intensive commuting lifestyle. Stand-alone houses do not support reductions in GHG emissions. More multi-unit compact and low carbon residential developments should be prioritised. |
| 31644 Murray Poulter | Strongly agree | |
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | Strongly agree | Strongly agree with the objective. We need to take climate action urgently. However, I'm not sure that this strategy really reflects this urgency. The proposal appears to include a lot of greenfield developments for stand-alone houses far away from anywhere to work. I expect that this will make us drive our cars more - not less. It also means that people who could be living more centrally, with a comparatively small carbon footprint, may now buy a house on the edge of town instead and live a more carbon-intensive commuting lifestyle. Stand-alone houses do not support reductions in GHG emissions. More multi-unit compact and low carbon residential developments should be prioritised. |
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | Strongly agree | This aligns extremely well with the NPS-UD and Government Policy Statement for Land Transport. Good urban form allows for more uptake of active mode transport and public transport, reducing reliance on private motor vehicles. |

| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | Strongly agree | Strongly agree Strongly agree with the objective. We need to take climate action urgently. However, I'm not sure that this strategy really reflects this urgency. The proposal appears to include a lot of greenfield developments for stand-alone houses far away from anywhere to work. I expect that this will make us drive our cars more - not less. It also means that people who could be living more centrally, with a comparatively small carbon footprint, may now buy a house on the edge of town instead and live a more carbon-intensive commuting lifestyle. Stand-alone houses do not support reductions in GHG emissions. More multi-unit compact and low carbon residential developments should be prioritised. |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31667 barbara nicholas | Strongly agree | |
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | Strongly agree | Please see attached - text copied below: I strongly support this outcome, however, I am concerned the the proposed FDS contradicts this outcome by proposing that over half of the population growth will come from urban sprawl developments housed from new greenfield sites, some of which extend finger development and make Nelson into a series of semi-isloated suburbs that create unsustainable economic and environmental demands. This degree of greenfield development also contradicts best practices that would take account our climate change developments. In view of this I request the strategy be amended to delete all greenfields sites and to make better provision for intensification of housing areas that can be integrated into existing infrastructure and transport systems reducing environmental degradation. |
| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | Strongly agree | Strongly agree Strongly agree with the objective. We need to take climate action urgently. However, I'm not sure that this strategy really reflects this urgency. The proposal appears to include a lot of greenfield developments for stand-alone houses far away from anywhere to work. I expect that this will make us drive our cars more - not less. It also means that people who could be living more centrally, with a comparatively small carbon footprint, may now buy a house on the edge of town instead and live a more carbon-intensive commuting lifestyle. Stand-alone houses do not support reductions in GHG emissions. More multi-unit compact and low carbon residential developments should be prioritised. |
| 31673 Mike Drake | Strongly agree | The current urban sprawl is not sustainable. If the goal is to reduce GHG, then we need to create a range of accommodation within easy reach of facilities. We should be designing an environment where vehicle ownership is an option, not a necessity. |
| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | Strongly agree | We need to take climate action urgently!!! I'm not sure that this strategy really reflects this urgency. The proposal includes too much greenfield developments for stand-alone houses far away from anywhere to work. This will not reduce car use. Detached housing is also more energy intensive to heat and take up |

| | more land and thus is a much more carbon hungry option both in the short and long term! More multi-unit compact and low carbon residential developments should be prioritized!!! |
|-------------------|--|
| | and the production of the prod |
| Strongly agree | There is a significant need to reduce GHG emissions. |
| Strongly agree | Climate Change will probably be the most far-reaching factor on everything in this strategy. |
| Strongly agree | we must do everything possible to reduce emissions and preserve our environment |
| Strongly agree | |
| Strongly agree | |
| Strongly agree | We are facing a climate crisis and we need to act with urgency. This strategy appears to acknowledge this but the strategy still feels like business as usual, with some tweaking. There is still a large focus on growth (you can't continue to grow indefinitely with finite resources), in particular greenfield developments of primarily stand alone houses which do not align with a climate emergency. |
| Strongly agree | Please read all answers to individual questions in the overarching context of the ATTACHED DOCUMENT. Summarised: FDS is inadequate for a climate-responsible future. No decarbonisation trajectory, gives climate minimal consideration and ignores changing energy, outdated models and doesn't take into account emissions associated with buildings, drivers of FDS are growth and low density subdivisions, urban intesification rates are too low, public transport needs to be anchor. |
| | We strongly support outcome 1 as there is a close tie between urban form and transport emissions, and especially around the viability of living without a private vehicle. However it is far from the only strategy needed to urgently reduce emissions as we must – for example a very real challenge of urban intensification (which we largely endorse), is that it can promote forms of construction with even greater embodied emissions. |
| Strongly agree | I am endorsing the Nelson Tasman Climate Forum's view. Nelson Tasman Climate Forum is concerned with rapidly and urgently reducing our region's greenhouse gas emissions, adapting to the impacts of climate change and ensuring that the needs of present and future people and all living things in this region are provided for in our transition to a sustainable, |
| | agree Strongly agree Strongly agree Strongly agree Strongly agree Strongly agree Strongly agree |

| | | equitable and resilient society. Even though we see climate change as critical, we see it as part of an even larger picture of human overshoot of ecological boundaries (too many people using too many natural resources and sinks). Encroachment on and pollution of the natural world and its biodiversity is inextricably part of the problem that needs to be solved, and curbing expansion of the human enterprise is a major part of that. At a minimum the Climate Forum is committed to ensuring that our national goal of net zero long-lived gases is reached before 2050. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has made it clear that this current decade is crucial for setting us on track for this goal, and that we must halve long-lived gas emissions by 2030. The Climate Change Commission (CCC) has recommended that "(e)nabling emissions reductions through changes to urban form, function and development." is one of the necessary pathways for achieving this goal(1). Annualising decarbonisation to achieve this goal highlights the magnitude of necessary reductions - 10% each year, year on year. Integrating land use and transport New structures need to be placed where they can greatly reduce this region's notably high level of vehicle |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| | | kilometres per person by global standards. Integration of land use with transport is important, but not the only aspect of development-related greenhouse gas emissions that needs attention. Other development-related emissions For a carbon-intensive arena such as urban development, involving heavy machinery, much steel and concrete use, for example, minimising construction emissions must be a very high priority. How much of our carbon budget can we afford to use on development, while meeting people's basic needs for housing. Decisions on where we allow development must be strongly influenced by the necessity to minimise construction, operational and transport greenhouse gas emissions and maximise sequestration. We aspire to be 'good ancestors', using all possible means to avoid burdening our descendants with more atmospheric carbon. Rather shockingly, this criterion does not |
| 31710 Ms Angela Fitchett | Strongly agree | It is essential to strengthen this aspect of Nelson/Tasman infrastructure. But this has to go alongside the kind of planning of housing etc that means low emissions transport options can and will be used. Generally speaking, Greenfield's developments will not do this. |
| 31713 Mrs Debora Scholl Dos Santos | Strongly agree | I support the creation of more public transport within the urban area, so we can leave our cars in the garage during the week and use it only to transport our families in the outings of the weekends. |
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | Strongly agree | The strategy is in direct conflict with this intent. Urban sprawl will only increase emissions other than minimising and concentrating travel by public transport and/or more physical means: walking, cycling. People will be less likely to use public transport if located further from a concentrated urban environment |
| 31726 Mr John Jackson | Strongly agree | Urban form must reduce GHGs. Also, transport connections between communities but do the same. Are we planning for a reduction in VKT? |

| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | Strongly agree | The proposal includes a lot of greenfield developments for stand-alone houses far away from anywhere to work. I expect that this will make us drive our cars more - not less. It also means that people who could be living more centrally, with a comparatively small carbon footprint, may now buy a house on the edge of town instead to live a more carbon intensive commuting lifestyle. Stand-alone houses do not support reductions in GHG emissions. More multi-unit compact and low carbon residential developments should be prioritised. |
|---|-------------------|--|
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | Strongly agree | We need to take climate action urgently. However, I'm not sure that this strategy really reflects this urgency. The proposal appears to include a lot of greenfield developments for stand-alone houses far away from anywhere to work. I expect that this will make us drive our cars more - not less. It also means that people who could be living more entrally, with a comparatively small carbon footprint, may now buy a house on the edge of town instead to live a more carbon intensive commuting lifestyle. Stand-alone houses do not support reductions in GHG emissions. More multi-unit compact and low carbon residential developments should be prioritised. |
| 31736 Ms Carol Curtis | Strongly agree | More multi-unit compact and low carbon residential developments should be prioritised centred around communities with lifestyle services and amenities within 10 minute walking distance, or 10min cycleway options. |
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | Strongly agree | We need to mitigate climate change by reducing urban sprawl; and using the "20 minute" principle. |
| 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert- Watene | Strongly agree | Keeping people close to services reduces travel |
| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | Strongly agree | |
| 31756 Ronald Alfred & Phylis Kinzett | Strongly agree | |
| 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | Strongly agree | |
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | Strongly agree | We need to take urgent climate action. However, this strategy does not reflect this urgency adequately. It includes lot of out-of-town developments, which means people will have to drive cars more, to get to work and the shops, thus raising not lowering the carbon footprint. Also, Stand-alone houses do not support reductions in GHG emissions. More multi-unit compact and low carbon residential developments should be prioritised. |

| 31771 Colleen Shaw | Strongly agree | I think it is self-explanatory that when people live closer to schools and workplaces then transport needs will generate less GHG. For that reason I support intensification and medium intensification of existing city centres and surrounds. I do feel that the FDP does need to deal with the topic of our energy use in the next few years We need to lower our emissions and do our part in mitigating the climate crisis which we are speeding headlong towards while rearranging the deck chairs on the Titanic. |
|--|-------------------|---|
| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | Strongly agree | However proposed new greendield developments work against this outcome. |
| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | Strongly agree | Please see attached - determined from feedback strongly agree. A: We strongly support this outcome: Sprawling low density suburbs such as you propose for the majority of the increase in people living in the area, inevitably comes with high greenhouse gas emissions. Building the infrastructure for new subdivisions inevitably comes with a higher GHG emissions than densifying existing settlements (see appendix where there are many actions that can be taken to if not obligate the need to increase infrastructure at all, despite supporting additional people, then can certainly minimise it) and the longer pipe lengths, longer road and footpath length, longer wire lengths have more embodied carbon emissions both initially and in maintenance over time. But more than that lower density Greenfield developments on the outskirts of urban areas or worse outlying villages, reinforce car dependency and at the same time low density makes servicing with frequent public transport less viable and cycling even with an e bike less likely. And we would emphasise that even if people are commuting in an electric car it is still a very energy inefficient way to transport 1 or 2 people in a two tonne, 10m2 metal box. And with sprawl they are being transported further - not just to work, but to school, after school activities, to the shops, to medical services. The era of profligate energy use is over, we need to be using less energy as well as putting out less GHG emissions. We are very disappointed that you made this statement in the document but ignored any climate change mitigation differences between the options in the MCA scoring. Any options that increase greenhouse gas emissions and car dependency should be automatically disallowed just like you have discounted building on flood and liquidation prone land. |
| 31801 Joan Skurr | Strongly agree | Please see attached Integrating land transport to me means, reducing the use of fossil fuels by ensuring densification not by stringing out housing along the highways. Reducing emissions means more densification, not green field building. |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | Strongly agree | Lessening impacts on Te Taiao |
| 31815 Peter Wilks | Strongly | |
| | | |

| | agree | |
|---------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31835 Mr Ian Wishart | Strongly agree | |
| 31836 Paula M Wilks | Strongly agree | We must address climate change by reducing greenhouse gas emissions wherever we can. |
| 31836 Paula M Wilks | Strongly agree | Esp jobs, services amenities with public & active transport. Desire to live in location not of strong value. The above in place make it a desirable place to live. |
| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | Strongly disagree | The proposed development of land identified as T136 in the draft Future Development Strategy does not support a reduction in GHG emissions. There is no public transport for that area, nor currently any employment opportunities locally, so of the 1,000 dwellings proposed, that'll be 1,000 vehicles on the roads. |
| 31192 Ms Rebecca Patchett | Strongly disagree | According to responses in previous community meetings to questions about plans for public transport options, it appears that public transport does not appear to be a priority for settlements along state highway 60 including tasman village and mapua. It appears that maybe once the population is big enough through further development then the public transport option will become available. This is a catch up scenerio and suggests that we can expect further congestion until some level is reached where public transport options will be available, affordable and convenient. This doesn't seem to fit with any reduction in GHG. Jobs, services and amenities provided by Richmond, Nelson and Motueka should not have to be duplicated in Mapua and Tasman to avoid people living in these areas having to go to bigger centers. |
| 31219 Mrs kate windle | Strongly disagree | |
| 31229 Mr Dave North | Strongly disagree | |
| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | Strongly disagree | If the Tasman Bay Village is adopted this will lead to a huge increase in cars in the area. If there are to be around 3200 new dwellings in Tasman / Moutere this will increase emissions. Each house is likely to have at least one vehicle if not two. This is a predominantly rural area and to suggest people will utilise public transport, even IF it is ever available at sufficient frequency, there is no getting away from the fact most people will continue to use their cars to get from A to B. |
| 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | Strongly disagree | T136 is 11 km form Motueka, 32 km from Richmond and 49 km km from Nelson, there is no public transport and will result in a lot more traffic on the roads and more greenhouse gas emissions. |
| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | Strongly | Curently Nelson subsides transport. I cant see this ever taking off as they dont cover many areas I need to |
| | | |

| | disagree | go. |
|----------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31511 Mr Vincent Riepen | Strongly disagree | Will increase energy use in homes adversely affected proposed development by those that can afford increase heating cost winter. Those unable to pay more will suffer compromised health issues. Majority of existing housing stock not compliant with current minimum building code standards. Transport emissions to be resolved with low or zero emission vehicles and public transport - not housing development. |
| 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | Strongly disagree | It will not achieve this. I support the reduction in GHG emissions but this strategy will not achieve that. |
| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | Strongly disagree | I don't believe it will reduce GHG emissions. People will voluntarily use public transport is a pipe dream. More people means more cars. This is time proven. We're rightfully moving towards lower emission vehicles but the belief people will automatically switch to public transport is pie in the sky. |
| 31706 Paul Donald Galloway | Strongly disagree | What do you mean by "Urban form" and "integrating land use transport"? You mean expanding housing dormitories and hoping people will take the bus? Few people will bike when the roads and streets are scarily dangerous at 50km/hour, in a hurry to get to school and work, dream on! |
| 31741 Mr Robert Stevenson | Strongly disagree | This will not work in a region where the private car use is preeminent |
| 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | Strongly disagree | Protection of high quality soils is more important than GHG as we can plant additional trees to reduce GHG |
| 31763 Susan Rogers | Strongly disagree | Survey is flawed from the beginning. You need to redesign this entire line of questioning. It leads only to answers desired by the maker of the survey. |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Strongly disagree | Please see attached: Very few of the Nelson - Tasman employing industries can be served by public transport. Only combined local & central would feature in top 10. MBIE Fact sheet 2020 - Nelson. |
| | | |

02 Please indicate whether you support or do not support Outcome 2: Existing main centres including Nelson City Centre and Richmond Town Centre are consolidated and intensified, and these main centres are supported by a network of smaller settlements. Please explain your choice:

| • | - | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|--|
| 31114 Ms Jill Rogers | Agree | Makes sense provided green spaces are part of the design - Need more details on the smaller settlements to be able to comment on that. |
| 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS | Agree | AGREE SUBJECT THE BASIC FACT THAT TO ACHIEVE GHG REDUCTION YOU HAVE TO LOCATE PEOPLE AS CLOSE TO JOBS AS POSSIBLE AND REDUCE CAR TRANSPORT AND COMMUTING. THUS DEVELOPING EXISTING TOWNS AND JOB PRODUCTION AREAS IS THE LOGICAL WAY TO GO SO PEOPLE CAN ACTUALLY WALK OR CYCLE TO WORK. BUILDING A NETWORK OF COMMUTER VILLAGES DOES NOT ACHIEVE THAT GOAL. THE PRIMARY EXPANSION HAS TO BE IN OR IMMEDIATELY ADJACENT TO EXISTING URBAN COMMUNITIES. |
| 31122 Mr Johan Thomas Wahlgren | Agree | Using existing infrastructure to intensify instead of spreading out the city over greenfield land. Everyone knows the most uneconomic and irrational way of building an expansion is sideways instead of upwards. |
| 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren | Agree | |
| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson | Agree | The smaller settlements must be as closely linked as possible to minimise transport needs and increased infrastructure. |
| 31136 Mrs Sophie Bisdee | Agree | |
| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | Agree | |
| 31165 Mr Vincent Dickie | Agree | |
| 31173 Mr Roderick Watson | Agree | |
| 31186 Mr Gary Scott | Agree | But not to the detriment of taking all of the Greenfield space formerly used to grow our food. |
| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | Agree | |
| 31192 Ms Rebecca Patchett | Agree | Nelson, Richmond and Motueka should be developed as they already have the infrastructure and services needed for a growing population. However support by smaller settlements needs some explanation. How big are these 'smaller' settlements supposed to grow? What does this mean for the nature of said smaller settlements and the extra infrastructure (schools, bigger shops etc.) needed to support doubling growth in the years to come. |
| 31227 Ms Lee Eliott | Agree | |
| 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | Agree | |
| | | |

| 31240 Michael Markert | Agree | |
|----------------------------|-------|---|
| 31248 Mr Will Bosnich | Agree | |
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | Agree | Unsure what "a network of smaller settlements " looks like - you need to give examples before people can comment. |
| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | Agree | |
| 31261 Mr John Weston | Agree | But not at the expense of existing Property owners lifestyles and environments. |
| 31262 Mr Martin John Shand | Agree | The council should be making the best use of the land and not be looking to get the most money from it. |
| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | Agree | But not the "network of smaller settlements" this leads to ribbon development. We should concentrate on building consolidated urban communities. |
| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | Agree | |
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | Agree | Thius seems to be a way to proceed. |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | Agree | |
| 31278 Wendy Ross | Agree | certainly agree city centers and town centers should be intensified BUT with thought in mind of the living conditions, sun, shade restrictions, height of buildings etc are thought of carefully and not just put up because there is land available. It is highly reprehensible that 6 story buildings and no off street parking is going to add anything to people's ability to lead happy stress free lives. Town planning is not a game to see how many houses can be squeezed into a space to enable a council to say - we have filled in any and every space regardless of the wishes and requirement to plan properly for the future. And what about climate change - the land around the city is already suspect to future flooding, not too mention The Maitai and The Brook. |
| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | Agree | It makes sense to intensify these already established areas where there are good facilities, work and schools. |
| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | Agree | |
| 31285 Dr Hamish Holland | Agree | Productive farmland needs to be protected to maintain food and natural (ie not petro-chemical) fibre production |
| 31286 Mr David Short | Agree | I believe that any new settlements should be as close to main centres as possible to make any commuting as close as possible by cycling, walking, private car or public transport. |
| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | Agree | I wish to maintain the rural appeal of the area outside of the main centers so am apposed the further development of these rural lands. |
| | | |

| | | If this development continues then there will lifestyle block connecting all of these main centers and no rural land left. |
|---|-------|--|
| 31309 Mr & Mrs Rose & Phillip Windle | Agree | As long as infrastructure meets the requirements for intensification. |
| 31316 John Heslop | Agree | Infill development is essential to ensure productive land is protected and limited the size/span of the residential zone. Higher density is the key. |
| 31318 Mrs Isobel Mosley | Agree | |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | Agree | |
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | Agree | If more people live in our centres, then these will become more vibrant and interesting. It also means that people can actually walk and cycle to work instead of adding more cars to our traffic jams. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. There are so many new greenfield sites in this strategy, that many people, who would otherwise buy in the centres, are likely to instead just buy a house in the suburbs. |
| 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman | Agree | |
| 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | Agree | Increased density wil help to a certain extent, but will fall short of satisfying the outcome we need for safe life on earth. |
| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | Agree | Our centres are well designed for driving into and shopping, but need to change. People need to live in these centres by the thousand instead of about 50, and most people will not have cars at all - they will use bikes or walk, or use buses for longer journeys. The Councils need to actively discourage cars and car-use and in particular remove all parking from the main streets. The existing small settlements have been commuter hubs, by car. This also needs to change. There are many ways to squeeze cars off the roads, and if we are to achieve what the IPCC says, 45% reduction in 8 years, this will have to happen. |
| 31355 Mr Barney Hoskins | Agree | Focus on intensification in main centres will ensure that transport requirements and emissions are reduced. Nelson City, Stoke and Richmond should be the main focus for intensification and will ensure that when investment in infrastructure is required it is not to geographically broad. Tahunanui's proposal has fat to high levels of intensification in regards to 4-6 story buildings. I do however support the intensification up to 3 stories and in some cases 3-4 story low rise residential intensification (including mixed use) in Tahunanui not not any higher due to impacts around access, safety and community feel. Aesthetics also play into this as a desirable location for recreation. |

| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn Ball | Agree | Intensification should be concentrated on centres that have the services to support it. |
|---------------------------------------|-------|---|
| 31435 Mr Alan Eggers | Agree | Support the consolidation of main settlements, though you still need opportunities for rural res development near existing settlements or new settlements. |
| 31434 Mrs cushla Moorhead | Agree | We need to concentrate the growth for transport and to keep productive land free. |
| 31430 Muriel Moran | Agree | Agree with consolidation and intensification but disagree with a network of smaller settlements as if the work is in the cities the outlying people will have to travel creating green house gas emissions. Why settle people where access to any services must require considerable travel in a world that is facing dramatic climate change requiring every effort to keep any temperature rise to within 1.5 degrees and having now reached the final tipping point. Council needs to take a responsible lead. Any outlying settlements must have transport with no or low emission gases as a precursor to such development but growth within the cities must come first. All housing plans must have the effects of the plan on climate change set as a priority in any decisions. |
| 31422 Mrs Marga Martens | Agree | Support vibrant main centres were people can walk and cycle to work and do their shopping. The green field developments undermine this outcome. |
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | Agree | further development of the existing centres has potential to achieve increases in population / housing density. Development of under utilised spaces is needed as part of this, eg brownfield development, change of use, etc. This can be used to provide both residential and commercial resource / space in the existing centres. |
| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling | Agree | More people would be able to walk and cycle to work and to commercial centres |
| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling | Agree | This is generally sound but it depends on the location and size of the smaller settlements |
| 31403 Mr Richard Deck | Agree | |
| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | Agree | Need both urban and rural |
| 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer | Agree | |
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | Agree | Best practice to intensify rather than utilise greenspace areas |
| 31360 Ms Thuy Tran | Agree | Agree only if 'smaller settlements' does not mean creating intensified communities like the Tasman Village, in case that proposal is cut down from 1200 houses to still several hundred. |
| 31356 Stephen Williams | Agree | As long as the smaller settlements are well connected to the main centers with public transport and bike paths, I am in support of this. |

| 31438 Aleisha Hosie | Agree | Yes, Small areas like Brightwater would benefit from growth - with amenities been easily accessible |
|-----------------------------|-------|---|
| 31441 Mr Chris Head | Agree | As above, whatever growth is planned beyond Nelson, Stoke and Richmond MUST be done in conjunction with an efficient public transport system. |
| 31443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | Agree | I am concerned about ongoing greenfield developments and urban sprawl, which is neither desirable with regard to lowering emissions nor is this socially the best form of living and it gobbles up valuable green spaces. There are many more creative forms of intensification that could be used to accomodate people within the existing city boundaries than have been mentioned in this draft strategy. New Zealanders have not had a chance to experience them and are therefore not able to imagine them either. Surveys reflect this and should not be giving the lead. We are in a climate emergency - this should be our foremost determinator. Any greenfield development should be delayed until intensification has been exhausted. Absolutely NO greenfield development in Mahitahi and Orchard Flats: The Maitai Valley is Nelson's precious recreational space which deserves to be maintained as such and not destroying its peacefulness and recreational value through urbanization |
| 31447 Dr David Jackson | Agree | Except I strongly disagree that a village at Hira was dropped from the draft FDS. This is close to Nelson City, would take traffic pressure off the roading network to the south, and could easily be serviced by an extended bus network and cycleway. Why can Tasman have nodes of villages, but not Nelson. It makes no sense. I would much prefer to see new development at Hira, rather than irreversibly spoiling the lower Maitai Valley with the Kaka Valley and Orchard Flat area (n-032). |
| 31449 Mr John Chisholm | Agree | |
| 31472 Dr David Briggs | Agree | An ambiguous question which I can't answer in any sensible way. I assume it means "will be consolidated and intensified will be supported", not "are (i.e. at present"), since they clearly aren't. If you do achieve this, would obviously be a benefit, though I am puzzled what you mean by "supported by a network". In what way are they supported? To be beneficial, this support requires not just shops and businesses but other social and cultural services (e.g. medical facilities, education, theatres, concert halls). And these need to be provided as part of the development process, not left to emerge by some unspecified commercial process long afterwards. |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | Agree | |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | Agree | |
| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | Agree | Concentrating in existing areas should reduce infrastructure requirements and transport costs/emissions. |
| | | |

| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | Agree | I agree with this consolidation as Stoke and Richmond areas are close to be consolidated already with increasing subdivisions being built currently between the two centres. Some intensification within Nelson and Richmond would be useful to enable more people to move into these areas but still have easy access to employment, services and activities in these areas. Another advantage is the shorter distances being covered with private vehicles. A more extensive bus service would also help to alleviate the use of private vehicles. However, some big changes are required with roading as there are bottlenecks into both Richmond and Nelson. |
|-----------------------------|-------|--|
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | Agree | |
| 31487 Ms Heather Spence | Agree | Minimise travel distances, create friendlier walking and cycle options, reduce vehicle emissions from fossil fueled vehicles. Not sure about a network of similar settlements, especially if new ones are developed. To me, 'consolidated and intensified' means, in climate terms, high-density housing, making it easier for people to move around without relying on cars. |
| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | Agree | I agree with intensification in already developed areas to reduce the need for expensive new infrastructure and to stop paving over of our productive land. However any intensification should be well designed and there is no detail in the strategy of what this intensification would look like. |
| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless | Agree | |
| 31508 Mr Roger Barlow | Agree | Stop waisting good productive land . |
| 31516 Mr Peter Lole | Agree | Logical and inevitable to combine and intensify Richmond and Nelson. Particularly Richmond. Smaller settlements need cheap and efficient public transit to connect. |
| 31529 Mr Steven King-Turner | Agree | |
| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard | Agree | These statements are ambiguous and poorly worded. Does the 'network of smaller settlements' refer to existing or new settlements? I agree that our town centres should be intensified to reduce pressure on recreational, natural, and horticultural land, and to create towns in which active transport is the most appealing transport option for residents. |
| 31533 Wendy Trevett | Agree | Stoke, Brightwater & Motueka to support the main centres. |
| 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery | Agree | I agree that these should be the main centres but I also believe that the smaller settlements need to be well-thought out and should plan now for commercial areas in order to meet outcomes 1 &3. |
| 31554 Wendy Barker | Agree | You have asked two questions in one here. I agree with the first part but not necessarily the second. |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | Agree | Please stop the spread - I am not against growth per-sé but am against a 'colonisation-type' sprawl of our productive green spaces and habitats. Tasman & NCC councils seem hell-bent on destroying the very |
| | | |

| | | essence of our regions & particularly our rural areas. Time for some creative vision and a chance for some forward thinking/innovative solutions - the world is full of them! |
|--------------------------|-------|--|
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | Agree | |
| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | Agree | That's the way it is nowallow natural progressiondon't force it. Consolidated Yesover intensified No |
| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | Agree | But the smaller settlements should be close with good transport connections |
| 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz | Agree | |
| 31608 Robbie Thomson | Agree | The existing infrastructure can be enhanced and added to without the need to create new centres in the majority of cases. |
| 31612 Mr Paul Davey | Agree | I think the best areas for intensification are city and town centres not where people want to go and have rest and recreation |
| 31614 Mr mark Morris | Agree | See attached submission. Summarised - T-112 Residential Intensification Future Development Area on the church property at 123 Salisbury Road, Richmond. |
| 31617 Ms steph jewell | Agree | I agree as long as the smaller settlements are consolidated existing ones and no new greenfield development occurs until we have built UP, as there is plenty of room up there. And as long as there is improved public transport as well as walk/cycle potential. |
| 31620 Mr Paul Baigent | Agree | |
| 31622 Peter Butler | Agree | |
| 31631 Mrs Joy Shackleton | Agree | I believe it is important to recognise and honour the historic importance of Nelson and any building should need to mirror this heritage/character. |
| 31635 Mr Joe Hay | Agree | Urban intensification is good. But a network of smaller settlements brings a risk of higher GHG emissions from commuter communities etc. |
| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | Agree | |
| 31647 Mrs Rebecca Parish | Agree | |
| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | Agree | It's good to have town centres, where people can gather - but not make it too big that you can't even ge there at all. Richmond should develop a bit more so we have a hub for people to meet and do activities. |
| 31656 Mr brad malcolm | Agree | |
| 31681 Seev Oren | Agree | Agree to have supporting Settlement as Tasman Village. |
| | | |

| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | Agree | With the proviso that the "network of smaller settlements" comprise appropriate expansion and/or intensification of existing communities and NOT new greenfields suburbs sprawling around our rural townships/viilages which are completely inconsistent with the rural look and feel of these thriving communities. |
|--------------------------------|-------|---|
| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | Agree | I agree with the intensification of the existing centres, Nelson City and Richmond Town Centre, but do not agree with the greenfield development in other centres or in Nelson and Richmond. |
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | Agree | Agree in principle but smaller settlements should remain small |
| 31692 Mr Alasdair Gardiner | Agree | |
| 31695 Christine Horner | Agree | |
| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | Agree | |
| 31703 Ms Paula Holden | Agree | Nelson CBD is ideal for more 'affordable' apartments and well-designed social housing. More people living in the CBD of both Nelson & Richmond would make them come alive & support local business. People would be able to walk to work and school & not necessarily need a car (apartment car-share scheme could be a great option). |
| 31705 Mr Lindsay Wood | Agree | We offer strong but qualified support to outcome 2 as low-density developments are a major cause of urban inefficiency as well as seriously compromising or ability to face a low-emissions, and very likely low-energy future. This However we do not consider the proposed increased density or its appallingly slow anticipated uptake go nearly far enough to achieve the scale of results needed. Additionally if this form of development happens it should align strongly with the concept of "Transit Oriented Development", (TOD). A key to achieving the rate of necessary decarbonisation is, again, the ability to live well with minimal private transport and this requires a highly effective public transport system not only within urban centres but between them and to many strategic other locations, such as transport hubs, popular recreational and cultural locations and so on. |
| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | Agree | I am endorsing the Nelson Tasman Climate Forum's view. Forum Response: We agree with the intensification of existing centres, and we disagree with greenfield development in the smaller towns or in Nelson and Richmond. We wish to draw attention to an economic analysis of cities using a methodology called Urban3. Each acre of several US cities and Auckland was analysed in terms of its net benefit to city revenue or net cost to the city - the latter mainly in providing infrastructure services. The results were startling. Inner city areas were the wealth engines of cities, and sprawling suburbs were net drains on city revenues. Inner city medium density, mixed use, walkable neighbourhoods were strongly revenue positive. Areas where the poorer |

| | | people of the city lived subsidised areas where the rich lived. Auckland, where the same methodology was applied, was the same as US cities in this phenomenon. The estimated cost of maintaining sprawling infrastructure greatly exceeded tax/rates revenue, causing municipal debt to increase year by year. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7Nw6qyyrTel • The lesson for our region is dramatic, particularly for Tasman, and particularly because planners propose a greater proportion of greenfield development for Tasman. The lesson is that any greenfield development in Tasman will be a drain on revenue too great to afford. We should minimise greenfield development in the whole region. |
|-------------------------------|-------|--|
| 31709 Ofer Ronen | Agree | Tasman Village - As smaller settlement. |
| 31710 Ms Angela Fitchett | Agree | Agree that the main centres are consolidated and intensified, but the smaller centres will need very good non-emitting transport links to support climate goals. Again, Greenfields' developments will work against this outcome. |
| 31712 Caroline Blommaert | Agree | Makes services more accessible to outlying areas. |
| 31718 Kathryn & Keith Quigley | Agree | |
| 31721 Ms Jill Cullen | Agree | |
| 31748 Jo Brooks | Agree | |
| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | Agree | Please see attached - Intensification of Brownfield areas (those already developed with Infrastructure) preferable to Greenfield development |
| 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | Agree | |
| 31759 Mr Damian Campbell | Agree | |
| 31769 Ms Jo Gould | Agree | It makes sense to consolidate and intensify existing town centres. A mix of retail and residential in the city centre would be good and bring life and vibrancy to the town. |
| 31771 Colleen Shaw | Agree | I agree but do not support greenfields development of the Maitai Valley, Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats as it would obliterate a valuable green recreational resource for the people of Nelson within walking or cycling distance from the city. More low density housing as well does not encourage lowered emissions. It is not efficient and supports a car-centric population which we have to move away from. |
| 31774 Mrs Jane Sutherland | Agree | Would not like too much intensification of Nelson and Richmond. Prefer expansion of the smaller settlements. |
| 31782 Greig Caigou | Agree | |

| 31783 Mr Peter Jones | Agree | This is an obvious outcome. However consideration of residents need and aspirations needs more consultation. |
|----------------------------|----------|---|
| 31787 Lilac Meir | Agree | Agree to have smaller settlements such as T-168 Tasman Village |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | Agree | No new smaller settlements. Lessening impacts on Te Taiao |
| 31815 Peter Wilks | Agree | |
| 31820 Debbie Bidlake | Agree | A low carbon future does not involve sprawling cities with ever expanding rural urban fringes. The FDS notes that in Nelson, 65% of population growth to 2052 is expected to be provided through intensification, compared with a disappointing 24% in Tasman. We support greater intensification/modernisation of cities and existing small rural towns such as Murchison, Tapawera, Takaka and Collingwood. The accessibility and vitality of these towns are important because they service rural industries and provide local housing for retirees and workers. There needs to be a greater range of housing and light commercial options in these areas. |
| 31835 Mr Ian Wishart | Agree | Please see attached - All depends on appropriate design & architecture, need novel imaginative ideas put before public. |
| 31836 Paula M Wilks | Agree | Emphasis on intensification. Don't want Richmond sprawling onto the Waimea Plains. Must consider carefully what smaller settlement networks are developed. Minimize commuting and traffic congestion. |
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | Disagree | The plans as proposed are very similar to urban planning in the 1970s in California, which created urban slums. I am writing articles for California newspapers showing how New Zealand is stupidly repeating the same mistakes. |
| 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | Disagree | I like them small and like they are now. I remember going to Kauai after a hurricane practically leveled the island. Their commitment was to rebuild, but no buildings taller than 3 stories. Apartment blocks and business building were all surrounded by luscious trees, and it looked like an island. Future tropical storms and cyclones didn't affect the buildings, either. |
| 31280 Jenny Knott | Disagree | |
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | Disagree | You should include Motueka as a consolidate and intensify hub, as otherwise all Motuekans will continue driving to R/Nsn for jobs, shopping and swimming etc. You should NOT develop any new smaller settlements unless they are zero carbon (at least in certain aspects) |
| 31365 michael monti | Disagree | I do not want the likes of intense inner-city living as presented in your proposal In short - blocking out the daylight with no "right of reply" to the idea No allowances made for intense street parking |

| 31505 Cheryl Heten | Disagree | Not enough transparency over multi story housing in amongst existing single story housing and the effect on those existing houses/homes. |
|---------------------------|---------------|---|
| 31558 Mr Steve Jordan | Disagree | |
| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | Disagree | Nelson city centre and Richmond city centre are not consolidates, nor intensified. Few people live in the city center with most residential buildings being one or two stories. |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | Disagree | Definitely agree with Urban intensification but need to know more about network of smaller settlements, as many unsuitable sites are probably included in the blanket statement. |
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | Disagree | The council should support cheap land development for urgent low cost housing needed |
| 31679 T R Carmichael | Disagree | |
| 31693 Carolyn Rose | Disagree | |
| 31711 Sara Flintoff | Disagree | Outlying towns need to be stand alone not dependent on Richmond. |
| 31741 Mr Robert Stevenson | Disagree | New greenfield sites should only have new intensive housing. Why create poorly designed ghettos in existing suburbs and towns |
| 31744 Mrs Lorna CRANE | Disagree | It does not appear to us that there is any need to support growth in these areas, it is already happening. |
| 31751 Hazel Pearson | Disagree | You have no limit/ goal re population. Cannot agree if no limit/ end goal. |
| 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | Disagree | |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Disagree | Please see attached: Majority of Nelson - Tasman employment is not in the two main centres. Most businesses serve the region from outside the CBD. |
| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | Disagree | Please see attached - determined Disagree from submission: A: No. We strongly support just consolidating existing urban areas. We show elsewhere in this submission how this can be accomplished with things you have missed or underestimated. We do not support expanding urban areas or growing existing country settlements that are not within easy cycling distance of existing main centres of Nelson Richmond and Stoke. |
| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | Don't know | |
| 31369 Mr Joseph Blessing | Don't know | |
| 31473 Mr Andrew Downs | Don't know | |

| 31502 Ms Caroline Jones | Don't know | |
|----------------------------|---------------|--|
| 31560 Ms Steph Watts | Don't know | |
| 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart | Don't know | |
| 31598 Mrs Nicola Worsfold | Don't know | |
| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | Don't know | |
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | Don't know | I agree though I don't understand what 'supported by a network of smaller settlements' means. If it is more subdivisions commuting to Nelson and Richmond centres, then I completely disagree. Given the recent IPCC report, it is important to adopt the 20 minute city principle - i.e. make sure that people are working, shopping, schooling etc all locally to them. |
| 31623 Ms Lucy Charlesworth | Don't know | I am wary of answering this question as I cannot be sure of how my answer will be interpreted. So I will state - I do not agree with developing green spaces. These spaces need to be reserved and protected to allow for sustainable biodiversity and for future generations. Intensification within Nelson CBD needs to be a priority. I do not agrees with building on Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. I do not agree with housing development on green fields. There is a climate emergency. Remove these areas from the FDS. |
| 31643 Inge Koevoet | Don't know | |
| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | Don't know | Not answering any of these leading questions |
| 31747 Mr (Tom) Neil BRETT | Don't know | Depends on how public transport is addressed. past experience tends to suggest that public transport in Nelson is not well supported. |
| 31784 Ms Teresa James | Don't know | |
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | N/A | Partly agree: yes to intensification, but the network of smaller settlements just sounds like more commuters. |
| 31363 Mr Steve Cross | N/A | I reject the premise of this question |
| 31460 Kris Woods | N/A | Intensification is an option, however this needs to be planned. However I do not agree with the |
| | | |

| | | methodology: "Because intensification within existing urban areas occurs slowly over time, neighbourhood planning can happen at the same time, or after, land is zoned for intensification" This doesn't work. A full plan must occur before any intensification. Otherwise infrastructure lags behind - just look at the traffic from Richmond to Nelson. Nightmare! Development has occurred w/out infrastructure to support |
|------------------------------|---------|---|
| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | Neutral | I have no strong views on this outcome. |
| 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | Neutral | I would support intensification of Nelson city, but not "supported by smaller settlements", if that means making the Maitai valley an urban village. |
| 31129 Mrs Gaynor Brooks | Neutral | |
| 31174 Ms Alison Westerby | Neutral | |
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | Neutral | |
| 31219 Mrs kate windle | Neutral | |
| 31250 Mr Richard Wyles | Neutral | |
| 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman | Neutral | The main centres should be consolidated, and housing should be intensified, but realistically, main towns support smaller centres, not vice versa. People travel to Richmond to do their shopping when they live in satellite towns and also to commute to work, the library, restaurants and meetings. This is the old model of development and it perpetuates daily travel and fossil fuel use. |
| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | Neutral | |
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | Neutral | Is this best for the collective hauora/well-being of people? Wellness is strongly connected to a sense of place and existing in a supportive environment. Modern, 'small-lot', intensive, mixed housing developments provide for expansive, shared green spaces, connected accessways and centralised service hubs. Intensifying on top of the 20th century model for town planning that exists in Nelson City and Richmond needs to first consider redevelopment to meet modern living and wellness needs. |
| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | Neutral | This seems reasonable. Again, if we really do need more dwellings. I believe if we changed our economic system to a less predatory/exploitive one then we wouldn't actually need more buildings. |
| 31364 Mrs Christine Tuffnell | Neutral | Covid has shown us that the majority of people can work from home. It has also shown us that consumer are more competent now to do most of their purchasing online. I think there is a need to re-think the concept of a CBD and what it will look like. Nelson's has the appearances of being dying for some years now. Bringing intensified accommodation into the existing CBD may not have the desired effect of bringing new life to this area. |
| | | |

| 31405 Mr Doug Hattersley | Neutral | This is a loaded question. I support intensification of Richmond and Nelson - not undefined settlements |
|------------------------------------|---------|--|
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas Hollyman | Neutral | |
| 31454 Mrs Tracey Koole | Neutral | |
| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | Neutral | |
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | Neutral | |
| 31480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | Neutral | |
| 31483 Debbie Hampson | Neutral | |
| 31484 Mr Gavin Brent Cook | Neutral | |
| 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | Neutral | |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne | Neutral | What smaller settlements? |
| 31520 Andrew Stirling | Neutral | |
| 31521 Mrs Marie Waterhouse | Neutral | |
| 31551 Mrs Jo Kitchen | Neutral | |
| 31570 Ms Annabel Norman | Neutral | Not sure this vision is clear in strategy |
| 31574 Mr David Bolton | Neutral | |
| 31579 Jane Tate | Neutral | |
| 31580 Jenny Long | Neutral | I very much support the intensification of central Nelson and Richmond, and by that I mean proper intensification with multi-storey apartments built in the very centre of town e.g. above shops on the ground level. I'm less supportive of intensification of wider suburbia outside the centre of town and I'm not supportive of creating new settlements in greenfields areas. |
| 31604 Mr Peter Moot | Neutral | |
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | Neutral | This could be a good idea, but there are so many greenfield sites mentioned in the stately, that you're no prioritising this. If you want to bring the city to life, this is a good idea, but you need to make this your focus. It would be excellent in the sense that there are existing shopping facilities, unlike in greenfield sites, good transport connections exist, and there would be less need for cars. New suburbs need so much support and infrastructure to be successful and desirable whereas inner city development already has these advantages. |

| 31628 Mr Daniel Levy | Neutral | I support intensification and consolidation within the existing town centres. I do not support 'green field' developments in the Nelson region. I particularly object to the proposed greenfield developments at Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats in The Maitai Valley. Development of new suburbs here would inevitably have an irreversible and significant negative impact on the health and wellbeing of the Maitai river. The resulting degradation of the Maitai river and the increased urbanization of the area with the associated increased traffic as well as air, water, noise and light pollution, will have an unacceptable negative impact on this valuable rural recreation area. |
|------------------------------------|---------|--|
| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | Neutral | |
| 31636 Joanna Santa Barbara | Neutral | We agree with the intensification of existing centres, and we disagree with greenfield development in the smaller towns or in Nelson and Richmond. We wish to draw attention to an economic analysis of cities using a methodology called Urban3. Each acre of several US cities and Auckland was analysed in terms of its net benefit to city revenue or net cost to the city - the latter mainly in providing and maintaining infrastructure services. The results were startling. Inner city areas were the wealth engines of cities, and sprawling suburbs were net drains on city revenues. Inner city medium density, mixed use, walkable neighbourhoods were strongly revenue positive Areas where the poorer people of the city lived subsidised areas where the rich lived. Auckland, where the same methodology was applied, was the same as US cities in this phenomenon. The estimated cost of maintaining sprawling infrastructure greatly exceeded tax/rates revenue, causing municipal debt to increase year by year. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7Nw6qyyrTel This 10 minute video is a clever visualisation of these findings. The lesson for our region is dramatic, particularly for Tasman, and particularly because planners propose a much greater proportion of greenfield development for Tasman. The lesson is that any greenfield development in Tasman will be a drain on revenue too great to afford. Initial heavy infrastructure costs may be compensated by development fees, but Tasman ratepayers are then left in perpetuity with the costs of maintaining and replacing this expensive infrastructure. We should minimise greenfield development in the whole region. |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | Neutral | |
| 31641 Mr Stephen (Steve) Hayden | Neutral | The proposed Braeburn Settlement (T-136 detailed on page 47) would be considered to be part of the network of smaller settlements anticipated by the FDS |
| | | |
| 31651 Dr Patrick Conway | Neutral | It depends upon whether this intensification enhances or destroys the unique character of Nelson downtown legacy architecture. This is a question of preserving our heritage. |

| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | Neutral | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | Neutral | |
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | Neutral | |
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | Neutral | See attached submission. Summarised - no key points related to this outcome. |
| 31716 Mr Alan hart | Neutral | |
| 31726 Mr John Jackson | Neutral | There is insufficient information to form an opinion with respect to plans for smaller settlements. |
| 31752 Jill Pearson | Neutral | |
| 31762 Mr Mark Hewetson | Neutral | |
| 31765 Mrs Lorna Ivy Cooper | Neutral | |
| 31775 Dr Thomas Carl | Neutral | |
| 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | Strongly agree | Believe this needs further work- strongly agree that the town centres need to be intensified and maybe this could be trickled down better to enabling it to happen. This may need to be in the form of a more comprehensive strategic plan for the centres and how this will look. I see Nelson City Council has a strategic town centre document. |
| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | Strongly agree | As above, this is critical, the continuous expansion of the region to date does not help foster a vibrant and lively place to live. As the region is struggling to attract a young demographic of people, it is critical that a strong focus is placed on creating the infrastructure needed to create a region that is easy and fun to live in. |
| | | I fully support the consolidation and intensification of the Nelson and Richmond 1000%. |
| 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | Strongly agree | We cannot lose more prime agricultural land to residential developments. N-106 & N-032 turn rural into residential - against the wished of more than 12,000 ratepayers |
| 31118 Ms Sarah Varey | Strongly agree | |
| 31130 Trevor James | Strongly agree | This has so many advantages: cost of infrastructure (e.g. 3 waters, electricity) is lower per unit of housing, reduces commuting times and greatly reduces emissions from vehicles (including heavy metals from brakes), it makes public transport more viable, can make for more social cohesion if designed right (e.g. with parks, walkways and commuter paths creating meeting places), reduces the human footprint on the region that displaces ecosystems (single-story buildings cover a much larger area that multi-story buildings), large areas of impervious surface (roads, roofs etc) create major adverse environmental effect |

| | | i.e. more erosion in our waterways, lower groundwater levels causing lower summer stream flows, more heating of our land and lower atmosphere. We need to get bold with intensification with a lot more 4-6 story buildings encouraged, but with greater parkland around them. |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward | Strongly agree | Intensification will provide a more satisfactory outcome for residents, and prevent the loss of productive land. |
| 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert | Strongly agree | We need to work wisely and intensify our cities , instead of urban sprawl |
| 31185 Myfanway James | Strongly agree | The advantages of this approach are many and seem to be building as climate change and population growth gets worse. These advantages include: reduced commuting times and greatly reduces emissions from vehicles (including heavy metals from brakes), public transport becomes more viable, cost of infrastructure (e.g. 3 waters, electricity) is lower per unit of housing, can make for more social cohesion if designed right (e.g. with parks, walkways and commuter paths creating meeting places), more heating of our land, reduced human footprint on the region that displaces ecosystems (single-story buildings cover a much larger area that multi-story buildings), large areas of impervious surface (roads, roofs etc) create major adverse environmental effect i.e. more erosion in our waterways, lower summer flows in stream flows etc. Four or more story buildings should be encouraged with economic incentives. We should not compromise on the amount of parkland. |
| 31195 Mr Serge Philippe Crottaz | Strongly agree | The City Centre forms the heart of Nelson, it is appropriate to intensify this part of our region as increasing housing in this area will have less impact on the nearby greenfield area in the Maitai Valley. 2,500 new homes including in attached forms such as apartment buildings three to six storeys make sense and use little land area. Living in an apartment appeal particularly young people and professional as these groups have busy lifes and do not want to take care of a garden and house maintenance. |
| 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | Strongly agree | Density in urban areas allows for living and working without the need or carbon transport. Urban sprawl creates traffic. |
| 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | Strongly agree | Nelson needs intensified and consolidated centres, with a growing and sprawling population and no real hubs it will create a widely spread population which will increase pollution. Areas such as Tahunanui are perfectly suited to be a intensified hubs and encourage development |
| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | Strongly agree | STRONGLY disagree with the specifications allowing for multiple storeys ANYWHERE apart from light industrial & industrial. Instead we should be building row houses, giving people access to outside, your own garden or outside entertainment area etc. And avoiding lack of socialisation, unwanted shadows & shade, cold, wind tunnels, lack of outdoor access etc. NO MORE apartments. |
| | | |

| 31247 Mr yuri aristarco | Strongly agree | As we name ourself the little smart city we cannot make the same mistakes other not so smart cities have been doing fin the past decades. It's vital to keep the footprint of our city as small and compact as possible. This is the only way to cut GHG tied to private transport, also so many people would enjoy living close to all the amenities the CBD has to offer, restaurants, pubs, shops and cinema all at walking a short biking distance. This will make our life better and free land for productivity and wilderness. |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan | Strongly agree | We need to keep intensification in and around these towns/city tight and keep our flat and rural land for production and recreation |
| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley | Strongly agree | |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | Strongly agree | Reductions in commuting and enabling a large increase in active transport possibilities is only possible through consolidation and intensification |
| 31284 Mr Jarmo Saloranta | Strongly agree | |
| 31298 Mr Duncan Macnab | Strongly agree | Yes - I strongly agree. We need to have consolidation and intensification in urban areas. We simply cannot continue to gobble up good pastoral and horticultural land with 1/4 acre pavlova paradises. We need the efficincies that consolidation brings so we can have effective and efficient public transport, sewerage and water services |
| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | Strongly agree | I feel to plan to consolidate existing main centres with an affordable choice of housing to cover all needs of the community and must include a good affordable efficient public transport and easy access to cycleways, safe walkways. This plan is practical and utilises present infrastructure and will reduce GHG if the use of cars is significantly reduced as people can be close to places of work / school / further education / recreation/ social needs or easy access to travel or escape via the airport |
| 31306 Mr Jaye Barr | Strongly agree | |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | Strongly agree | |
| 31322 Mrs BARBARA AND TIM ROBSON | Strongly agree | Low density developments are not efficient and they encourage high emission, private vehicle dependency. The Strategy doesn't recommend that the high density option as a high enough priority |
| 31325 Dr Ann Briggs | Strongly agree | The network of smaller settlements should be individually self-sustaining: ie have land and infrastructure allocated for education, health, recreation and basic retail services. There should also be designated areas of green space between settlements to sustain the natural environment and enhance the quality of |
| | | |

| ife. |
|--|
| ntensification goes hand-in-hand with lower transport emissions, and the construction of apartment buildings (using sustainable, low-emissions technology) results in fewer GHG emissions than stand-alone buildings strung out in ribbon developments that encroach on productive land. |
| low-density developments are a major cause of urban inefficiency and seriously compromise our ability to face a low-emissions and low-energy future. However there are so many new greenfield sites in this strategy, that many people, who would otherwise buy in the centres, are likely to instead just buy a house in the suburbs. |
| This must be the focus, even if unpopular. High-density communities are cheaper to operate and resource. |
| Unfortunately, with so much new greenfield development in the strategy, too many people will still buy a nouse in the suburbs instead of the centres. |
| with so much new greenfield development in the strategy, too many people will still buy a house in the suburbs instead of the centres. |
| These main centres already have a land footprint that can sustain and should be developed to intensify it use. These areas should be those being considered for development of building tall buildings. Tall buildings are already there - expected and accepted. |
| Tahunanui is its own style - own visual impact and micro-climate. There's good daylight angles, sea preeze, community feel - not a mish mash of the rise and rise of tall ugly buildings. |
| Makes sense to focus on intensification of our existing urban centres. This should be done sensitively, to promote the vibrancy and liveability of our town centres. As a new Nelson resident I believe the vibrancy of the Nelson CBD area could be much improved by the council facilitating quality multi-story housing and commercial enterprises. This would bring more life to the area and provide options for those who can't afford, or do not want to live in, a standalone house. |
| Will destroy amenity. |
| The logic is consistent with the chosen outcomes, and makes most sense for mirroring and extending the way the region works now - a vibrant city with a number of small, reasonably self-supporting settlements |
| There is huge scope for urban intensification in Nelson which would reduce the urban sprawl and the subsequent reliance on cars. Safe, affordable places to live within the CBD would enhance the vibrancy of the city, providing easy access to work, schools and healthcare. |
| ا ا |

| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | Strongly agree | Strongly agree with the objective. If more people live in our centres, then these will become more vibrant and interesting. It also means that people can actually walk and cycle to work instead of adding more cars to the traffic jams. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. There are so many new greenfield sites in this strategy, that many people, who would otherwise buy in the centres, are likely to instead just buy a house in the suburbs. |
|------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31373 Ms Jenny Daniell | Strongly agree | |
| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | Strongly agree | Urban sprawl is no longer acceptable, while we see this as a "new" model, it is actually a very old model, tested and tried. About time we learn. |
| 31384 Mr Jace Hobbs | Strongly agree | |
| 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann | Strongly agree | |
| 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett | Strongly agree | But the smaller settlements must be existing ones, not new ones. |
| 31400 Miss Heather Wallace | Strongly agree | Smaller settlements need to be within current facilities not new areas. |
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | Strongly agree | There needs to be more intensification of the city centres, much more than proposed in the FDS. When people live close to where they work, there are less emissions from transport. |
| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | Strongly agree | reduces GHGe faciiltates social cohesion, capitalises on existing infrastructure |
| 31406 Ms Floortje van Lierop | Strongly agree | Yes we need to build up, not out. And use whatever buildings are already there and use them in a smarter way. We need to have more people living in the CBD to make it a livelier place and to reduce the number of people that need to commute. |
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle | Strongly agree | If more people live in our centres, then these will become more vibrant and interesting. It also means that people can actually walk and cycle to work instead of adding more cars to our traffic jams. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. There are so many new greenfield sites in this strategy, that many people, who would otherwise buy in the centres, are likely to instead just buy a house in the suburbs. |
| 31410 Mr Scott Smithline | Strongly | Strong support. Low density developments are fail in the area of 21st Century climate imperatives: they |
| | | |

| | agree | are inefficient & compromise the ability to face s low emission - low energy future. |
|----------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin | Strongly agree | Yes please. Our cycling network is a fabulous start and can be further improved to encourage less car use. Greenfield developments should be reconsidered though. High value agricultural land is probably not the best place to put sprawling housing developments. |
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | Strongly agree | |
| 31416 Tim Leyland | Strongly agree | We note the many new greenfield sites in the overall strategy. We would like to see Tapawera strengthened in terms of size so that we have a critical mass of services. At the moment many people living in Tapawera and Districts commute to Richmond and Nelson for work and services such as supermarkets, farm and engineering supplies. By having more people and businesses in this area there will be less need for the commute. |
| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors | Strongly agree | |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | Strongly agree | |
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | Strongly agree | The proposal does not appear to be committed to urban intensification. The many greenfield development sites that are included will attract people to traditional suburban lifestyles which rely on cars for transport to school, work, shops, facilities. Our challenge is to build intensified housing within urban centres where people can walk and cycle safely to places outside their homes. Nelson and Richmond which are often dead, uninteresting cities will become vibrant, attractive and offer a new type of lifestyle to its residents. |
| 31423 Mr Roger Frost | Strongly agree | |
| 31431 Katerina Seligman | Strongly agree | |
| 31452 Mr David Bartle | Strongly agree | Intensification is essential in order to respond to future energy shortages and the climate crisis. It also relates best to the future financial viability of both councils. |
| 31457 Mr J Santa Barbara | Strongly agree | The default model for development should be medium density mixed use projects. This applies to both Nelson and Richmond town centres, as well as other settlements in the region. Mixed use should include |

| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | Strongly agree | I strongly believe that full intensification of central city for both residential and business use is vital to create a vibrant life style. To support this I believe that a marked increase in provision of public transport is necessary. The dependence on motor traffic for residents in smaller townships is both environmentally and aesthetically detrimental. The current development of properties on productive land outside city and town centres is becoming an urban sprawl. |
|---|-------------------|--|
| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | Strongly agree | I strongly support outcome 2 as low-density developments are a major cause if urban inefficiency as well as seriously compromising or ability to face a low-emissions, and very likely low-energy future. However I do not consider the increased density or slow uptake go nearly far enough to achieve the scale of results needed |
| 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon | Strongly agree | |
| 31485 Ms Robin Schiff | Strongly agree | I strongly support this because low density developments are inefficient and will be at a great disadvantage when we need to face a low emissions future. I don't think your current proposal goes far enough to be successful at the scale needed. |
| 31488 Annette Starink | Strongly agree | See answer 3 |
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | Strongly agree | If more people live in our centres, then these areas will become more vibrant and interesting and become attractive to others as an area to live. It also means that people can actually walk and cycle to work instead of adding more cars to the already existing traffic jams. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. There are so many new greenfield sites in this strategy, that many people, who would otherwise buy in the centres, are likely to instead just buy a house in the suburbs and use their cars to commute given the frequency and conveinence of the current public transport system. |
| 31492 Anton, Benni, Shalom, AJ Bank, Bonnin, Shalom Davis | Strongly agree | We know that low-density developments are a major cause of high emissions and private vehicle dependency. it seems to us that the recomended strategy doesnt encourage the high density option enough. |
| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | Strongly agree | Centres will become more vibrant and interesting if more people live in them. People can walk and cycle to work. Strategy is doing very little to achieve this outcome, 70% of growth is on greenfield land, not intensification. |
| 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | Strongly agree | If more people live in our centres, then these will become more vibrant and interesting. It also means that people can actually walk and cycle to work instead of adding more cars to our traffic jams. This proposed strategy is not going to achieve this. There are so many new greenfield sites in this strategy, that many people, who would otherwise buy in the centres, are likely to instead just buy a house in the |
| | | |

| | | suburbs. |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31496 Mrs Petra Dekker | Strongly agree | refer attachment: By allowing sprawl, people need to drive their cars to get to and from work, schools, shops and sporting facilities in urban areas, which will increase GHG emissions, requires new infrastructure and eventually adds to more congestion on roads. This is not a long-term solution based on action on Climate Change. |
| 31499 Ms Jane Fisher | Strongly agree | |
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | Strongly agree | intensified settlement is good for reducing traffic |
| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | Strongly agree | Low-density developments outside main centres are a major cause of urban inefficiency. Future developments should be as close as possible to existing main centres. The proposed Tasman Village development is in direct conflict with this Outcome, and should not be allowed to go ahead. |
| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | Strongly agree | Strongly Agree. The sustainable use of land and infrastructure, compact walkable neighbourhoods promoting incidental exercise and improved social interactions, and more affordable housing for smaller household sizes are just some of the benefits that urban intensification can provide, leading to improved community health and wellbeing outcomes. It is essential however that urban intensification is done sympathetically with access to green space and development of a "green" urban landscape with tree planting, good urban design that enhances the character of the city and high quality public amentities. One benefit of urban intensification is the preservation of arable land for food production and ecologically important and biodiverse areas. |
| 31515 Geoffrey Vause | Strongly agree | The concept of "network of smaller settlements" needs debate. Such settlements should be commensurate with village concepts that support the surrounding horticultural and agricultural industries plus specific location specific commercial activities such as tourism. These need based factors should be the criteria for any such network and not developer driven greenfield residential developments. |
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers | Strongly agree | This is how it is now, to hard to change |
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | Strongly agree | I definitely agree with the objective as people can actually walk and cycle to work instead of adding more cars to our traffic jams if they live in our centres. However, with so many new greenfield sites proposed many people are likely to buy in the suburbs and not buy in the centres. |
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | Strongly agree | Primarily for reasons given in my Q. 1 comments. |

| 31549 Mr Ian McComb | Strongly agree | This change is long overdue, and NZ is now well behind international trends of urban density and community-enhancing living opportunities. |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | Strongly agree | Leave as much open space for non-human activity as possible. Productive land and wildlife conservation areas should be our top land use priorities. |
| 31562 Grant palliser | Strongly agree | as long as cycling, walking and public transport promote connectivity. Scattered greenfield development encourages driving. |
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | Strongly agree | Strongly agree with the objective. If more people live in our centres, then these will become more vibrant and interesting. It also means that people can actually walk and cycle to work instead of adding more cars to our traffic jams. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. There are so many new greenfield sites in this strategy, that many people, who would otherwise buy in the centres, are likely to instead just buy a house in the suburbs. |
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | Strongly agree | If more people live in our centres, then these will become more vibrant and interesting. It also means that people can actually walk and cycle to work instead of adding more cars to our traffic jams. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. There are so many new greenfield sites in this strategy, that many people, who would otherwise buy in the centres, are likely to instead just buy a house in the suburbs. |
| 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett | Strongly agree | I strongly agree that town centres need to be consolidated and intensified. I think there is a true potential to revitalise Nelson CBD and strengthen the local economy by providing high/medium density housing whilst funding social infrastructure which enhances the feel of the town. There is so much potential for these centres to thrive, to build character and a deeper level of community connection than there currently is. I am weary about the projected growth in Mapua, Tasman and Motueka because many residents commute from these settlements into Richmond or Nelson, there are already huge issues with traffic flow in Richmond during peak times and I support the prioritisation of medium/high-density development in Nelson and Richmond whilst finding solutions with Waka Kotahi before pursuing development in the outer settlements. |
| 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham | Strongly agree | A network of local street in consolidated centres like Nelson and Richmond will reduce through traffic and create more inclusive and friendly neighbourhoods |
| 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | Strongly agree | Expanding existing town centres makes sense however the proposed strategy doesn't seem to reflect this. There seems to be a high reliance on new greenfield sites. |
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins | Strongly agree | I strongly support outcome 2 to increase the intensification of existing centres as low-density developments are a major cause of urban inefficiency. Low-density developments also seriously |
| | | |

| consider the increased density or slow uptake go nearly far enough to achieve the scale of results ne The economic future of our region is very dependent on the reduction of carbon emissions, so I belie the FDS needs to address carbon reduction in a pragmatic manner with clear actions and objectives. Strongly agree with the objective. If more people live in our centres, then these will become more vit and interesting. It also means that people can actually walk and cycle to work instead of adding more to our traffic jams. But again, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. There are so many n greenfield sites in this strategy, that many people, who would otherwise buy in the centres, are likely instead just buy a house in the suburbs. Strongly agree If more people live in our centres, then these will become more vibrant and interesting. It also mean people can actually walk and cycle to work instead of adding more cars to our traffic jams. However, not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. There are so many new greenfield in this strategy, that many people, who would otherwise buy in the centres, are likely to instead just house in the suburbs. Strongly We need people to live in our centers to become more vibrant, interesting and add to economic grow It would also mean that people can actually walk and cycle to work instead of adding more cars to our traffic, and jams many complain about already. In Nelson this would be too aligned with "Te Ara ô Whakati - City Centre Spatial Plan" however, not would think this to happen in stages - first intensify, make the choice of living in the city centre on the edges attractive – and by doing so evaluate the further need for more greenfield sites away for the centres. 30 years is a long time and we have to adapt to changes more felixble than thatI believ people need to be educated that stand alone houses are not the future – and away from jobs, entertainment don't support GHG emissions, etc If more peo | | | |
|--|--------------------------|----|---|
| agree and interesting. It also means that people can actually walk and cycle to work instead of adding more to our traffic jams. But again, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. There are so many not greenfield sites in this strategy, that many people, who would otherwise buy in the centres, are likely instead just buy a house in the suburbs. If more people live in our centres, then these will become more vibrant and interesting. It also mean people can actually walk and cycle to work instead of adding more cars to our traffic jams. However, not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. There are so many new greenfield in this strategy, that many people, who would otherwise buy in the centres, are likely to instead just house in the suburbs. Strongly agree If would also mean that people can actually walk and cycle to work instead of adding more cars to our traffic, and jams many complain about already. In Nelson this would be too aligned with "TE Ara ō Whakatū - City Centre Spatial Plan" however, opening up greenfield sites might reduce the willing to choose inner city living, and smaller settlements as community co-living, facilitating again the desistand alone houses then looking for more efficient possibilities. Too I would think this to happen in stages – first intensify, make the choice of living in the city centre on the edges attractive – and by doing so evaluate the further need for more greenfield sites away from the centres. 30 years is a long time and we have to adapt to changes more felixble than thatI believ people need to be educated that stand alone houses are not the future – and away from jobs, entertainment don't support GHG emissions, etc If more people live in our centres, then these will become more vibrant and interesting. It also mean people can actually walk and cycle to work instead of adding more cars to our traffic jams. However, not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. There are so many | | | compromise our ability to face a low-emissions, and most likely, low-energy future, However I do not consider the increased density or slow uptake go nearly far enough to achieve the scale of results needed. The economic future of our region is very dependent on the reduction of carbon emissions, so I believe the FDS needs to address carbon reduction in a pragmatic manner with clear actions and objectives. |
| people can actually walk and cycle to work instead of adding more cars to our traffic jams. However, not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. There are so many new greenfield in this strategy, that many people, who would otherwise buy in the centres, are likely to instead just house in the suburbs. Strongly agree We need people to live in our centers to become more vibrant, interesting and add to economic grow the would also mean that people can actually walk and cycle to work instead of adding more cars to ou traffic, and jams many complain about already. In Nelson this would be too aligned with "Te Ara ō Whakatū - City Centre Spatial Plan" however, opening up greenfield sites might reduce the willing to choose inner city living, and smaller settlements as community co-living, facilitating again the desi stand alone houses then looking for more efficient possibilities. Too I would think this to happen in stages – first intensify, make the choice of living in the city centre on the edges attractive – and by doing so evaluate the further need for more greenfield sites away for the centres. 30 years is a long time and we have to adapt to changes more felixble than thatI believe people need to be educated that stand alone houses are not the future – and away from jobs, entertainment don't support GHG emissions, etc Strongly agree first intensify first or the future – and away from jobs, entertainment don't support GHG emissions, etc | 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | | But again, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. There are so many new greenfield sites in this strategy, that many people, who would otherwise buy in the centres, are likely to |
| Braunsteiner agree It would also mean that people can actually walk and cycle to work instead of adding more cars to out traffic, and jams many complain about already. In Nelson this would be too aligned with "Te Ara ō Whakatū - City Centre Spatial Plan" however, opening up greenfield sites might reduce the willin to choose inner city living, and smaller settlements as community co-living, facilitating again the desi stand alone houses then looking for more efficient possibilities. Too I would think this to happen in stages – first intensify, make the choice of living in the city centre on the edges attractive – and by doing so evaluate the further need for more greenfield sites away from the centres. 30 years is a long time and we have to adapt to changes more felixble than thatI believ people need to be educated that stand alone houses are not the future – and away from jobs, entertainment don't support GHG emissions, etc Strongly agree If more people live in our centres, then these will become more vibrant and interesting. It also mean people can actually walk and cycle to work instead of adding more cars to our traffic jams. However, not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. There are so many new greenfield in this strategy, that many people, who would otherwise buy in the centres, are likely to instead just house in the suburbs. | 31593 Mr William Samuels | ٠, | If more people live in our centres, then these will become more vibrant and interesting. It also means that people can actually walk and cycle to work instead of adding more cars to our traffic jams. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. There are so many new greenfield sites in this strategy, that many people, who would otherwise buy in the centres, are likely to instead just buy a house in the suburbs. |
| agree people can actually walk and cycle to work instead of adding more cars to our traffic jams. However, not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. There are so many new greenfield in this strategy, that many people, who would otherwise buy in the centres, are likely to instead just house in the suburbs. | | | Whakatū - City Centre Spatial Plan" however, opening up greenfield sites might reduce the willingness to choose inner city living, and smaller settlements as community co-living, facilitating again the desire for stand alone houses then looking for more efficient possibilities. Too I would think this to happen in stages – first intensify, make the choice of living in the city centre or on the edges attractive – and by doing so evaluate the further need for more greenfield sites away from the centres. 30 years is a long time and we have to adapt to changes more felixble than thatI believe people need to be educated that stand alone houses are not the future – and away from jobs, |
| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS Strongly Strongly agree with the objective. | 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | | If more people live in our centres, then these will become more vibrant and interesting. It also means that people can actually walk and cycle to work instead of adding more cars to our traffic jams. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. There are so many new greenfield sites in this strategy, that many people, who would otherwise buy in the centres, are likely to instead just buy a house in the suburbs. |
| agree If more people live in our centres, then these will become more vibrant and | 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |

| | | interesting. It also means that people can actually walk and cycle to work instead of adding more cars to our traffic jams. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. There are so many new greenfield sites in this strategy, that many people, who would otherwise buy in the centres, are likely to instead just buy a house in the suburbs. |
|------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | Strongly agree | Having a blend of businesses and residents in city centres will be efficient for housing and commuting, green spaces should be prioritised as well as pleasant housing with parks or outdoor spaces for children to play. |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | Strongly agree | Strongly agree with the objective. If more people live in our centres, then these will become more vibrant and interesting. It also means that people can actually walk and cycle to work instead of adding more cars to our traffic jams. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. There are so many new greenfield sites in this strategy, that many people, who would otherwise buy in the centres, are likely to instead just buy a house in the suburbs. |
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | Strongly agree | Vibrant city centres as well as smaller centres encourage healthy communities and provide opportunities for improved public transport and active transport. I do not believe that the proposed greenfieds in this strategy are supportive of this principle. |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | Strongly agree | Strongly agree with the objective. If more people live in our centres, then these will become more vibrant and interesting. It also means that people can actually walk and cycle to work instead of adding more cars to our traffic jams. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. There are so many new greenfield sites in this strategy, that many people, who would otherwise buy in the centres, are likely to instead just buy a house in the suburbs. |
| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | Strongly agree | Focusing on intensifying will encourage more cycling and walking and reduce the amount of emissions from cars. |
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | Strongly agree | |
| 31632 Ms Jacquetta Bell QSM | Strongly agree | We strongly support intensifying main centres and the 'network of smaller settlements' as low-density settlements make it impossible to meet our carbon reduction goals. We support: • providing additional housing that maximises efficient use of infrastructure • reducing private car use and emissions • ensuring rural recreational opportunities are accessible to all • keeping agriculturally rich soils on the Waimea Plains for food production. |

| 31633 Ms Jacquetta Bell QSM | Strongly agree | I strongly support intensifying main centres and smaller settlements as low-density developments will make it impossible to meet our carbon reduction goals. I support: • providing additional housing that maximises efficient use of infrastructure • reducing private car use and emissions • ensuring rural recreational opportunities are accessible to all • keeping agriculturally rich soils on the Waimea Plains for food production. |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31637 Ms Frances Kemble Welch | Strongly agree | |
| 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin | Strongly agree | |
| 31640 Mr Ryan Brash | Strongly agree | If more people live in our centres, then these will become more vibrant and interesting. It also means that people can actually walk and cycle to work instead of adding more cars to our traffic jams. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. There are so many new greenfield sites in this strategy, that many people, who would otherwise buy in the centres, are likely to instead just buy house in the suburbs. |
| 31644 Murray Poulter | Strongly agree | |
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | Strongly agree | Strongly agree with the objective. If more people live in our centres, then these will become more vibrant and interesting. It also means that people can actually walk and cycle to work instead of adding more cars to our traffic jams. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. There are so many new greenfield sites in this strategy, that many people, who would otherwise buy in the centres, are likely to instead just buy a house in the suburbs. |
| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | Strongly agree | We need more high rise residential living in the city centre to give the dead centre more vitality and life. Spreading houses into the green areas surrounding the city will not be so necessary and will protect the recreational and environmental advantages that our fantastic valleys, rivers and forest give Nelson. |
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | Strongly agree | Waka Kotahi strongly favours intensification, due to the resulting benefits to active and public transport. |
| 31657 Mrs Andrea Hay | Strongly agree | SEE ATTACHED (text copied below): I strongly support intensifying main centres, but I consider that promoting smaller settlements as low-density developments risks making it impossible to meet our carbon reduction goals. I support: • providing additional housing that maximises efficient use of existing infrastructure |

| | | reducing private car use and emissions ensuring nearby rural recreational opportunities are accessible to all keeping agriculturally rich soils on the Waimea Plains for food production. |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31662 Joe Roberts | Strongly agree | Yes, and it is important that settlements such as Brightwater are provided the opportunity to grow as a part of meeting the demands and lifestyle choices of those who want to live in this settlement. |
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | Strongly agree | Strongly agree Strongly agree with the objective. If more people live in our centres, then these will become more vibrant and interesting. It also means that people can actually walk and cycle to work instead of adding more cars to our traffic jams. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. There are so many new greenfield sites in this strategy, that many people, who would otherwise buy in the centres, are likely to instead just buy a house in the suburbs. |
| 31667 barbara nicholas | Strongly agree | really important to consolidate and intensify housing to create stronger communities and actively manage the collective impact on the environment |
| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | Strongly agree | Strongly agree Strongly agree with the objective. If more people live in our centres, then these will become more vibrant and interesting. It also means that people can actually walk and cycle to work instead of adding more cars to our traffic jams. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. There are so many new greenfield sites in this strategy, that many people, who would otherwise buy in the centres, are likely to instead just buy a house in the suburbs. |
| 31673 Mike Drake | Strongly agree | Any settlements need to have robust public transport to the main centres. Again, vehicle usage should be minimised. Even if everyone has an EV, where will they park? They still have to charge there vehicle. The FDS needs to be integrated with the Walking and Cycling Plan. We need to develop healthy, low carbon travel options. |
| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | Strongly agree | If more people live in our centres, then these will become more vibrant, people can walk and cycle to work instead of adding more cars to our traffic jams. But, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this!!! There are so many new greenfield sites in this strategy, that many people, who would otherwise buy in the centres, are likely to instead just buy a house in the suburbs. |
| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | Strongly agree | This will support inner city business and enhance vibrancy in our centres. It will attract young people, good for the environment and will bring our community together. |

| 31683 Richard Davies | Strongly agree | The need for travel must be radically reduced to reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases. Half of NZ's emissions are due to transport. |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31688 Gerard McDonnell | Strongly agree | Urban living is essential for reducing transport costs and emissions |
| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | Strongly agree | |
| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | Strongly agree | Yes, we need to consolidate the two main centres and link with attractive (regular, cheap and efficient) public transport and also support active transport (safe and direct) that also supports existing 'satellite' communities. I do not support more green field developments. |
| 31704 Mr Paul Bucknall | Strongly agree | Intensification is clearly important. The FDS doesn't resolve the question of how to make it happen. |
| 31713 Mrs Debora Scholl Dos Santos | Strongly agree | These main centres are where the jobs are, this is where we need to focus in developing to its full potential. |
| 31717 Mr Frank Ryan | Strongly agree | Not everyone wants to live where they work and also will kill off any businesses setting up in rural areas to support local communities |
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | Strongly agree | By increasing the availability of housing within our urban centres the result will be a attractive destination / community thus resulting in a stronger economical asset to the district. Whereas if more housing development is proposed to be located further afield from these centres the likelyhood of busy and vibrant hospitaility and shopping centre is less so due to the need to travel by vehicle to that destination. By bringing the people to the centre with housing this potential will be maximised. |
| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | Strongly agree | If more people live in our centres, then these will become more vibrant and interesting. It also means that people can actually walk and cycle to work instead of adding more cars to our traffic jams. This proposed strategy does not look as though it will achieve this. There are so many new greenfield sites in this strategy, that many people, who would otherwise buy in the centres, are likely to instead just buy a house in the suburbs. |
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | Strongly agree | If more people live in our centres, then these will become more vibrant and interesting. It also means that people can actually walk and cycle to work instead of adding more cars to our traffic jams. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. There are so many new greenfield sites in this strategy, that many people, who would otherwise buy in the centres, are likely to instead just buy a house in the suburbs. |
| 31734 Eric Thomas | Strongly | Yes, these main centres support the smaller settlements. |
| | | |

| | agree | |
|--|----------------------|---|
| 31736 Ms Carol Curtis | Strongly agree | intensification near the town centres is paramount, but the option to also provide the "network of smaller settlements" does not meet the objective. to make this work, do not encourage the smaller settlements UNTIL the intensification occurs. |
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | Strongly agree | The intensification and concentration of Nelson and Richmond are worthy outcomes for many reasons - reduce emissions / mitigate climate change; reduce impacts on valuable soils; reduce adverse effects on landscape values; reduce impacts on much loved recreation areas but not developing adjacent to them; make everyday living cheaper; make the town centres vibrant and lively; provide smaller dwellings for those that want them (like my aged parents). |
| 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert- Watene | Strongly agree | Infrastructure is already present there |
| 31754 Ms Joanna Hopkinson | Strongly agree | The "smaller settlements" need their own institutions, offices + services. "Supporting" Richmond is a smoke screen for spending large on Richmond + then requing the smaller settlements like Murchison to travel risks on dangerous roads to access service. |
| 31761 Karen Steadman | Strongly agree | Richmond is 120km from Murchison - to far to travel. not practicle. If TDC was half it size then it would work - You are proposing spending more money in Richmond and neglecting the other towns. |
| 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | Strongly agree | Higher density is important. |
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | Strongly agree | Intensification and consoldidation of existing main centres is a great objective, as, if more people live in our centres, then these will become more vibrant and interesting, and the carbon footprint will go down. But this strategy has too many greenfield sites, so, many people who would otherwise buy a house in the towns centres, will be more likely to buy in the suburbs. |
| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | Strongly agree | See Q1 |
| 31801 Joan Skurr | Strongly agree | Please see attached I agree as long as the these are not "supported by a network of smaller settlements, unless these are within the '20 minute zone' for accessibility. We need a wider range of housing types making better use of the current built up area. |
| 31291 Mr ian thompson | Strongly disagree | We do not support the intensification of the Tahunanui Area beyond 4 levels high |
| | | |

| | disagree | on the inadequate roading structure around our district, example - Gladstone road, Richmond deviation, Whakatu drive. |
|-------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | Strongly disagree | There is no mention of Motueka here which is greatly supported by the communities along the Motueka Valley, State Hwy 61 and 60. Intensification is not for everyone. Sure it helps make it easier and cheaper for councils to provide infrastructure but is not the type of lifestyle many people would choose. |
| 31358 George Harrison | Strongly disagree | |
| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | Strongly disagree | My submission explains why. SUMMARISED - opposes 6 storey height limits proposed in Tahunanui, supports 2004 Tahunanui Plan. |
| | | Your proposal is to rezone 8 mtrs residential area to 6 story or 18mtrs high buildings in the Tahunanui area. Absolutely appalling. |
| 31481 Mrs Lucy Harrhy | Strongly disagree | It's ok to intensity existing main centres however, any smaller settlements should not be at the expense of fertile land for growing food. |
| 31511 Mr Vincent Riepen | Strongly disagree | |
| 31523 Ms karen steadman | Strongly disagree | Out lying towns like Murchison need to be developed to be stand alone independent towns. To expect the people of Murchison to support Richmond is like expecting people in Richmond to support Blenheim. You are I believe asking permission to spend huge amounts of money in Richmond at the expense of smaller towns. Bigger is not always better. |
| 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | Strongly disagree | yes I agree with the intensification of Nelson and Richmond. But the network of smaller settlements with provide for urban sprawl and is already doing this. Further this strategy will increase cars and traffic on roads and increase vehicle emissions . |
| 31571 Ms Susan Drew | Strongly disagree | I dont want intensification which can impact on my property in terms of buildings 6 storeys high, 3x3 townhouse built next door with out any consent. I rely on the council to protect my view and sunlight in the place I have chosen to live. |
| 31572 Mr David Todd | Strongly disagree | The objective to consolidate and intensify is vague and open to major errors in planning policy. |
| 31606 Mr Trent Shepard | Strongly disagree | From what I've read about turning existing neighbourhoods into free for all opportunities to cram 3 story buildings onto residential lots, next to single family homes, is a terrible idea. Why is this region growing right now? Is it because those fleeing big cities are wanting to go to other places where people are living on top of each other, trees are cut down around homes to make way for 3 story apartment buildings, and |
| | | |

| | | there's little privacy? No. It's the opposite. They want some space, space between them and the neighbour who may have Covid. Sun hitting their windows instead of a view of the wall of a building blocking the sun. One of the idea promoted for living with climate change is to shade your dwelling. I think the idea is to shade it with a tree in your garden, not a 3 story building. These new settlements in the lower Moutere, are people living there going to be competing for a place to ride or drive on two lane Highway 60, where we have every increasing congestion and accident numbers. |
|----------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | Strongly disagree | Definitely agree with intensification of Nelson City Centre and Richmond Town Centre but do not agree with the blanket regional smaller settlements. Greenfield development should be excluded till all other areas that already have some development are developed to their maximum capacity. The matai should be kept as a rural area for all the increasing residents can enjoy. |
| 31634 Ms Josephine Markert | Strongly disagree | I strongly oppose the "secondary proposal" with provision for "new communities" that would appear to be surplus to requirement and far from services and employment, especially in regards to the Tasman village. The proposed areas seem arbitrary, are poorly connected and are unlikely to develop into a compact village pattern. The proposed areas would add to land fragmentation and further compromise the productivity and character of our highly productive land. |
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | Strongly disagree | Please see attached - text copied below - I support the intensification of Nelson and Richmond town centres but I do not support further development of any new smaller settlements created on Greenfield sites |
| 31697 Robert King-Tenison | Strongly disagree | |
| 31706 Paul Donald Galloway | Strongly disagree | No Nelson and Richmond should not be intensified and consolidated. And NO to a network of small housing dormitories if it is what you mean by settlements! New small towns self sufficient thriving on their own creating new jobs new schools new opportunities in a friendly pleasant environment. |
| 31720 Ms Rainna Pretty | Strongly disagree | Strongly disagree to intensification - 4-6 storey buildings in The Wood. Developers don't have to provide off-street parking which will affect car parking availability on the street. 3x3 Townhouses can be built 1n from my boundary without consultation therefore no privacy, no view, no sunlight. |
| 31739 Philippa Hellyer | Strongly | |

| 31756 Ronald Alfred & Phylis Kinzett | Strongly disagree | Need smaller settlements to get around the parking problem. |
|---|----------------------|--|
| 31763 Susan Rogers | Strongly disagree | Survey is flawed from the beginning. You need to redesign this entire line of questioning. It leads only to answers desired by the maker of the survey. |
| 31777 Mr David Lucas | Strongly disagree | As mentioned elsewhere, high rise intensification will destroy the ambience of Nelson City to the point of making people think of living elsewhere. |
| 31830 K.M. McDonald | Strongly disagree | Please see attached Intensification destroys the character of areas people choose to live in because of pleasant suburban areas, not high rise apartments which destroy outlook - buildings, not hills or sky. |

03 Please indicate whether you support or do not support Outcome 3: New housing is focussed in areas where people have good access to jobs, services and amenities by public and active transport, and in locations where people want to live. Please explain your choice:

| 31114 Ms Jill Rogers | Agree | This is obvious but, as important is the fact those areas need to include land where crops can be grown and animals reared to feed the local people - as you say in your proposals reducing emissions means people should not need to travel by car so much. In all the areas you have outlined for new development you have not included this in your plan - it must be part of that. Huge growing/greenhouse areas when local people can work and grow their own food - that will bring employment and self sustainability - maybe done on a community level |
|-----------------------------------|-------|--|
| 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS | Agree | AGREE SUBJECT TO THE SAME BASIC QUESTION WHY DOES THE COUNCIL WANT TO EXPAND ITS EXISTING POPULATION AND ECONOMIC BASE. YOU RISK LOSING THE KEY STRENGTHS THAT TASMAN HAS TO OFFER CURRENTLYLOW POPULATION, CLEAN AIR, TOP CLASS TOURISM, STRONG AGRICULTURAL BASE AND DECENT WATER SUPPLY. |
| 31122 Mr Johan Thomas Wahlgren | Agree | A no brainer |
| 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | Agree | |
| 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren | Agree | As long it's not in any greenfield areas |
| 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert | Agree | |
| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | Agree | |
| 31165 Mr Vincent Dickie | Agree | |
| 31173 Mr Roderick Watson | Agree | |
| 31174 Ms Alison Westerby | Agree | |
| 31186 Mr Gary Scott | Agree | I agree that people should live where they work to reduce the daily commute. That's why I don't understand why people live in Richmond and work in Nelson. More intensified dwellings are required in both centers. |
| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | Agree | |
| 31192 Ms Rebecca Patchett | Agree | The term 'where people want to live' must be balanced by the amenities that already exist or are easily put in place. Just because someone wants to live there doesn't mean they shouldtake coastal properties for example. The same could be said for radically changing and potentially eroding the nature of a small community with limited options for affordable housing, jobs and public transport just because |
| | | |

| | | someone 'wants' to live there . Although I agree with the statement I don't agree with intensifying housing outside of Nelson, Richmond and Motueka. |
|-----------------------------|-------|---|
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | Agree | Transport options need to be already clearly delineated and supplied for, I do not support anything that would increase traffic in front of Central School, or along Nile Street. |
| 31216 Ms Judith Holmes | Agree | With provisos that: 1) poor quality land is used for housing NOT prime horticultural flat land! (as on the Waimea plains!!!) 2) some high-rise housing is provided. Paving and building urban sprawl on good agricultural land is no longer appropriate. |
| 31227 Ms Lee Eliott | Agree | |
| 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | Agree | My caveat is that Nelson's public transport is rather poor now you can get to work in the morning, but i you want to get home after 4 or 5pm, you're out of luck, especially if you want to go to one of the suburbs. |
| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | Agree | I agree but STRONGLY disagree with the specifications allowing for multiple storeys ANYWHERE apart from light industrial & industrial. Instead we should be building row houses, giving people access to outside, your own garden or outside entertainment area etc. And avoiding lack of socialisation, unwanted shadows & shade, cold, wind tunnels, lack of outdoor access etc. NO MORE APARTMENTS. |
| 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | Agree | |
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | Agree | If 'locations where people want to live' means life-style blocks or commuting from Wakefield, I don't agree. The rest I agree with. |
| 31248 Mr Will Bosnich | Agree | |
| 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan | Agree | Butnot at the expense of productive land and urban sprawl |
| 31262 Mr Martin John Shand | Agree | Would be great if it was possible. Unfortunately it is all dictated to by the developers. |
| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | Agree | |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | Agree | |
| 31278 Wendy Ross | Agree | "in locations where people want to live" quote from above - want to live is extremely important and I do not see people giving up sun and off street parking unless the housing is of a lower standard and could be used as rentals - which is not a good choice for the future of any town planning - people, by circumstance who rent are more transient that owners so care less about their surroundings - this could and would turn a great town planning idea into a possible slum. |
| | | |

| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | Agree | |
|---|-------|---|
| 31284 Mr Jarmo Saloranta | Agree | Agree only on the assumption that 'good access to jobs, services and amenities by public and active transport' does NOT mean that brand new areas such as the Tasman Village proposal are included, with only a 'promise' that new public transport, services and amenities will be provided at some point in the future. The outcome 3 should be supported in the sense that it is in areas that ALREADY have the required infrastructure in place. |
| 31286 Mr David Short | Agree | This makes perfect sense. |
| 31287 Ms Suzanne Bateup | Agree | Being able to live close to where we work and study builds strong neighbourhoods, communities and is healthier for people and the environment as we can use public and active transport |
| 31309 Mr & Mrs Rose & Phillip Windle | Agree | |
| 31316 John Heslop | Agree | With the increase in the cost of living, housing needs to be in close proximity to the work place for most low to medium income families. Higher density small sections smarter living is the only way the communities will be able to collectively support each other. Live, work and play within the same localized area will ensure the living amenity is protected by its own population. |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | Agree | This is a good idea as most infrastructure is already in place. |
| 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman | Agree | |
| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | Agree | |
| 31349 Laurien Heijs | Agree | Yes, however this should not trump the need to preserve areas that hold immense value to the community. For example the Maitai valley. Areas of high amenity, biodiversity, and/or productivity should be safeguarded. |
| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | Agree | Yes I agree, but "new housing" can no longer mean low density big houses spreading over rural land. New housing means the end of green field subdivision - these just encourage car use - and the beginning of multiple high rise in the centres. I think green field subdivision should be banned completely henceforth. We have enough houses and can't afford (GHG emissions) to build any more. Too bad. We have to build up in the centres and learn to live with this. The IPCC report MUST trump simple demand in many areas. If it doesn't, our part of the world will also be monstrously flooded or burnt repeatedly within decades, but then this may happen anyway now. |
| 31360 Ms Thuy Tran | Agree | Generally agree, with the caveat that 'good access' does not mean the council starting from scratch to CREATE that infrastructure in some future year. |
| 31364 Mrs Christine Tuffnell | Agree | But again Covid has shown us that most jobs can be done from home, and that most services can be |
| | | |

| | | purchased from home. It does require transport to deliver or collect. I dont think the FDS takes into account the way that society has changed over the last few years. Looking at NCC plans for the new library also - again, this service is likely to become a much more automated, online service, - not requiring a huge fancy building. There will still be considerable need for private transport - with a much higher percentage of the population being in the older age group biking and getting on and off public buses is not likely to be popular nor possible. |
|------------------------------|-------|--|
| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | Agree | In Golden Bay a definite trend of folks moving from cities and working remotely . I do not think the plan takes account of this sufficiently. |
| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | Agree | personal choices for living locations must be subsidiary to other qualifications stated |
| 31405 Mr Doug Hattersley | Agree | Again, loaded question - 'where people want to live' is subjective. Priority is intensification. |
| 31406 Ms Floortje van Lierop | Agree | I agree we need to build new housing where people have good access to jobs, services and amenities by public and active transport. The second part, 'in locations where people want to live' is an unclear addition. A place that initially may not appeal to people in its current state could very well be made more attractive e.g by well thought-through, high quality architectural tweaks and improved infrastructure. |
| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling | Agree | This general principal is sound but it may not be compatible with where people want to live if this is in vulnerable coastal area for exmple |
| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling | Agree | We need to reduce individual car usr. |
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | Agree | |
| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors | Agree | |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | Agree | I disagree with last part of this question "Location where people want to live " as this implies that if i wan to live anywhere I should expect council to create the opportunity to do so . This will result in haphazard development . |
| 31430 Muriel Moran | Agree | Where people want to live may pose some difficulty when that want is not sustainable. Many larger hectare properties are not climate friendly as they are further from all amenities and food sources requiring a lot of travel and often good land is lost to production. Green fields should not continue to be swallowed up to provide easy housing development. Many cities i New Zealand, Wellington, Dunedin, Oamaru and Timaru are built mostly on very hilly and some steep land. Just because there is flat land in Tasman it shouldn't automatically qualify for new housing. Quality agricultural land needs to be removed from any further development for housing. Has a survey offering a wide range of choices or asking for innovative suggestions been used to inform this plan before presentation to the public? |

| 31435 Mr Alan Eggers | Agree | The ability to be able to cycle to work and shops is really important. |
|----------------------------|-------|---|
| 31441 Mr Chris Head | Agree | As long as development is done in a way that "where people want to live" is consistent with creating a sustainable network of transport options, rather than making assumptions on where you think people might want to live without regard for how this could be sustainably achieved long-term. |
| 31449 Mr John Chisholm | Agree | |
| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | Agree | |
| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | Agree | In my opinion this means nearer to town centres - to say 'where people want to live 'is a distraction give the perceived desirability of so called lifestyle blocks etc. Living centrally has many advantages. |
| 31460 Kris Woods | Agree | |
| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | Agree | Building where the need and want lies sounds preferable to the opposite, as long as it remains somewhere desirable once it's built. |
| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | Agree | Yes, definitely this adds to quality of life for people / families as they have easy access to everything they need and of course GHG emissions are reduced. This is why development along SH6 seems a sensible option however, the proposed Tasman Village and Upper Moutere developments are too far away to allow for good access. If families were to move into these developed areas there would be a lot of travelling back and forth for education, employment and extra-curricular activities which many families take advantage of. Most of these activities, e.g. sports are based in Nelson, Stoke and Richmond. |
| 31484 Mr Gavin Brent Cook | Agree | There is very limited jobs outside of any main centre, having to travel will just create more greenhouse gases where not necessary |
| 31485 Ms Robin Schiff | Agree | with emphasis on access to jobs, services and amenities by public and safe active transport. |
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | Agree | |
| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | Agree | I agree with the outcome but I don't see how the strategy is going to achieve this as it is focused on too many greenfield developments far from jobs services and public transport |
| 31499 Ms Jane Fisher | Agree | Intensified areas near public transport need to be made attractive and desirable. |
| 31502 Ms Caroline Jones | Agree | But do not think the planned sections in Rangihaeata is ideal in fact I oppose the idea for 50 sections I applaud TDC for looking at solutions to housing but 50 sections in a small rural settlement is way too many That's at least 100 more cars a day on a small narrow country Rd There is no cycle lane to town In fact it is a very unsatisfactory unsafe cycle to Takaka from Rangihaeata |

| | | I would support 10 houses on the proposed land and opening up subdivision in Rangihaeata to all properties in Rangihaeata over 5 acres Land closer to Takaka township would be ideal for families so they could walk cycle hence reducing |
|-----------------------------|-------|---|
| | | emissions |
| 31511 Mr Vincent Riepen | Agree | Need to plan for the future. Not wind the clock back on past planning rules and regulations that community have built their lives around. |
| 31520 Andrew Stirling | Agree | |
| 31529 Mr Steven King-Turner | Agree | |
| 31551 Mrs Jo Kitchen | Agree | Better public transport has been a requirement for some time now in our region. |
| 31560 Ms Steph Watts | Agree | |
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | Agree | |
| 31572 Mr David Todd | Agree | |
| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | Agree | I agree with most of the statement, except the part that states 'in locations where people want to live'. Any housing that is build will have people wanting to live there, pretty much regardless of the location. |
| 31579 Jane Tate | Agree | |
| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | Agree | As above that's the way it is nowallow natural progressiondon't force it |
| 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz | Agree | |
| 31588 pene Greet | Agree | People should live within easy reach of their workplaces. |
| 31591 Mr Ben Edwards | Agree | |
| 31595 Gary Clark | Agree | Housing needs to have employment opportunities nearby. |
| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | Agree | However I absolutely do not agree with Greenfields development in the Maitai Valley. I believe housing should be intensified in existing areas within city boundaries |
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | Agree | It seems fairly clear that people 'want to live' anywhere they can find a house in the region. Look at the demand for Richmond West! I would delete the wording "in locations where people want to live" as this not about Councils following the market, rather they should be setting the appropriate approach. |
| 31608 Robbie Thomson | Agree | While there will be more people working from home as an economical model, and a preference for many, there will still be jobs to travel to. Distances should be as short as practicable, and public transport user friendly. Cycleways added to what's there already and enhanced. |
| | | |

| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | Agree | I agree this would be good. Not sure that you really support this when there is so much mention of new greenfield sites. As an example, I am concerned at plans to build high density housing in Tahunanui, while Tahunanui Drive is to become the main state roadway. This will effectively cut the suburb in two, with a massive semi-highway going through, alongside increased strain in existing infrastructure, a lack of parking, increased pressure on sewage, water, power, schools, health services. A lack of a supermarket is already causing residents to have no choice but to drive to the supermarket. A proposed re-routing of bus services away from most houses on the flat part of Tahunanui. This is the opposite of your objective outcome, but is already, in part, happening. |
|-----------------------|-------|--|
| 31614 Mr mark Morris | Agree | See attached submission. Summarised - T-112 Residential Intensification Future Development Area on the church property at 123 Salisbury Road, Richmond. |
| 31617 Ms steph jewell | Agree | I agree with new housing in the 'brownfield' environment. "Where people want to live" is evasive. We all need re-educating about apartment living instead of 1/4 acre paradise. No-one wants to be boxed into some badly designed shoebox. So apartments must be attractive to the eye as well as beautifully designed for living. Warm and light is everybody's right in this country, and doesn't have to be top dollar, although I have read that developers don't make as much money as they would on greenfield sites. |
| 31620 Mr Paul Baigent | Agree | |
| 31622 Peter Butler | Agree | |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | Agree | At face value this question (and by inference the thinking behind it) makes an assumption about linear relationships and the drivers of development. It fails to acknowledge a complex, interconnected, and dynamic system. It ignores both suppressed demand and latent potential. |
| | | For example, just because people currently 'want' to live in a location, doesn't mean they should! Similarly, it's not to say that they wouldn't like to live somewhere else if that somewhere else was better planned/integrated. |
| | | Again, jobs; living. The two need to be constantly, responsively, contextually harmonised; guided by an underlying strategy that respects the context of our land and culture. |
| | | Locals currently seem to 'want' to carve rural land across the Moutere, rendering giant sections and sparse costly infrastructure (or is it just that's the only place expedient to purchase, consent, and build?); the same 'want' to work in town and drive for 40-120 minutes of the day to get to work (or is it just that we haven't had the foresight to develop light industrial zoning in the Moutere that might have employed them?). A business hub next to good power and fibre internet? A small tech park? |

| | | - I would! I'm a returned engineer experienced in mechatronics/transport/built environment and interested in the future of sustainable technologies, with a network of colleagues up and down country who'd love to move somewhere like Nelson if it offered more than sheep and urban sprawl. The reality is a number of friends (I'm talking 30's, 40's, career peak) have tried; couldn't get a place to live in Nelson; couldn't see any hope with facilities outside of the centre. So they gave up and left. There's a limited few of us capable of operating remotely from home. It gives me a headache to think how I'd ever scale from a small remote team to local offices and workshop space; while keeping the local community and lifestyle I value on family land in the Moutere; and minimising travel emissions for myself and staff. We've failed to provide jobs and more particularly compact HUBS in all across the region. While |
|-----------------------------|-------|--|
| | | conversely we've failed to provide affordable accommodation, healthy dense centres, proximate green belts, active mode infrastructure etc etc in Nelson/Richmond/ Motueka. |
| 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | Agree | |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | Agree | |
| 31632 Ms Jacquetta Bell QSM | Agree | We agree with Outcome 3, but realise the challenge is in defining what "good access" means. If it means low-emissions mobility and minimal reliance on private cars, then we strongly agree. |
| 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin | Agree | |
| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | Agree | |
| 31647 Mrs Rebecca Parish | Agree | |
| 31651 Dr Patrick Conway | Agree | |
| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | Agree | Also start some shared rides or new transport routes. Best to follow your statement but also understanding that it won't always be the case. Some people want to live out of the way, etc. |
| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | Agree | Our development areas in Marsden Valley and Ngawhatu Valley are within close proximity to Stoke, Richmond, Airport & Industry. The greenfield development areas are not high/valuable productive areas. |
| 31679 T R Carmichael | Agree | Agree from Question 3 to Question 7 |
| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | Agree | This implies most new housing will be in a around Nelson-Richmond-Brightwater-Wakefield corridor which has the jobs, public transport and amenities for residents of all age groups. It should NOT mean that just because people may want to live is smaller rural communities that these settlements are forced to provide thousands of new homes that will completely change the character of such areas. |
| | | |

| | | Furthermore, given these communities largely support/service the existing rural agriculture/orchard/vineyard businesses, we struggle to see how thousands of new residents will find work locally, thus they will be forced to commute into Nelson-Richmond. Why not just provide more housing options there? |
|--------------------------------|-------|--|
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | Agree | The challenge comes where people want to live in smaller settlements because of their character and charm but then these are intensified, hence losing those aspects |
| 31692 Mr Alasdair Gardiner | Agree | |
| 31697 Robert King-Tenison | Agree | |
| 31703 Ms Paula Holden | Agree | I agree as long as productive land is not continually smothered by single dwellings. We can build smarter than that! Recent history & the impact on global supply chains has reminded us of the importance of cherishing our productive horticulture land close to Nelson. Also, I don't believe housing should cover the beautiful Maitai Valley. It's a treasured place for the whole community and should be protected & enhanced not smothered & the river polluted by the impacts of housing & it's stormwater runoff etc. |
| 31704 Mr Paul Bucknall | Agree | This outcome is contradictory. The activity in the market and the growth we have seen suggests many people want to live in places not connected to amenities by public and active transport. I think we need some lateral thinking to join the dots here. A suggestion of a new settlement is interesting - but it must be done in such a way as to provide the amenities, jobs and services nearby or as connected by public transport (that people will still use when it's cold and wet). |
| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | Agree | I am endorsing the Nelson Tasman Climate Forum's view . Forum response: We agree with planning for high accessibility to jobs, services and amenities by public and active transport, but not with allowing greenfield development 'where(ever) people want to live'. This outcome will be accomplished only by intensification of current urban areas, by measures to ensure affordability and by effective public transport We know from Council planning data that some people would prefer to live in urban areas, but are forced to commute from rural areas because they can't afford urban housing. In addition to projected population increases, we need to plan for housing people of our region who are displaced by sea level rise, other climate impacts and 'insurance retreat', and possibly, climate-forced migration and managed retreat. All of these groups will need intensified, affordable urban housing. Provision for public transport outside Nelson and Richmond is extremely bad in this region. Plans for improvement in the Regional Land Transport Plan are slow and seriously unambitious in terms of emissions reductions. Any greenfield development will bring more cars onto the roads, increasing carbon emissions, air pollution, noise, traffic congestion, road accidents and severance of communities. It will increase demands for new roading which will compound the problem. We oppose greenfield development, |

| | | allowing for a few possible, well-justified exceptions. (Can you, planners, justify it to your grandchild living in a hotter, depleted world?) We would like to see planners bold enough to draw a line around our towns and say 'no development beyond here', protecting agricultural and wild land. We would like planners to be guided by the concept of the '15 or 20 minute city'. We think the 30 minute standard you have used in your accessibility assessment (p88 of the Technical Document for the FDS) is too long to support the transport mode shift we regard as essential. Many people will want to jump in a car rather than walk 30 minutes. If this planning is done well, with people having easy access to workplaces, education, health care, leisure areas, goods and services etc, a sense of convivial community will be fostered, enhancing wellbeing. Such planning is occurring in cities all over the world, facilitated by new methodology. We are aware that developers will lobby for greenfield development, and trust that planners will not put their interests ahead of our obligation to be |
|-------------------------------|-------|--|
| 31710 Ms Angela Fitchett | Agree | Of course! But I am not sure how the Greenfield's developments proposed will allow this objective to be met. Also, the phrase "where people want to live", is questionable. What if they want to live in places that will cause problems for infrastructure, increase emissions and. in coastal areas, create costs (eg relocation) that will be borne by future ratepayers? Peoples' desire should not be a driver of planning. Council expertise is needed to guide good choices, surely? |
| 31718 Kathryn & Keith Quigley | Agree | |
| 31721 Ms Jill Cullen | Agree | I support more intensive housing in Nelson & Richmond. I don't agree with the urban sprawl on horticulture & agricultural land. |
| 31722 Trevor Chang | Agree | however not necessarily in locations where people want to live. Where people want to live and where people need to live are two entirely separate issues. |
| 31726 Mr John Jackson | Agree | Agree in principle. However, information is needed in these areas to confirm level of support: 1) How will the locations of facilities (shops, schools, parks, health, etc) be optimised? Will there be a policy of the X-minute community and, if so, how will inequity at the tail-end of the distribution of housing be avoided? 2) What scenarios have been considered for resilience in the event of inundation, earthquake, flood, etc.? |
| 31742 Mr tim manning | Agree | But why is a new settlement in Tasman village proposed when it involves destruction of productive land, increased car usage and the need for a substantial investment in infrastructure? Will those who live there and work in Motueka, Richmond, Stoke or Nelson really take the bus to work or go by bicycle rather than by car? |
| | | |

| Please see attached: Also focus on areas which already have infrastructure. Each building/dwelling as sel contained as possible e.g collection of water stored on property, energy from solar (or wind) on property access to composting facilities. |
|---|
| |
| |
| Strongly agree regarding transport. |
| |
| Agree, this supports outcome 1 and reduction of GHG emissions as well as providing a better work/life balance |
| |
| |
| |
| City centres are not the place for low cost housing. A greater focus on making areas |
| Basically agree but "where people want to live" is not necessarily the overall optimum outcome. Encouragement of Nelson City/Richmond & Motueka as the primary population centres and leave the rural townships as they are (Tapawera/Tasman etc.) Otherwise the whole region will become one great urban sprawl. |
| Please see attached This assumes that major growth is inevitable and a good thing. New housing demands earth's resources and contributes to global warming/climate change. |
| |
| The plans will destroy the character of current neighbourhoods. |
| We have noooo public transport in Golden bay |
| New housing should indeed be focused on where jobs and amenities are. However, very few people would want to commute to Richmond from Mapua, Wakefield or Brightwater by 'active transport'. The possibility of going shopping at PaknSave by bike from these areas is zero. These are pleasant places to live, but there are few jobs there. Outcome 3 is not achieved by the plans proposed. |
| |

| 31264 Ms Maxine Leaning | Disagree | My concern is that buildings adjacent to my property will block the sun from my vegetable plot. The cost of food rising rapidly means my own productive garden is very important to me and my family. |
|-------------------------------------|----------|---|
| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | Disagree | The core plan largely meets this goal, however, again the Tasman Bay Village option does not provide good access to jobs, services and amenities by public and active transport. |
| 31322 Mrs BARBARA AND TIM ROBSON | Disagree | If people choose to live in greenfield development then it will bring more cars onto the roads, increasing carbon emissions, air pollution, noise, traffic congestion, road accidents and severance of communities. It will increase demands for new roading which will compound the problem of high emissions. |
| 31355 Mr Barney Hoskins | Disagree | I support in principle however I do not support intensification to 6 stories in Tahunanui. This would take away from the community feel as well as create issues with access and safety, particularly if intensification took place around the intersection at Tahunanui drive and Bisley Ave. There are many young children and families that use this area and congestion is already an issue without the additional of this level of intensification. I do however support the intensification up to 3 stories and in some cases 3-4 story low rise residential intensification (including mixed use). Focus on intensification in main centres should be the key focus (Nelson city and Richmond in particular) as this will ensure that transport requirements and emissions are reduced and dwellings are in the most appropriate locations in relation to employment opportunities and services. This will also ensure that when investment in infrastructure is required it is not to geographically broad. |
| 31395 Ms Gretchen Holland | Disagree | I disagree if these area are anywhere in the Maitai Valley but especially Kaka Valley and Orchard Flat |
| 31403 Mr Richard Deck | Disagree | People should be able to live where they want too. |
| 31410 Mr Scott Smithline | Disagree | Access to jobs via public transport or safe cycling only. Discourage automobiles & travel distance as it violates climate crisis thinking. |
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | Disagree | in some areas or the FDS it is, in others not. New housing is not the whole answer |
| | | Review of housing occupancy is needed as there is a huge portion of the existing housing capacity used for low density occupancy (people per household) or other commercial use (eg holiday houses / Air BnB). The traditional NZ model of low density housing on large land areas with very low occupancy is not logical to continue, the FDS doesn't address any of these issues. |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas Hollyman | Disagree | A lot of people like to live in rural areas & not neccessarily have public transport to work |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | Disagree | It is not because people want to live in a certain area that space must become available. |
| 31492 Anton, Benni, Shalom, AJ | Disagree | If people choose to live in greenfield development then it will bring more cars onto the roads, increasing |
| | | |

| | Bank, Bonnin, Shalom Davis | | carbon emissions, air pollution, noise, traffic congestion, road accidents and severance of communities. It will increase demands for new roading which will compound the problem of high emissions. |
|-------|-------------------------------|----------|---|
| 31505 | Cheryl Heten | Disagree | City dwelling commercial buildings potential change of use to new multi story housing. |
| 31521 | Mrs Marie Waterhouse | Disagree | |
| 31523 | Ms karen steadman | Disagree | Following on from the previous statement you are of the mindset of forcing people to live near the biggest town in the TDC area, I guess for the reason its cheaper for the council to provide infrastructure. Your desire to support people to live in the areas they wish to live is at the bottom of the consideration list. Jobs are wide spread and the way in which people do work is a fast changing model. |
| 31554 | Wendy Barker | Disagree | Again, a many-pronged question. There are many areas of new housing in the Nelson/Tasman area where people are living who do not need access to jobs. Either they are retired, or are living off savings (eg many of the wealthy immigrants who build/buy big expensive homes, or they can work from home. This phenomenon is here to stay. |
| 31570 | Ms Annabel Norman | Disagree | |
| 31645 | Mrs Karin Klebert | Disagree | There has to be new thinking. |
| 31706 | Paul Donald Galloway | Disagree | its about where people CAN live not where they WANT to live when cities have attained a comfortable pleasant thriving size, other options other location are offered to create revive new towns. |
| 31711 | Sara Flintoff | Disagree | No public transport in Murchison. |
| 31741 | Mr Robert Stevenson | Disagree | |
| 31744 | Mrs Lorna CRANE | Disagree | We believe that new housing should be developed in areas where people want to live. This may not necessarily be where there are jobs. Provision should be made for a variety of living styles including "off grid". |
| 31775 | Dr Thomas Carl | Disagree | |
| 31791 | Peter Olorenshaw | Disagree | Please see attached - determined Disagree from submission: A: No. Although we strongly support the first part of the question, the last part needs qualification. As we show in the rest of our submission, the Demand preferences survey is flawed as the only constraint on location (we believe) was price. The thing is we can't all live in spread out single story houses and expect to be able to easily drive into town centres in just a few minutes and park right outside where we want to go - it just doesn't work in other than small provincial centres. Richmond is not longer a small provincial town, it is an urban centre, really a conurbation with Nelson and Stoke. When everyone lives in sprawling low density subdivisions and everyone drives everywhere (because everything is so spread out its too far to bike, certainly to far to walk and public transport doesn't work because it's such low density), you |

| | | inevitably end up with massive road congestion like we see in this region. So really the Demand Preferences study should have said, "Would you be prepared to live in a more compact townhouse where you could easily walk to many places, very easily bike to most of the rest and due to increased density have very frequent public transport, rather than being forced into car dependency and traffic jambs every weekday and often during the weekend". And you need to show some appealing medium density housing pictures illustrating what this might be like otherwise what can you expect but biased negative responses— Please see the attached Appendix for some examples you should have used. |
|----------------------------|---------------|--|
| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | Don't know | |
| 31369 Mr Joseph Blessing | Don't know | |
| 31473 Mr Andrew Downs | Don't know | |
| 31598 Mrs Nicola Worsfold | Don't know | |
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | Don't know | |
| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | Don't know | Not answering any of these leading questions |
| 31784 Ms Teresa James | Don't know | |
| 31809 Mr Andrew Spittal | Don't know | Mapua is a very popular place to live given that it is conveniently located between Motueka and Richmond, and with a lot to offer in terms of amenities and lifestyle. The qualities of this environment, coupled with its location, as such that the FDS 2022 should provide for its growth to meet the growing needs and demands. |
| 31363 Mr Steve Cross | N/A | I reject the premise of this question |
| 31623 Ms Lucy Charlesworth | N/A | I am wary of answering these questions as I cannot be sure of how they will be interpreted. So I will state I do not agree with developing green spaces. These spaces need to be reserved and protected to allow for sustainable biodiversity and for future generations. Intensification within Nelson CBD needs to be a priority. I do not agrees with building on Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. I do not agree with housing development on green fields. There is a climate emergency. Remove these areas from the FDS. |
| 31118 Ms Sarah Varey | Neutral | |
| | | |

| 31129 Mrs Gaynor Brooks | Neutral | |
|---------------------------------------|---------|--|
| 31247 Mr yuri aristarco | Neutral | |
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | Neutral | Classic example of a question searching for a required answer by the questionner where a yes/no response is impossible - clearly most people will answer yes to this but if the question said "on greenfield sites" many would answer no. |
| 31261 Mr John Weston | Neutral | as infrastructure and Transport facilities improve there is nothing to stop people living in the hillside areas. (please see my main argument at the back of the submission). |
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | Neutral | There is a danger that the natural aspects of this area might be overwhelmed by houses and traffic. |
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | Neutral | As long as productive land is not compromised because of wants. Productive land is an essential need and needs to be preserved as taonga. |
| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | Neutral | Not absolutely sure we need any new buildings, however it does make sense to locate them where people want to live. |
| 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | Neutral | We must stop right now, using arable land for spreading housing settlements. People need a house, to be sure, but they also need food, and it's silly to build houses where food was grown before. We still need the horticulture which sustains our people. By building apartments, going vertical, people can live in apartments where there is good access to jobs, service and amenities by public and active transport, and in locations whre people want to live. |
| 31347 Ms Paula Baldwin | Neutral | Yes, it would be fabulous to start with a clean page and design living in areas where people have good access to jobs, services and amenities by public and active transport - but we're not discussing starting afresh. This discussion is about how to manage the living style and value of the existing Tahunanui area. Tahunanui has been settled since the late 1800s. The 1910 Declaration of Trust states land was for the "health, amusement and instruction of the inhabitants of the City of Nelson". This isn't a pocket of an area next to or within Tahunanui - Tahunanui is to be enjoyed as a vibrant community, not intensive urban development. |
| 31358 George Harrison | Neutral | |
| 31365 michael monti | Neutral | |
| 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer | Neutral | |
| 31434 Mrs cushla Moorhead | Neutral | I feel there are two statements here that could be at opposite purposes. Where people want to live might not be where they should. |
| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn Ball | Neutral | Residential development in the regions result in increased commuter traffic. |

| 31443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | Neutral | I do support the first part of the question but not if that means developing new suburbs in the first instance. As in my previous comment: there should be a halt on building low density suburbs until all options of intensification have been taken. Building transport infra structure to new sprawling suburbs is extremely costly and if done, is taking up green spaces that could be otherwise used productively. |
|------------------------------|---------|--|
| 31452 Mr David Bartle | Neutral | Locations where people want to live is too non-specific. Livability is changing and hard to predict. Outcome 3, as stated, is a lost opportunity to highlight cycling/walking feasibility and also key safety and risk considerations including from sea-level rise, earthquakes and extreme weather. |
| 31454 Mrs Tracey Koole | Neutral | |
| 31457 Mr J Santa Barbara | Neutral | Existing settlement areas need to be transformed to medium density mixed use. These areas should be made attractive and their advantages marketed to make them where people want to live. People are too likely to currently want detached single family homes, which should be discouraged. Simply "leaving it to the market" will not yield good outcomes. |
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | Neutral | |
| 31480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | Neutral | |
| 31481 Mrs Lucy Harrhy | Neutral | New housing would be best for intensifying existing main centres and not at the expense of good, fertile land for growing food. |
| 31483 Debbie Hampson | Neutral | |
| 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | Neutral | |
| 31508 Mr Roger Barlow | Neutral | Public transport is almost non existent. Travelling distances around the area are minimal so not an issue. |
| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard | Neutral | This is a poor question, as so many factors are not considered in the question. I agree that new housing should enable active transport (i.e., intensification). Please also consider that the public wants to protect some areas from development (e.g., the Maitai Valley). |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | Neutral | Agee with most of Outcome 3 but 'and in locations where people want to live' doesn't give regard to how people want to live. The current march of 'Berryfield' type developer-led soul-less suburbs across the region give no housing solutions to retired couples who want to downsize nor young families who want to enter the market - given the price tag, the lot sizes and the absence of green spaces to socialise /remain connected. |
| 31558 Mr Steve Jordan | Neutral | |
| 31574 Mr David Bolton | Neutral | |
| 31580 Jenny Long | Neutral | I strongly support having public and active transport being a key focus and a deciding factor in where new |
| | | |

| | | housing is focused. I'm less supportive of the idea of building housing in "locations where people want to live" because it is subjective and unrealistic given other constraints - protecting the environment and protecting society from the effects of climate change is more critical than this. We need to help people live in a more environmentally-friendly manner by building housing that enables them do so by default. |
|---------------------------------|---------|---|
| 31604 Mr Peter Moot | Neutral | |
| 31606 Mr Trent Shepard | Neutral | That is an overly broad outcome. |
| 31628 Mr Daniel Levy | Neutral | |
| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | Neutral | |
| 31631 Mrs Joy Shackleton | Neutral | |
| 31636 Joanna Santa Barbara | Neutral | We agree with planning for high accessibility to jobs, services and amenities by public and active transport, but not with allowing greenfield development 'where(ever) people want to live'. |
| | | File uploaded. |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | Neutral | |
| 31641 Mr Stephen (Steve) Hayden | Neutral | The proposed Braeburn settlement is close to existing settlements. Unaware there will be enough work. Public transport will need to be developed - there is hardly any |
| 31643 Inge Koevoet | Neutral | Agree, if thats actually what the council is doing but they are not. Just build, build, build without consideration of infrastructure. |
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | Neutral | Agree conditionally - however this is a poorly framed outcome as it is impossible to create unless the housing provided is permitted to be medium or intensive housing. Recommend the proposed FDS focus on creating more attractive medium and high density housing areas ie areas with cycling and walking access to parks, schools etc. Otherwise urban sprawl creates car dependency and associated traffic congestion and its associated noise and air pollution and undermines the idea of "good access". |
| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | Neutral | |
| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | Neutral | |
| 31688 Gerard McDonnell | Neutral | Nelson and Richmond own centres must be made more attractive and vibrant so that people want to live in them |
| | | |

| 31695 Christine Horner | Neutral | Agree with where people want to live. |
|----------------------------|----------------|--|
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | Neutral | See attached submission. Summarised - suggested change: "in locations thats avoid incompatible activities and where people want to live" |
| 31716 Mr Alan hart | Neutral | |
| 31734 Eric Thomas | Neutral | But not everyone must live in Richmond/Nelson. We have to have growth in our smaller areas both for our areas to alleviate pressure on bigger areas provides for all life styles. |
| 31751 Hazel Pearson | Neutral | |
| 31752 Jill Pearson | Neutral | |
| 31762 Mr Mark Hewetson | Neutral | transport is a personal choice |
| 31765 Mrs Lorna Ivy Cooper | Neutral | |
| 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | Strongly agree | |
| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | Strongly agree | |
| 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | Strongly agree | Providing amenity (sites for pre-school and local shops) must be part of the cost of development, and borne by the developer. |
| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | Strongly agree | This is sensible in existing urban areas, where there are plenty of existing jobs, services, amenities and public transport. |
| 31130 Trevor James | Strongly agree | |
| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson | Strongly agree | As above. Services and amenities should be local, accessible by foot or bicycles as much as possible. |
| 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward | Strongly agree | Housing should be focussed in areas where the infrastructure already exists, or can be easily extended 'Locations where people want to live' is a very ambiguous statement which needs clarifying. |
| 31143 Ms Prudence Roborgh | Strongly agree | Environmental reasons . Less cars on road , |
| 31171 Ms Sallie Griffiths | Strongly agree | |
| | Strongly | |

| | agree | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | Strongly agree | People want to have it on their doorstep, and don't want to travel. |
| 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | Strongly agree | As is happening and working well around the world, localised and consolidated housing creates a vibe that is beneficial to the city and the surrounding suburbs. Brisbane, is a good example of areas that were of no value that once intensified housing and commercial occurred, locations became destinations. |
| 31240 Michael Markert | Strongly agree | stop the spread, intensify, bring jobs and housing together See the proposed Eco Apartments on Buxton Square |
| 31250 Mr Richard Wyles | Strongly agree | The Golden Bay housing market is characterised by strong demand and limited supply. The FDS promotes specific outcomes, namely: "new housing is focused in areas where people have good access to jobs, services and amenities" Access to affordable housing is desperately needed in and around Takaka. In addition to the new zones identified, TDC should consider the rezoning of 89 Abel Tasman Drive. It is already surrounded by residential housing, is low value rural land which has already been subdividied to the point where it is sub-scale for productive rural use. |
| 31257 Mr Kent Inglis | Strongly agree | Proximity to your place of employment and recreational activities and services are key drivers when people considering locations in which to live. |
| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | Strongly agree | |
| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | Strongly agree | But see how some of the proposed greenfield sites simply do not give good (any) access to jobs, services and amenities. Particularly T136 |
| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | Strongly agree | Urban design has to address a reduction in car use by providing useful and safe active transport infrastructure, and housing near services and jobs. |
| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley | Strongly agree | |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | Strongly agree | Except that planning is required to ensure that even if the rural residential is wanted it is not necessarily allowed if it requires increased commuting. This FDS must lead the way, not follow the whim of ad hoc rural development |
| 31285 Dr Hamish Holland | Strongly agree | TI36 fails to satisfy any requirement for good access to jobs, services and amenities by public transport. |
| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | Strongly agree | Traffic is a major problem in this region and therefore new housing should be in the towns where public transport is available. |

| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | Strongly agree | Commuting is not NOT the way of the future. I feel the next generation is already showing a greater need and desire to have a new and modern attitude for a healthy balance of life/work /play. I think the next generation is already looking towards the future and rather than be the slave to the land and look after gardens, mowing lawns etc and the costs of maintaining a large Home or even the desire to have a small Holding is not a dream. The cost and thought of commuting be it driving, shared or car pooling or public transport is also personal time used and often full of frustration because of traffic or services. I feel that most young people are keen to participate in sport, outdoor activities, team sports and/or explore, they want time to socialise, be active in social or community activities and involved in shared/community gardens or to be entertained, dine out or simply rest. Therefore I believe the intensified housing is the best plan forward. Homes that are available, affordable and close to all services A quality built home that has all the comfort and virtually no to low maintenance is what many will be wanting and I think that councils should be planning for this now. |
|----------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31306 Mr Jaye Barr | Strongly agree | |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | Strongly agree | Please see attached for further detail: Summarised below: People may be financially unable to live where they want. Developers pipe the tune of where people may live. "last part? People may be financially unable to live where they want. Developer pipe the tune of where people may live. If they build a house people will buy it. Same as? - build more roads, more they get used by car. Grid lock is only solved by reducing single car usage. People are living in 4 bedroom homes |
| | | when a two bedroom small home would be sufficient. They are not family homes. Purchasers only buy 4-bedroom homes becuase that is all there is. Developers build 4 bedroom homes to make as much money out of property as they can" |
| 31318 Mrs Isobel Mosley | Strongly agree | |
| 31325 Dr Ann Briggs | Strongly agree | I strongly agree with the statement as a principle, but the current proposals do not meet this outcome. Access to jobs, services, amenities and public transport is not available in all areas designated for growth. |
| 31328 Ms Karen du Fresne | Strongly agree | I agree, but we need a well-planned public education campaign to ensure people understand the implications of their choices. Too many people are still happy to build on land subject to sea level rise and/or flooding, and too many people do not yet accept that the footprint of an average new build in this |
| | | |

| | | country is unsustainably large. |
|------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31334 Diane Sutherland | Strongly agree | Strongly agree BUT many of the greenfield developments proposed in the strategy are actually located far away from any jobs and will only lead to more cars on the road, not less. |
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | Strongly agree | Yes, totally, therefore include Motueka as such a hub, and not open up new 'smaller settlements' |
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | Strongly agree | Absolutely! That would immediately cut down how much time we spend in our cars. There are so many better things I can think of for spending my time, than sitting in a traffic jam. Also, with the price of petrol today, not everybody can afford commuting long distances anymore. |
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | Strongly agree | I strongly agree as this seems to cover all basis when you say, 'and in locations where people want to live |
| 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | Strongly agree | Exactly! - Please amend the strategy accordingly to ensure that all growth will actually happen close to work and public transport! |
| 31346 Martin Hartman | Strongly agree | Please amend the strategy accordingly to ensure that all growth will actually happen close to work and public transport! |
| 31356 Stephen Williams | Strongly agree | Being able to live close to where you work reduces the impact on the environment and increases one's quality of life through reduced commuting and closer community ties. |
| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | Strongly agree | Especially locations where people want to live |
| 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | Strongly agree | As above |
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | Strongly agree | Strongly agree with the objective. Absolutely! That would immediately cut down how much time is being spent behind the wheel. There are so many better things I can think of for spending my time, than sitting in a traffic jam. Also, with the price of petrol today, not everybody can afford commuting long distances anymore. However, I'm not sure that the 2 of 16 NelsonTasman2050 - Future Development Strategy 2022-2052 proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. Many of the greenfield developments proposed in the strategy are actually located far away from any jobs and will only lead to more cars on the road, not less. |
| 31373 Ms Jenny Daniell | Strongly agree | |

| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | Strongly agree | As above |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31384 Mr Jace Hobbs | Strongly agree | |
| 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann | Strongly agree | |
| 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett | Strongly agree | use, and if necessary expand existing facilities. To expensive to create new facilities from the ground up. |
| 31400 Miss Heather Wallace | Strongly agree | Climate change issues and productive land must be maintained for production. |
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | Strongly agree | I do not agree with the part of the statement that says "locations where people want to live". That will lead to more greenfield development. |
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle | Strongly agree | Absolutely! That would immediately cut down how much time we spend in our cars. There are so many better things I can think of for spending my time, than sitting in a traffic jam. Also, with the price of petrol today, not everybody can afford commuting long distances anymore. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. Many of the greenfield developments proposed in the strategy are actually located far away from any jobs and will only lead to more cars on the road, not less. |
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin | Strongly agree | Yes please. But many of the greenfield sites proposed in this strategy are too far away from work and schools and this will only encourage more car use. |
| 31415 Mrs Zanahe Ruth Galloway | Strongly agree | Controlled limited population growth to its Center of town might be acceptable as we are in a Climate Change Emergency and Nelson cannot afford to overgrow its population because of its natural difficult geography with very limited numbers of roads to access and exit in case of extreme weather events like floods and fires. It is not about where people WANT to live it is about where people CAN live to make it sustainable ecological in line with the latest IPCC report. |
| 31416 Tim Leyland | Strongly agree | Many of the greenfield developments proposed in the strategy are arguably located far away from jobs and services. We would like to see more thought in how to make some of the rural townships such as Tapawera more viable. There is considerable and growing amounts work in this area in the agriculture sector around Tapawera. We also have an aging population that would prefer to live closer to their roots than move to Nelson or Richmond or Motueka. |
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | Strongly agree | The proposed strategy will simply not achieve this. The Greenfield developments will increase the use of cars, the amount of traffic on the road, emissions, time wasted commuting, unhealthy lifestyles, and |
| | | |

| | | financial drain with increasing cost of petrol. |
|---------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31422 Mrs Marga Martens | Strongly agree | New housing should be focused in areas where people have good access to jobs, services and amenities. The greenfield developments don't provide for that. They just create more commuter traffic. |
| 31423 Mr Roger Frost | Strongly agree | |
| 31431 Katerina Seligman | Strongly agree | |
| 31438 Aleisha Hosie | Strongly agree | Yes, People need access to all of the above to be able to positively participate in the community |
| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | Strongly agree | All planning has to start from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
| 31472 Dr David Briggs | Strongly agree | This is, of course, sensible if we want to reduce GHG emissions and create stable sustainable communities. It impolies, however, that these facilities are designed-in from the start, under a process that is led and supervised by the Council - not left to private developers. The key to achieving this aim is proper, interventionist planning. |
| 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon | Strongly agree | |
| 31487 Ms Heather Spence | Strongly agree | My points in previous questions apply. |
| 31488 Annette Starink | Strongly agree | Common sense. No cars Good for environment Good for mental and physical health. Healthy happy community |
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | Strongly agree | This would immediately cut down how much time we spend in our cars. There are so many better things could be doing with my time, rathber than sitting in a traffic jam. Also, with the price of petrol today, not everybody can afford commuting long distances anymore. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. Many of the greenfield developments proposed in the strategy are |
| | | |

| | | actually located far away from any jobs and will only lead to more cars on the road, not less plus the associated extra vehicle movements outside travelling to and from work. |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | Strongly agree | Absolutely, cuts down time in cars and reduce carbon emissions. Strategy only plays lip-service to this outcome. and does not deliver on it. Many of greenfield sites are located far from jobs only leading to more cars not less |
| 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | Strongly agree | However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. Many of the greenfield developments proposed in the strategy are actually located far away from any jobs and will only lead to more cars on the road, not less. |
| 31496 Mrs Petra Dekker | Strongly agree | refer attachment: This should be the objective. That would drastically cut down the reliance on cars. I |
| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless | Strongly agree | |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne | Strongly agree | central city should have intensified housing. |
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | Strongly agree | access to jobs and services are essential for reducing traffic, but where are the jobs for the greenfield developments? |
| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | Strongly agree | I strongly agree with the first part of this Outcome, but the locations for future development should be limited to those that contribute to GHG emissions reductions and are not threatened by likely sea level rise. |
| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | Strongly agree | Strongly agree, for the reasons given above. Improvements to the transport network, in particular walking and cycling links and public transport, are vital as this supports positive health and environmental wellbeing. This type of investment supports intensification as many residents may decide not to own private vehicles. |
| 31515 Geoffrey Vause | Strongly agree | Living in areas with increase population density facilitates social engagement vastly more than in lower density areas remote from social facilities. The benefits both for society and for reduction in carbon footprint plus more efficient use of infrastructure are very significant. Alas this strategy with its proposed greenfield development is dissonant with this proposed outcome. |
| 31516 Mr Peter Lole | Strongly agree | Local government needs to work with and encourage developers to move away from the usual green field, easy-to-build model, and into creative, lower impact (on the environment) and more intensive solutions. |
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers | Strongly | to achieve the reduction in GHG |
| | | |

| | agree | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | Strongly agree | I certainly support Outcome 3 but because of the many new greenfield developments proposed, this will lead to more road congestion due to commuting, and therefore not achieve the outcome. |
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | Strongly agree | Again as per Q. 1 response. |
| 31533 Wendy Trevett | Strongly agree | To stop people commuting in cars. |
| 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery | Strongly agree | Tasman's roading network is becoming increasingly congested and substandard as a result of traffic exceeding the capacities it was built for. It would be better for people to travel less by private vehicles for employment and services and even better if these services were in walking distance. This would have a positive environmental outcome in the long term but also in the immediate future- especially when you consider wear and tear on roading and impacts on the surrounds of transit areas. |
| 31549 Mr Ian McComb | Strongly agree | |
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | Strongly agree | We want to improve the quality of people's lives by getting out of our cars and living in places where we can cycle and walk to most things we need. |
| 31562 Grant palliser | Strongly agree | cuts commuting, Greenfield development promotes issolation |
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | Strongly agree | Strongly agree with the objective. Absolutely! That would immediately cut down how much time we spend in our cars. There are so many better things I can think of for spending my time, than sitting in a traffic jam. Also, with the price of petro today, not everybody can afford to commute long distances anymore. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. Many of the greenfield developments proposed in the strategy are actually located far away from any jobs and will only lead to more cars on the road, not less. |
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | Strongly agree | Absolutely! That would immediately cut down how much time we spend in our cars. There are so many better things I can think of for spending my time, than sitting in a traffic jam. Also, with the price of petrol today, not everybody can afford commuting long distances anymore. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. Many of the greenfield developments proposed in the strategy are actually located far away from any jobs and will only lead to more cars on the road, not less. |
| 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett | Strongly | Yes 100%. All new development should be strategically linked with public and active transport networks. |
| | | |

| | agree | There is currently plans underway for the public transport and active transport networks, they should be adaptive to meet new demands that may arise alongside the FDS and any other active transport technologies. I do not support greenfield development and again, only support medium-density or high-density housing in Tasman and Nelson we need to provide housing that links in with existing settlements/infrastructure. The definition of "where people want to live" is to broad so cannot agree with it but I believe the environment is paramount so we need to provide housing that is resilient and has a low level of hazard risk while ensuring that people have a warm, healthy home to live in. |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham | Strongly agree | It is self evident that living in a community with local amenties will reduce carbon emmisions |
| 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart | Strongly agree | |
| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | Strongly agree | A "no brainer" - with sensible sized housing and plots |
| 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | Strongly agree | This means the intensification/additional housing needs to be close to all the existing urban areas where the employment opportunities are. It is confusing to me that this is not reflected in the FDS as its main focus is on more greenfield developments which would result in more cars and car movements. |
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins | Strongly agree | I strongly support this objective. In particular, the key to decarbonisation in the FDS is to provide good access to public and active transport. The current options are not adequate or enticing to the public. |
| 31589 Mrs Renee Edwards | Strongly agree | |
| 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | Strongly agree | Strongly agree with the objective. That would immediately cut down how much time we spend in our cars. Also, with the price of petrol today, not everybody can afford to commute long distances anymore. However, many of the greenfield developments proposed in the strategy are actually located far away from any jobs and will only lead to more cars on the road, not less. How does this help? |
| 31593 Mr William Samuels | Strongly agree | Absolutely! That would immediately cut down how much time we spend in our cars. There are so many better things I can think of for spending my time, than sitting in a traffic jam. Also, with the price of petrol today, not everybody can afford commuting long distances anymore. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. Many of the greenfield developments proposed in the strategy are actually located far away from any jobs and will only lead to more cars on the road, not less. |
| 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner | Strongly agree | Totally! However, the FDS indicates many new greenfield sites that are neither close to a job nor have the infrastructure towards a public, active transport already in place. I don't believe this approach is supporting outcome 1 – act towards the climate crisis, support reduction of GHG emissions. |
| | | |

| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | Strongly agree | Absolutely! That would immediately cut down how much time we spend in our cars. There are so many better things I can think of for spending my time, than sitting in a traffic jam. Also, with the price of petrol today, not everybody can afford commuting long distances anymore. However, I'm not sure that the 2! of 1! 6 NelsonTasman2050 - Future Development Strategy 2022-2052 proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. Many of the greenfield developments proposed in the strategy are actually located far away from any jobs and will only lead to more cars on the road, not less |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | Strongly agree | Strongly agree with the objective. Absolutely! That would immediately cut down how much time we spend in our cars. There are so many better things I can think of for spending my time, than sitting in a traffic jam. Also, with the price of petrol today, not everybody can afford commuting long distances anymore. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. Many of the greenfield developments proposed in the strategy are actually located far away from any jobs and will only lead to more cars on the road, not less. |
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | Strongly agree | Yes this would be great, but unless the greenfields developments incorporate some businesses as well as accommodation, then people will need to commute to the town centres for work. And unless bus services are subsidised and frequent, many will commute by car. |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | Strongly agree | Strongly agree with the objective. That would immediately cut down how much time we spend in our cars. Also, with the price of petrol today, not everybody can afford to commute long distances anymore. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is going to achieve this. Many of the greenfield developments proposed in the strategy are actually located far away from any jobs and will only lead to more cars on the road, not less. |
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | Strongly agree | This reduces carbon emissions from driving and reduces traffic jams. However the proposed greenfields do not support this principle. |
| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | Strongly agree | Without question. See answer to question 4. |
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | Strongly agree | |
| 31633 Ms Jacquetta Bell QSM | Strongly agree | In its proposals for intensification the FDS should do more to foster eco-communities where people will want to live. |
| 31637 Ms Frances Kemble Welch | Strongly | |
| | | |

| | agree | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31640 Mr Ryan Brash | Strongly agree | Absolutely! That would immediately cut down how much time we spend in our cars. There are so many better things I can think of for spending my time, than sitting in a traffic jam. Also, with the price of petrol today, not everybody can afford commuting long distances anymore. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. Many of the greenfield developments proposed in the strategy are actually located far away from any jobs and will only lead to more cars on the road, not less. |
| 31644 Murray Poulter | Strongly agree | |
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | Strongly agree | Strongly agree with the objective. That would immediately cut down how much time we spend in our cars. Also, with the price of petrol today, not everybody can afford to commute long distances anymore. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is going to achieve this. Many of the greenfield developments proposed in the strategy are actually located far away from any jobs and will only lead to more cars on the road, not less. |
| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | Strongly agree | But only in city centre itself as people will use cars beyond 5 kms or so. More cycle friendly lanes (clip on around Rocks Road) are brilliant and help keep the population healthier and less car reliant. |
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | Strongly agree | This aligns extremely well with the NPS-UD and Government Policy Statement for Land Transport |
| 31656 Mr brad malcolm | Strongly agree | |
| 31662 Joe Roberts | Strongly agree | Support, as per 2 above. |
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | Strongly agree | Strongly agree Strongly agree with the objective. That would immediately cut down how much time we spend in our cars. Also, with the price of petrol today, not everybody can afford to commute long distances anymore. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is going to achieve this. Many of the greenfield developments proposed in the strategy are actually located far away from any jobs and will only lead to more cars on the road, not less. |
| 31667 barbara nicholas | Strongly agree | |
| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | Strongly agree | Strongly agree Strongly agree with the objective. That would immediately cut down how much time we spend in our |

| | | cars. Also, with the price of petrol today, not everybody can afford to commute long distances anymore. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is going to achieve this. Many of the greenfield developments proposed in the strategy are actually located far away from any jobs and will only lead to more cars on the road, not less. |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31673 Mike Drake | Strongly agree | The first part of the question is obvious. Why would houses be built where people don't want to live? |
| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | Strongly agree | That would immediately cut down how much time we spend in our cars. But, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is going to achieve this. The greenfield developments proposed in the strategy are actually located far away from any jobs and will only lead to more cars on the road, not less!!!! |
| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | Strongly agree | No brainer. |
| 31683 Richard Davies | Strongly agree | Yes but I am not sure the last part will always be compatible with the first part! |
| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | Strongly agree | I agree with this objective but do not believe the plan achieves that. Greenfield development that you are proposing will require more travel into the existing centres for work and amenities. It's time to not let people live where they want to live, there needs to be control. |
| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | Strongly agree | |
| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | Strongly agree | |
| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | Strongly agree | If people are living close to where they work and services then the shift away from private vehicle is far easier. We need to encourage a shift to active and public transport through both a carrot and stick approach; Making cycling, walking and public transport an attractive, safe and cheap option while at the same time make private car use less attractive. Intensifying our inner cities (removing car parking and encouraging more inner city housing for example) would help to achieve this. |
| 31713 Mrs Debora Scholl Dos Santos | Strongly agree | I totally support intensification infill, there is where the jobs are and where the buses run. There are so many houses with huge backyards that could easily fit one or even 2 small houses. Small houses are more affordable, and if we have them available we can attract more work force to our region. |
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | Strongly agree | This would minimise time spent in vehicles down how much time we spend in our cars, thus reduce travel expense |
| | | |

| | | The current proposed greenfield development is in direct conflict with this as the need for cars would be more so. |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | Strongly agree | Absolutely! That would immediately cut down how much time we spend in our cars. With the price of petrol today, not everybody can afford commuting long distances anymore. However, the proposed strategy is not going to achieve this. Many of the greenfield developments proposed in the strategy are actually located far away from any jobs and will only lead to more cars on the road, not less. |
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | Strongly agree | Absolutely! That would immediately cut down how much time we spend in our cars. There are so many better things I can think of for spending my time, than sitting in a traffic jam. Also, with the price of petrol today, not everybody can afford commuting long distances anymore. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. Many of the greenfield developments proposed in the strategy are actually located far away from any jobs and will only lead to more cars on the road, not less. |
| 31736 Ms Carol Curtis | Strongly agree | agree with the first part, but question the need for the qualifier "in locations where people want to live". The objective should be for Councils to only support areas which are meet the other Outcomes, it is considered, that if these are well designed and planned for now and the future, then of course they will be where people want to live. (preferably not where real estate agents or developers, or school zones tell people where they want to live) |
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | Strongly agree | I strongly believe we should be moving towards the "20 minutes" principle of urban living - everything you need including jobs, schools, recreation etc is within 20 minutes of where you live. And provision of public and access transport should be part of the concept. As it stands the FDS will not achieve this - there are too many greenfield developments that are too far away from jobs, amenities and services. The commuter traffic on the main routes into Richmond and Nelson is already far too great. We also need to ensure that we do not wreck recreation areas and rural landscapes in the process, for example, development up the Maitai Valley will disenfranchise many Nelson people from active and peaceful recreation. |
| 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert- Watene | Strongly agree | This reduces travel |
| 31748 Jo Brooks | Strongly agree | Question 3 to 7 is strongly AGREE |
| 31754 Ms Joanna Hopkinson | Strongly | But not necessarily bigger towns. There is plenty of opportunity in small towns such as Murchison, if only |
| | | |

| | agree | the TDC would support this growth. |
|--|----------------------|--|
| 31756 Ronald Alfred & Phylis Kinzett | Strongly agree | The demand for residential sections in smaller towns is long overdue. |
| 31761 Karen Steadman | Strongly agree | A double sided coin, Murchison has jobs, but no public transport. People want to live here, Which in turn creates jobs. Future jobs can be anywhere. Trying to bunch people together where jobs are currently is short sighted. |
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | Strongly agree | Yes! This is what we need to lower our ecological footprint, but this strategy with so many out of town and sprawling developments, will prevent this objective being achieved! Stop the suburban sprawl, to achieve your objective! |
| 31779 Mrs Julie Sherratt | Strongly agree | |
| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | Strongly agree | See Q1 |
| 31801 Joan Skurr | Strongly agree | Please see attached "The locations where people want to live" must include access to jobs, services and amenities by public and active transport within 20 minutes as a goal. In 30 years time there will not be enough energy for longer commutes. |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | Strongly agree | Lessening impacts on Te Taiao |
| 31195 Mr Serge Philippe Crottaz | Strongly disagree | The very few Greenfield areas left near Nelson City centre are treasures that should not be developed as stated repetitively by the people of the region. The significant social and environmental impacts of the Maitai and Kaka Valley is known by all the Nelson City Councilors. This green area is the last one remaining undeveloped and I urge the Nelson City to remove the Greenfield areas N-106 and N-032 from the draft of the Future Development Strategy 2022-2052. |
| 31279 Mr Jeremy Thompson | Strongly disagree | Nelson City Council needs to re-evaluate its expansion strategy to comply with the core intent of New Zealand's Climate Change obligations. People cause climate change emissions. For example, more people means more human activity with not least being the reduction in green spaces (where Carbon Dioxide is consumed and Oxygen is produced) in favour of the highly negative construction of new houses all of which necessarily deliver a substantial initial carbon footprint, with an ongoing one due to the activities of the inhabitants. NCC: Think "Growth" as the cause of our planetary problem. Instead think "Smart Growth" through a graduated change to climate-friendly economic activity with the same or lower population base. |

| 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | Strongly disagree | T136 Braeburn area has no public transport, employment in this area is mainly seasonal and there are no nearby services. |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | Strongly disagree | Will destroy amenity value |
| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | Strongly disagree | Your proposal is to rezone 8 mtrs residential area to 6 story or 18mtrs high buildings in the Tahunanui area. Absolutely appalling. |
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | Strongly disagree | Prefer to intensify in town locations where walking or biking is the main form of transport. |
| 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | Strongly disagree | This is a self perpetuating urban sprawl approach. Growth in jobs should be limited to the two main centres and the small centres network approach needs to be rethought. Please see attached submission. |
| 31563 Mrs Loretta Anne Hogg | Strongly disagree | It's about where you can afford to live and you make your lifestyle and job work from there for yourself. That's what we have all did. |
| 31654 Ms brenda wraight | Strongly disagree | I object strongly to the proposed intensification of Tahunanui. This area is a jewel in Nelson's crown. Over summer the area is already at capacity. 6 story buildings are completely at odds with this. The community there represents the diversity of our town. Apartments will push out those most vulnerable - and the relocation options for families and less affluent people has not been considered. We do not want the eyesore of the Gold Coast. The land is sandy, prone to liquefaction and completely unsuitable. Joining Richmond and Nelson together is a far more sensible and pragmatic option. |
| 31717 Mr Frank Ryan | Strongly disagree | As for 2 |
| 31739 Philippa Hellyer | Strongly disagree | The Lower Moutere sites will not be suitable for access to jobs, services and amenities. Entirely unsuitable for urban development. |
| 31747 Mr (Tom) Neil BRETT | Strongly disagree | Access to jobs and services is a red herring as most Nelson residents are already within reasonable travelling distances to these facilities. Also address the public transport issue first. |
| 31763 Susan Rogers | Strongly disagree | Survey is flawed from the beginning. You need to redesign this entire line of questioning. It leads only to answers desired by the maker of the survey. |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Strongly disagree | Please see attached: Nelson Tasmanshorticultural, forestry, processed seafood and processed wood products are not in urban areas. |
| | | |

04 Please indicate whether you support or do not support Outcome 4: A range of housing choices are provided that meet different needs of the community, including papakāinga and affordable options. Please explain your choice:

| 31114 Ms Jill Rogers | Agree | |
|---------------------------------|-------|--|
| 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS | Agree | |
| 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | Agree | |
| 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren | Agree | |
| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson | Agree | |
| 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward | Agree | |
| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | Agree | |
| 31173 Mr Roderick Watson | Agree | |
| 31174 Ms Alison Westerby | Agree | |
| 31186 Mr Gary Scott | Agree | What's papakaianga? Not everyone needs to live in million dollar houses. There is a need to build more rental property, but landlord compliance issues are restrictive and detrimental to achieving this. |
| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | Agree | |
| 31192 Ms Rebecca Patchett | Agree | Although I agree with this statement, allowing large numbers of arguably unaffordable housing to be built in areas that do not have easy access to transport, and where the jobs available are not highly paid begs the question of the councils commitment to any climate action. |
| 31195 Mr Serge Philippe Crottaz | Agree | Affordable housing is just, fair and indispensable and can be achieved in socially sensible small apartments blocks near the city centre where people are really able to walk to work or were efficient and affordable public transport is available at low or no cost. |
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | Agree | |
| 31227 Ms Lee Eliott | Agree | |
| 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | Agree | However, each area has a unique identity and character which leads to people "preferring" to live in a certain area, and that should remain so. I live in Tahunanui and have done most of my life, and I appreciate the atmosphere and feel of the place. Contributing to that feel is the casual relaxed and safe feeling of the area, with areas of minimal traffic which encourages a freedom for people of all ages to relax while out of their homes and on the way to the beach, sports ground and other recreation areas. There are some double story homes, but most are single story. That creates a relaxed friendly |

| | | environment which fits well with the beach and its history as a "beachside" settlement. recent so called advancements ie: the Beach Road multistoried apartments reflects commercial dominance and a "need to keep up" with Australia and other noisy, expensive and over populated places. I do not like that direction, and most I talk to feel the same. Should that direction take place we will surely look back with regret, just as we do on the subdivisions of land which have resulted in tight driveways, small gardens and too many cars, lack of privacy, outlook, shade issues, and security. Keep our local "feel" for Tahunanui. Keep it as a place people can happily come to in an increasingly busy and so called progressive world. Let people who like the buzz of development (ie the new multi home complexes outside Richmond) go to those areas. Many of us enjoy less flash, less congested, less expensive, less commercial places to be. We can welcome others who escape from the multistoried apartments to come and enjoy our barefoot, happily friendly environment, where they can walk places and use the multitude of bike pathways without cars noise and commercial interferenceand recharge their souls before going back to their 6th story apartment that shades the neighbours, interferes with neighbours outlooks, creates higher levels of waste accumulation, needs more carparks, earplugs for other peoples radios, parties, rows, etc etc. Ask anyone in London, Brisbane etc. Progress has its price. Leave well alone in some areas, especially TahunanuiEnough "damage" has already been done in the past in the name of progress historical buildings taken down, Reclamations, modern monstrosities scaring natural sceneryI know it sounds emotive, but beware of overcrowding, lack of infrastructure, |
|----------------------------|-------|---|
| 21247 Mr. vuri aristarca | Agroo | "keeping up with the Jones's", slums and places where crime is nurtured. Be mindful. Small footprint housing is required. In Europe and much urban Asia many families live in 60/100 sqmt |
| 31247 Mr yuri aristarco | Agree | flats. We need this housing option in the market to offer low income people healthy, cheap new homes. |
| 31248 Mr Will Bosnich | Agree | |
| 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan | Agree | Too many big houses are being built in subdivisions that don't cater for the downsizers and smaller budgets |
| 31262 Mr Martin John Shand | Agree | That would be good. |
| 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman | Agree | I'm strongly in favour of a range of housing provision. There are many plans available internationally for intensive housing designs which are not a blot on the landscape. Richmond and Nelson should adopt this model, rather than allowing continued development as is presently occurring immediately southeast of Richmond and along Lower Queen St. |
| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | Agree | |
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | Agree | My agreement is tempered by the area in which such housing is to be built. Areas of natural beauty should be preserved and the the road infrastructure would need much delevlopement to support such expansion. Extra schools, medical facilities and recreational facilities will also be needed. |

| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | Agree | Its important to ensure that there are smaller homes located in centres where first home buyers can afford to purchase and rent. |
|-------------------------------------|-------|---|
| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | Agree | |
| 31285 Dr Hamish Holland | Agree | Unfortunately the present state is that "affordable" often corresponds to poor access to amenities, services and local employment - frequently because it is in areas where job options are limited. This is even more obvious if one considers those employment options which provide employees with enough income to not require government support. |
| 31286 Mr David Short | Agree | It is important that all people are catered for in any new development including people on low incomes. |
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | Agree | Yes - diverse people = diverse housing needs. |
| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | Agree | Yes, very good. As long as we acknowledge and start to anticipate/accept that the current economic money system is biased and toxic, creating massive inaquality and poverty. Whilst the plan is well intentioned, we have a moral duty to be moving toward a more equitable and sustainable basic operating system. Such as the money-free, Resource Based Economy. |
| 31316 John Heslop | Agree | Everyone needs somewhere to live. There needs to be careful thought as to how/where the range of housing options are placed. As a whole community needs to bend as one. |
| 31322 Mrs BARBARA AND TIM ROBSON | Agree | If these meet intensification of development criteria - and allow perhaps for clusters of tiny houses. The choices should not include large scale greenfield development |
| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | Agree | Everyone needs somewhere to live |
| 31350 Ms Janet Tavener | Agree | |
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | Agree | |
| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | Agree | Yes up to a point. There are "needs" in the community that are incompatible with 45% reduction of GHG emissions in 8 years. We don't need any more big houses anywhere - too bad, let them inflate in value. We need flats and apartments in centres to 8 storeys without cars. There are thousands of precedents overseas! We need to avoid developments like Richmond West at all costs - what an embarrassment and laughing stock! At sea level on prime growing land! Who's idea was that? "Affordable" has become a misnomer, as so many things converge to lift most property values and construction costs continually, further out of reach. Inflation will rise further. |
| 31355 Mr Barney Hoskins | Agree | I support in principle however I do not support intensification to 6 stories in Tahunanui. This would take away from the community feel as well as create issues with access and safety, particularly if intensification took place around the intersection at Tahunanui drive and Bisley Ave. There are many |
| | | |

| | | young children and families that use this area and congestion is already an issue without the additional of this level of intensification. I do however support the intensification up to 3 stories and in some cases 3-4 story low rise residential intensification (including mixed use). Focus on intensification in main centres should be the key focus (Nelson city and Richmond in particular) as this will ensure that transport requirements and emissions are reduced and dwellings are in the most appropriate locations in relation to employment opportunities and services. This will also ensure that when investment in infrastructure is required it is not to geographically broad. |
|---------------------------------------|-------|---|
| 31358 George Harrison | Agree | |
| 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer | Agree | |
| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | Agree | |
| 31410 Mr Scott Smithline | Agree | Agree if community diversity is achieved with greater density |
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | Agree | |
| 31415 Mrs Zanahe Ruth Galloway | Agree | I would agree to this point except until now only very expensive apartments and houses have been built. Where are the affordable buildings? instead of an unnecessary extremely expensive new library why not affordable apartments at this location owned by NCC? Proclaiming Climate Change Emergency and overgrowing our population, spending the money to retrofit the existing houses is the only way to prepare for an uncertain future with extreme weather events. |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | Agree | |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas Hollyman | Agree | People should have more choice of where to live |
| 31435 Mr Alan Eggers | Agree | Yes, it is important to provide a range of housing choices from small town houses to larger rural residential properties that tend to have larger houses. This allows for the different needs in the community. |
| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn Ball | Agree | Recent developments in Richmond and Mapua do not provide diversity. |
| 31449 Mr John Chisholm | Agree | |
| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | Agree | |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | Agree | |
| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | Agree | Yes, it sounds good in principle, but depends on the quality of the solution. |
| | | |

| 31481 Mrs Lucy Harrhy | Agree | It makes sense that a range of housing choices are provided. |
|---|-------|--|
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | Agree | |
| 31492 Anton, Benni, Shalom, AJ Bank, Bonnin, Shalom Davis | Agree | Yes - if these meet the intensification of development required. |
| 31505 Cheryl Heten | Agree | Agree in theory to intensified housing as long as it is affordable and the development is not owned or held by one or two development companies. |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne | Agree | |
| 31529 Mr Steven King-Turner | Agree | |
| 31533 Wendy Trevett | Agree | We support it with intensified housing in the main centres where jobs are available. |
| 31551 Mrs Jo Kitchen | Agree | |
| 31558 Mr Steve Jordan | Agree | |
| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | Agree | |
| 31579 Jane Tate | Agree | |
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins | Agree | I support this outcome. My concern is that the FDS needs to include provision so that housing affordability should not come at the expense of sustainability. Construction is a wasteful process. Homes are not designed as "passive homes" and there is no incentives, or regulation, to include renewable energy generation at new builds. |
| 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz | Agree | |
| 31588 pene Greet | Agree | |
| 31595 Gary Clark | Agree | Important to have a wide social mix for a successful community. |
| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | Agree | low-cost housing to the city centre is a good idea, will revitalise the city centre. |
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | Agree | There should be room for everyone in Nelson / Tasman. But we need to consider the placement and density of housing carefully, in relation to location, services and environment, as well as the style of housing. Building new, isolated suburbs where you need to commute everywhere for everything is not the answer, but typically this is what happens. (I grew up in one). A targeted housing strategy needs to be annotated. |
| 31620 Mr Paul Baigent | Agree | |

| 31621 Dr Kath Walker | Agree | |
|----------------------------|-------|--|
| 31622 Peter Butler | Agree | |
| 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | Agree | |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | Agree | |
| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | Agree | |
| 31647 Mrs Rebecca Parish | Agree | |
| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | Agree | A range of apartments to suit all budgets in the city centre with communal spaces would be ideal. |
| 31651 Dr Patrick Conway | Agree | |
| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | Agree | Consumer demand for variable outcomes has changed considerably over the last 10 years. (Section and building envelope sizes have reduced significantly, primarily due to cost. It would be a challenge to foresee where this will end up over the next 5-30 years. I believe it is important to consider, and provide a selection of options for density, recreation, height restrictions, and the potential for pockets of light commercial within these areas. |
| 31673 Mike Drake | Agree | We don't want the developers to keep building 3 bedrooms, 2 toilets and single level. We need a wide range of housing to meet requirements and also allow people to ease into house ownership. Developers have an agenda which will conflict with this requirement, maximise profits. Developers should not be determining the design of our towns and villages. The TDC (and Government) need to look at the European rental models. |
| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | Agree | |
| 31681 Seev Oren | Agree | We support a rouge of different Housing Choices to meet demand for younger couples near the school on Williams st. |
| 31683 Richard Davies | Agree | Yes but NZ has a present day tendency to construct houses that are too large and often unnecessarily opulent. |
| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | Agree | MDCA fully supports residents having housing options, but in doing so this should not over-ride the rights of existing residents to enjoy their rural lifestyles. Intensification within existing townships as and when lots become available and new homes build as part of the current town footprint is supported - not standalone med-high density homes on existing Rural land. |
| 31692 Mr Alasdair Gardiner | Agree | |
| 31697 Robert King-Tenison | Agree | |
| | | |

| 31706 Paul Donald Galloway | Agree | |
|-------------------------------|-------|--|
| 31709 Ofer Ronen | Agree | T-168: Support 500sqm |
| 31716 Mr Alan hart | Agree | |
| 31718 Kathryn & Keith Quigley | Agree | |
| 31721 Ms Jill Cullen | Agree | |
| 31722 Trevor Chang | Agree | |
| 31726 Mr John Jackson | Agree | Agree if equity and transport choices are considered and iwi are consulted (not necessarily in connection with papakainga). |
| | | While housing standards are not included they will impact aspects of the plan. For example, rainwater collection and energy use. |
| | | Housing choices will be impacted by different scenarios for transport infrastructure. For example, will cars be permitted in all streets? |
| 31734 Eric Thomas | Agree | Yes not everyone has \$ but everyone has to have home to live in that is affordable to there needs. Areas will only grow if we provide a balance for that. |
| 31751 Hazel Pearson | Agree | But still need to have big picture limits. The region area is finite. |
| 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | Agree | |
| 31769 Ms Jo Gould | Agree | It makes sense to provide a mix of housing, particularly affordable options |
| 31774 Mrs Jane Sutherland | Agree | |
| 31775 Dr Thomas Carl | Agree | |
| 31777 Mr David Lucas | Agree | I agree, but on the condition that some mixtures will not work. For example, the high rise rental accommodation planned for central Nelson will not mix well with the business and recreational parts of the City and the likes of the Trinity Church development in Nile Street will not work and is just a copy of what has failed overseas. Intensification without sorting out parking, increased traffic and how three-storey units will mix with one and two-storey villas are just a recipe for disaster. |
| 31787 Lilac Meir | Agree | Agree to have a range of housing choices to meet demand near Christian Tasman School |
| 31830 K.M. McDonald | Agree | Please see attached |
| | | |

| | | Housing choices should include off-street parking for private vehicles. Public transport is not an option for some people. "Affordable" housing won't happen while development is in the hands of bankers and developers chasing excessive profits. |
|-----------------------------|----------|--|
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | Disagree | These plans will result in many families and elderly people being forced out of their homes. |
| 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | Disagree | The subdivision of T136 from farmland into housing will not benefit the region and result in the loss of productive farmland. |
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | Disagree | I agree if this means 'in the total housing package available to the population of the area, we need what it says above>' However, I assume that what you are going to develop / open up for development will be more of what we have seen in the last 40 years: rich people decide what new houses will be built (large ones, unaffordable for others), and poor people will have to make do with the leftovers, ie unhealthy homes or not enough smaller home, so living in their car or an old moldy house but or caravan. Therefor I said Disagree. |
| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | Disagree | Dont see a plan, so how can I make a comment of what it looks like. |
| 31443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | Disagree | I do support a range of housing but not guided by surveys. As previously said, New Zealanders have not been exposed to a good range of creative medium to high housing solutions. Sprawling new suburbs are not compatible with climate change goals |
| 31488 Annette Starink | Disagree | We need more 1 and/or 2 bedroom homes built. Less family homes. On street collective parking areas instead of a garage with each home. This brings cost down. |
| 31521 Mrs Marie Waterhouse | Disagree | |
| 31554 Wendy Barker | Disagree | Not necessarily. Even so called affordable options are too expensive for most people these days. Affordable should mean what it says and this is what a Council should be providing for, not huge expensive houses that no one needs. |
| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | Disagree | Pipe dream. Profit will rule (which is what's driving this whole process) builders are there to make money and the Council is primarily money driven. The word 'affordable' is an open ended subjective issue. Ignoring this is naïve and stupid |
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | Disagree | Please see other fields |
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | Disagree | No people should not be offered a range of housing options based only on affordability. Options could be affordable but at the same time they must not create urban sprawl that causes loss of greenspaces, agricultural land, horticultural land or land that if developed would degrade existing recreation areas. I would like the FDS to focus on innovative intensive housing areas that make possible a range of housing styles and prices that are attractive to the inhabitants by the proximity of services. |
| | | |

| 31739 Philippa Hellyer | Disagree | Same reason as above in question 1. |
|---------------------------|---------------|--|
| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | Disagree | Please see attached - determined Disagree from submission: A: No. People shouldn't be offered sprawl as an option as its not an option if we are serious about climate change. |
| 31809 Mr Andrew Spittal | Disagree | Not all of the preferred options selected to provide for growth in the draft FDS 2022 are able to deliver a range of housing choices. The land at 49 Stafford Drive provides this opportunity, demonstrated in the Concept Masterplans attached to this submission. This masterplan shows three different housing typologies of: - 500-650m2 - 350-400m2; and - 180-250m2 This layout has been preferred using best practice urban and landscape design principles. Importantly, as outlined below I response to other key outcomes of the draft FDS 2022, this also achieves a number of the other high-level objectives. |
| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | Don't know | |
| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | Don't know | |
| 31473 Mr Andrew Downs | Don't know | |
| 31508 Mr Roger Barlow | Don't know | |
| 31598 Mrs Nicola Worsfold | Don't know | |
| 31606 Mr Trent Shepard | Don't know | |
| 31643 Inge Koevoet | Don't know | |
| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | Don't know | Not answering any of these leading questions |
| 31363 Mr Steve Cross | N/A | I reject the premise of this question |

| 31460 Kris Woods | N/A | Affordable needs to be truly affordable. As currently exhibited - smaller footprint does not mean more "affordable" |
|---|---------|---|
| 31623 Ms Lucy Charlesworth | N/A | I am wary of answering these questions as I cannot be sure of how they will be interpreted. So I will state I do not agree with developing green spaces. These spaces need to be reserved and protected to allow for sustainable biodiversity and for future generations. Intensification within Nelson CBD needs to be a priority. I do not agrees with building on Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. I do not agree with housing development on green fields. There is a climate emergency. Remove these areas from the FDS. |
| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | N/A | I am endorsing the Nelson Tasman Climate Forum's view . Forum response: Strongly agree. We are pleased to see the inclusion of housing types that will provide greater urban intensity - townhouses, apartments. We hope duplexes, clustered houses, conversion of large houses into apartments, cooperative housing (where households share some facilities such as laundry, garden etc.). We would like to see provision for clustered tiny houses too. |
| 31122 Mr Johan Thomas Wahlgren | Neutral | As soon as developers are involved there won't be an affordable option. We need rentals managed by a renters organisation. |
| 31129 Mrs Gaynor Brooks | Neutral | |
| 31278 Wendy Ross | Neutral | I would need to see a better plan than just words on a page. |
| 31284 Mr Jarmo Saloranta | Neutral | |
| 31309 Mr & Mrs Rose & Phillip Windle | Neutral | Very difficult to provide housing choices due to requirements of councils. |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | Neutral | I have no idea what papakainga is. |
| 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman | Neutral | |
| 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | Neutral | People might need to be more flexible aobut their "needs" in the new world order. Of course, there should be papakāinga and affordable options, but they will not be able to be as we have them now. We need to build high and leave space for recreation and horticulture. |
| 31347 Ms Paula Baldwin | Neutral | Again - if starting afresh, yes - go for it have as many housing choices as are deemed appropriate. It's not appropriate to have buildings taller than 3 storey at most/the absolute limit; and preferably only a few. Tahunanui is a great place to live because of the good sunlight and fresh air available due to its location. |
| 31360 Ms Thuy Tran | Neutral | |

| 31365 michael monti | Neutral | |
|---------------------------------|---------|--|
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | Neutral | Choice too wide ranging |
| 31405 Mr Doug Hattersley | Neutral | As long as it meets the "20 minute city rule" |
| 31454 Mrs Tracey Koole | Neutral | |
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | Neutral | |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | Neutral | |
| 31480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | Neutral | |
| 31483 Debbie Hampson | Neutral | |
| 31484 Mr Gavin Brent Cook | Neutral | |
| 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | Neutral | We need affordable housing options. Why not do something about all the 'holiday homes' standing empty for a months every year. I see more and more of these houses. |
| 31563 Mrs Loretta Anne Hogg | Neutral | I don't believe there is a housing crisis. Housing has always been affordable to different groups in the community - we all start somewhere. Buy something very cheap and work hard to do it up and move up the ladder. you don't need to build a lot of cheap nasty houses in beautiful greenfield. |
| 31572 Mr David Todd | Neutral | |
| 31574 Mr David Bolton | Neutral | |
| 31604 Mr Peter Moot | Neutral | |
| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | Neutral | |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | Neutral | |
| 31641 Mr Stephen (Steve) Hayden | Neutral | Don't know until we see what final plans are |
| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | Neutral | |
| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | Neutral | |
| 31695 Christine Horner | Neutral | Great model but at what "cost". |
| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | Neutral | all text must be in English or a translation provided to all NewZealand to avoid misrepresentation of issues |
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | Neutral | |
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | Neutral | See attached submission. Summarised - no key points related to this outcome. |
| | | |

| 31741 Mr Robert Stevenson | Neutral | Affordable options only in greenfield sites. Do not create large affordable or social housing areas. as they create problems with crime etc. |
|----------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31752 Jill Pearson | Neutral | |
| 31759 Mr Damian Campbell | Neutral | |
| 31765 Mrs Lorna Ivy Cooper | Neutral | |
| 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | Strongly agree | |
| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | Strongly agree | Critical. |
| | | A focus needs to be placed on bringing a range of people to the region and allowing them the opportunity to invest in their own housing, so they can invest themselves into the community (this can not always happen when people are only able to rent). So much of the new housing provided is largely high end (>\$750K). This is largely the result of private development driven housing. What is needed is housing (<\$500K) which is set up for first home buyers by local council and government. This is what will help the region. |
| 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | Strongly agree | This is a disingenuous question= what does "range" mean? Placement of the affordable units is as important as including some affordable units. The affordable units must be in full sun (poor families cannot afford heating) with immediate access to (developer-provided and subsidised) public transport. The proposed Kaka valley development placed affordable units in areas with very late winter sun - making the units damp and cold. |
| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | Strongly agree | Affordable housing is required in the Nelson/Tasman region to meet the needs of the region. |
| 31118 Ms Sarah Varey | Strongly agree | |
| 31130 Trevor James | Strongly agree | |
| 31136 Mrs Sophie Bisdee | Strongly agree | |
| 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert | Strongly agree | Because we need to be an inclusive society |
| 31143 Ms Prudence Roborgh | Strongly | |
| | | |

| | agree | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31165 Mr Vincent Dickie | Strongly agree | People desperately need affordable housing. |
| 31171 Ms Sallie Griffiths | Strongly agree | |
| 31185 Myfanway James | Strongly agree | There should be a lot more 1-2 bedroom apartments to meet single person's needs. |
| 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | Strongly agree | Mixed housing stops segregation. |
| 31216 Ms Judith Holmes | Strongly agree | Absolutely basic common sense. Needs to be in already built up areas. |
| 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | Strongly agree | House prices are ever increasing, more availability to supply of all styles of housing needs to be encouraged to increase supply over demand. |
| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | Strongly agree | Agree but STRONGLY disagree with the specifications allowing for multiple storeys ANYWHERE apart from light industrial & industrial. Instead we should be building row houses, giving people access to outside, your own garden or outside entertainment area etc. And avoiding lack of socialisation, unwanted shadows & shade, cold, wind tunnels, lack of outdoor access etc |
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | Strongly agree | |
| 31250 Mr Richard Wyles | Strongly agree | |
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | Strongly agree | Who could possibly disagree with this statement? |
| 31257 Mr Kent Inglis | Strongly agree | Changing demographics (aging populations, less persons per household etc) are changing the requirements for 'standard family homes'. |
| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | Strongly agree | |
| 31261 Mr John Weston | Strongly agree | All ages, ethnicities, life style etc should be catered for from apartment blocks to tiny homes. |
| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | Strongly agree | Developers tend to stay with the tried and tested, and that is understandable because that maximises profits. It needs more radical thinking to offer a wider choice. |

| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | Strongly agree | Affordable housing is a major problem in NZ that can be addressed in part by provision of a range of housing options. |
|----------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley | Strongly agree | |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | Strongly agree | Housing affordability is an issue throughout Aotearoa. Land must be made available and well planned for 'Tiny Home villages' that are not the traditional trailer park but places where residents can have right of tenure and stability. The opportunities of Papakainga are important not only to Maori but also offer opportunities in the pakeha world. Land price is one of the drivers of housing unaffordability so the ability to share land with second dwellings, granny flats and sleep outs is essential |
| 31287 Ms Suzanne Bateup | Strongly agree | Please consider co housing options as well, rather than more retirement villages. Co housing is healthier for aging people as they are part of a diverse community and can contribute in so many ways, rather than being in an environment of all older people |
| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | Strongly agree | Choice of where to live to make a Home is needed right across the spectrum from the first time home leaver(s) to the older person(s) with an empty nest wishing to down size, or to live in a granny flat next to or with their whanau. I fully support papakāinga and community housing groups. A variety of Homes in all communities should be available to reflect that our personal circumstances may be different and changing. |
| 31306 Mr Jaye Barr | Strongly agree | |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | Strongly agree | |
| 31318 Mrs Isobel Mosley | Strongly agree | One current trend, not mentioned in this report, is the popularity and growing demand for retirement villages. There has been huge expansion around Richmond. These villages meet the requirements for intensification and promote social cohesion, not just development. There needs to be allowance for such a development in Motueka. |
| 31325 Dr Ann Briggs | Strongly agree | Again, I agree with the principle, but do not see that this outcome is assertively addressed. I am ashamed that the Tasman area offers so few options for first-time buyers and low-income earners. Housing development is substantially left to the developers, who seek maximum return on their investment. This cycle can only be broken by intervention from the Council regarding zoning / resource consent stipulating a range of housing types. |
| 31328 Ms Karen du Fresne | Strongly | Hard to disagree with this. |
| | | |

| | agree | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31334 Diane Sutherland | Strongly agree | This is vital! So many people in this area want to downscale to much smaller homes, or buy a smaller home for affordability reasons, and there are just not the options. So many retirees that I know, and there many in our area, do not want a large home any longer - if the option of smaller dwellings were available they could stay in their supportive local community and free uplarger homes for larger families. But those smaller options are just NOT available. To achieve this diversity it will be critical to move away from commercial developer-led housing. All we seem to get in that area is the standard 3 bedroom/2 bathroom requirements and no emphasis on building vibrant and diverse communities. The FDS should ensure that more community-led initiatives are supported and that diversity is encouraged in every way possible. A lot more thinking outside the box is required for that. We do have creative and bold expertise and ideas in this area - if only there could be a way of allowing those voices a role. Passive development, as the FDS and councils seem to support, is no longer sufficient. |
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | Strongly agree | This is so important! I know so many people, who simply can't afford a standard house in the suburbs, but there are hardly any other options! However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve much more diversity of housing options or support community-led housing initiatives and social housing. Building a lot of housing development on the edge of towns is nothing new. So why should we expect lots of housing choices all of a sudden? I think we will only get more developer-led large stand-alone houses if we follow this strategy. How does the FDS ensure that more community-led initiatives are supported? In its current form, the strategy supports more of the same developer-led housing. |
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | Strongly agree | That would be ideal. |
| 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | Strongly agree | I know of too many people who had/have to move away because the large houses in suburbs are not affordable. However, the FDS does not really support this if it leaves it to developers to build affordable housing. The council needs to support community-led initiatives. |
| 31346 Martin Hartman | Strongly agree | We know of too many people who had/have to move away because the large houses in suburbs are not affordable. However, the FDS does not really support this if it leaves it to developers to build affordable housing. The council needs to support community-led initiatives. |

| 31349 Laurien Heijs | Strongly agree | Endorse NelsonTasman2050 submission. It's not clear how the strategy is achieving this and what tools it has to achieve this. |
|------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31356 Stephen Williams | Strongly agree | Increased diversity creates a more robust community. |
| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | Strongly agree | I had not been aware that the region is so poor, so yes, a range of housing choices should be available. Price of land will be key, hence support for some density. We've just moved from Auckland, and the medium density of places like Botany, Stonefields and Hobsonville Point take some getting used to, their affordable use of underlying land and acceptable design ethos makes it work (especially if supported by amenities). Less so in places like Panmure, but that's the issue with intensifying existing settlements. |
| 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | Strongly agree | A range of affordable housing options. This does not mean more of the 'large house-small section' builds that have been the norm for over a decade. Apartments or townhouse options that are well designed with a focus on amenities are needed in the region. |
| 31364 Mrs Christine Tuffnell | Strongly agree | Affordable options need to include these people having access to a natural environment - not stuck in the corner of a highrise building. |
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | Strongly agree | Strongly agree with the objective. This is so important! There are many people, who simply can't afford a standard house in the suburbs, but there are hardly any other options! However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve much more diversity of housing options or support community-led housing initiatives and social housing. Building a lot of housing development on the edge of towns is nothing new. So why should we expect lots of housing choices all of a sudden? I think we will only get more developer-led large stand-alone houses if we follow this strategy. How does the FDS ensure that more community-led initiatives are supported? In its current form, the strategy supports more of the same developer-led housing. |
| 31373 Ms Jenny Daniell | Strongly agree | |
| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | Strongly agree | The current 3 -4 bed house is not accomodating to many, yet alone affordable. Change the model! Change the incentives for urban developers, so that we move away from the same old same old Californian model. Council needs to adopt an open mind about what and how people live and the accept the range of accomodations people are comfortable with. e.g. Currently I could divide my house, to accommodate a couple for instance, but it is impossible (in the practical / financial) sense to do so due to the regulations - eg allowing another kitchen space. |
| 31384 Mr Jace Hobbs | Strongly agree | |

| 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann | Strongly agree | |
|------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett | Strongly agree | Fair and Necessary. |
| 31400 Miss Heather Wallace | Strongly agree | |
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | Strongly agree | There needs to be a range of housing choices, but reduce the greenfield options. Curbing urban sprawl is necessary and probably needs to be done by regulation. |
| 31403 Mr Richard Deck | Strongly agree | I believe all New Zealanders should be able to own their own home. |
| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | Strongly agree | Logical but not necessarily a planning decision as influenced by commerce |
| 31406 Ms Floortje van Lierop | Strongly agree | yes, we cant just build for wealthy pākeha - there is huge need for affordable housing throughout the community. |
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle | Strongly agree | This is so important! I know so many people, who simply can't afford a standard house in the suburbs, but there are hardly any other options! However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve much more diversity of housing options or support community-led housing initiatives and social housing. Building a lot of housing development on the edge of towns is nothing new. So why should we expect lots of housing choices all of a sudden? I think we will only get more developer-led large standalone houses if we follow this strategy. How does the FDS ensure that more community-led initiatives are supported? In its current form, the strategy supports more of the same developer-led housing. |
| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling | Strongly agree | We would have the choice as there are differing household sizes and set-ups. |
| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling | Strongly agree | People need to downsize once their children leave home. Town houses and flats are urgently needed to give people a choice of what size home they have. |
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin | Strongly agree | Yes please, but lets have more innovation in urban design and architecture, rather than more urban sprawl. Developers are necessarily the best people to be leading the way in the shape of our new developments. Local government has a role in leading the thinking and providing innovative solutions. I would like local government to put out the call to other groups, to come up with housing solutions which are not based on a model which is outmoded and land-hungry. |
| 31416 Tim Leyland | Strongly agree | Great but the strategy needs to spell out how we move from what appears to be the current norm of more developer-led large stand-alone houses |

| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors | Strongly agree | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | Strongly agree | The proposal does nothing to assure me that new housing will not continue to be developer-led. Developers always prefer green field developments - easier and cheaper. We need a new model that is community led, with vision for our future lifestyle and care for the environment being the bottom line, not profit. Housing development on the edge of towns tends to be very traditional stand-alone houses with gardens around them - no choices of different types of residential styles. |
| 31422 Mrs Marga Martens | Strongly agree | Agree, but again the strategy is not going to provide that. Greenfield building driven by commercial developer led building creates more of the same (stand alone houses). |
| 31423 Mr Roger Frost | Strongly agree | |
| 31430 Muriel Moran | Strongly agree | All new housing needs to offer choices in one, two (other than in retirement homes) and three+ bedrooms. High rise housing (Three stories) can be developed and promoted. Opening up ideas for other ways of housing people for consideration. |
| 31431 Katerina Seligman | Strongly agree | Homeless people in our society is not acceptable! |
| 31434 Mrs cushla Moorhead | Strongly agree | The wider range of housing, the wider range of people and that leads to a healthy community. A community needs people of all ages integrating to provide cohesion, support for each other and a wide range of combined knowledge. |
| 31438 Aleisha Hosie | Strongly agree | Yes, Everyone has different wants and needs when it comes to housing types - so all options should be considered. |
| 31441 Mr Chris Head | Strongly agree | You may need to expand your definitions of what constitutes "housing choices" (i.e. prefab, tiny houses, container houses, apartments, etc), rather than continuing to rely on traditional housing techniques. We are currently so limited in what we can build that it just seems to play into the hands of developers, lenders and the council, which all contributes to pushing the cost of building a maintaining adequate housing beyond many people's reach. |
| 31447 Dr David Jackson | Strongly agree | |
| 31452 Mr David Bartle | Strongly agree | The strategy should have a baseline of current stock and population mix. Currently the former appears poorly matched to the latter |
| | | |

| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton Strongly agree believe that housing shortage is for single - often older people and families or individuals on lower income should limit larger and less environmentally appropriate housing. 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens Strongly agree Strongly agree we need housing for low income families and young f | | | |
|--|----------------------------|----------|--|
| believe that housing should focus on these groups and that in any case more stringent planning controls should limit larger and less environmentally appropriate housing. Strongly agree 31472 Dr David Briggs Strongly agree 31472 Dr David Briggs Strongly agree 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon Strongly agree 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon Strongly agree 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson Strongly agree 31487 Ms Heather Spence 31487 Ms Heather Spence 31487 Ms Heather Spence 31487 Ms Heather Spence 31488 Strongly agree 31489 Mr Nigel Watson 31490 Mr Nigel Watson 31490 Mr Nigel Watson Strongly agree 31490 Mr Nigel Watson 31491 Ms Annette Milligan 31491 Ms Annette Milligan 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay 31490 Is group agree 31490 Ms Helen Lindsay 31490 | 31457 Mr J Santa Barbara | | Not only affordable but also smaller and well insulated and passive solar to save energy |
| 31472 Dr David Briggs Strongly agree 31472 Dr David Briggs Strongly agree 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon Strongly agree 31475 Mrs Angela Donaldson Strongly agree 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson Strongly agree 31487 Ms Heather Spence Strongly agree Agree agree | 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | . | The main housing shortage is for single - often older people and families or individuals on lower incomes. believe that housing should focus on these groups and that in any case more stringent planning controls should limit larger and less environmentally appropriate housing. |
| agree a total reversal of the way that urban development is done. Again, the need is proper planning which specifies the type of housing that can be built anywhere, the housing density, the plot size, the price, it green space requirements, the transport facilities, the services etc etc. Are you willing (and able) to do that? Strongly agree 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson Strongly agree 31487 Ms Heather Spence Strongly agree Strongly agree 1 walked around a recent housing development in Mapua yesterday. I was appalled at the low-density housing - huge houses designed for a quite high income bracket. In a sterile environment, lots of cpncrete. They all looked as if they are 3 bedrooms, I saw no vegetable gardens, no community ameni I believe TDC has sold its soul to housing developers and this ia a huge concern. Strongly agree Definitely a must! I know so many people, who simply can't afford a standard house in the suburbs, by there are hardly any other options! However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve much more diversity of housing options or support community-led housing initiatives and soc housing. Building a lot of housing development on the edge of towns is nothing new. So why should we expect lots of housing choices all of a sudden? I think we will only get more developer-led large standalone houses if we follow this strategy. How does the FDS ensure that more community-led initiatives supported? In its current form, the strategy supports more of the same developer-led housing. The definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over and expecting a different outcome Affordable housing is a crucial component for health & wellbeing. This should, in my view, be given a high priority I support this outcome but I can't see anything in the strategy that will achieve it because there is no agree detail about how the developer-led preference for standalone housing will change to the smaller mor | 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | | we need housing for low income families and young families |
| Strongly agree Strongly agree | 31472 Dr David Briggs | | specifies the type of housing that can be built anywhere, the housing density, the plot size, the price, the green space requirements, the transport facilities, the services etc etc. Are you willing (and able) to do |
| agree accommodation. Strongly agree bousing - huge houses designed for a quite high income bracket. In a sterile environment, lots of cpncrete. They all looked as if they are 3 bedrooms, I saw no vegetable gardens, no community ameni I believe TDC has sold its soul to housing developers and this ia a huge concern. Strongly agree befinitely a must! I know so many people, who simply can't afford a standard house in the suburbs, but there are hardly any other options! However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve much more diversity of housing options or support community-led housing initiatives and soo housing. Building a lot of housing development on the edge of towns is nothing new. So why should wexpect lots of housing choices all of a sudden? I think we will only get more developer-led large standalone houses if we follow this strategy. How does the FDS ensure that more community-led initiatives supported? In its current form, the strategy supports more of the same developer-led housing. The definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over and expecting a different outcome Affordable housing is a crucial component for health & wellbeing. This should, in my view, be given as high priority I support this outcome but I can't see anything in the strategy that will achieve it because there is no detail about how the developer-led preference for standalone housing will change to the smaller more. | 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon | | |
| housing - huge houses designed for a quite high income bracket. In a sterile environment, lots of cpncrete. They all looked as if they are 3 bedrooms, I saw no vegetable gardens, no community ameni I believe TDC has sold its soul to housing developers and this ia a huge concern. Strongly agree Definitely a must! I know so many people, who simply can't afford a standard house in the suburbs, by there are hardly any other options! However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve much more diversity of housing options or support community-led housing initiatives and soch housing. Building a lot of housing development on the edge of towns is nothing new. So why should wexpect lots of housing choices all of a sudden? I think we will only get more developer-led large standalone houses if we follow this strategy. How does the FDS ensure that more community-led initiatives supported? In its current form, the strategy supports more of the same developer-led housing. The defintion of insanity is doing the same thing over and over and expecting a different outcome Strongly agree Affordable housing is a crucial component for health & wellbeing. This should, in my view, be given a view high priority I support this outcome but I can't see anything in the strategy that will achieve it because there is no detail about how the developer-led preference for standalone housing will change to the smaller more | 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | ٠. | Everyone should be catered for in any expansion. No one should ever be excluded from be able to afford accommodation. |
| there are hardly any other options! However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve much more diversity of housing options or support community-led housing initiatives and sochousing. Building a lot of housing development on the edge of towns is nothing new. So why should wexpect lots of housing choices all of a sudden? I think we will only get more developer-led large standalone houses if we follow this strategy. How does the FDS ensure that more community-led initiatives supported? In its current form, the strategy supports more of the same developer-led housing. The defintion of insanity is doing the same thing over and over and expecting a different outcome Strongly agree high priority Strongly agree Strongly agree detail about how the developer-led preference for standalone housing will change to the smaller more achieves in the strategy that will achieve it because there is no detail about how the developer-led preference for standalone housing will change to the smaller more | 31487 Ms Heather Spence | | cpncrete. They all looked as if they are 3 bedrooms, I saw no vegetable gardens, no community amenities |
| agree high priority Strongly I support this outcome but I can't see anything in the strategy that will achieve it because there is no agree detail about how the developer-led preference for standalone housing will change to the smaller more | 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | . | |
| agree detail about how the developer-led preference for standalone housing will change to the smaller more | 31491 Ms Annette Milligan | | Affordable housing is a crucial component for health & wellbeing. This should, in my view, be given a very high priority |
| and dable nousing which is needed. | 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | . | I support this outcome but I can't see anything in the strategy that will achieve it because there is no detail about how the developer-led preference for standalone housing will change to the smaller more affordable housing which is needed. |

| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | Strongly agree | This is very important! Many people cannot afford a standard house. The strategy will not achieve this outcome. We need more diversity of housing options and a strategy that supports community led housing initiatives and social housing and provides ways to increase the uptake of intensification other than to leave to the market. traditional approach has not worked in the past. Strategy supports more of the same developer led housing. |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | Strongly agree | This proposed strategy does not seem to achieve much more diversity of housing options or support community-led housing initiatives and social housing. Building a lot of housing development on the edge of towns is nothing new. So why should we expect lots of housing choices all of a sudden? Previous developments show we will only get more developer-led large stand-alone houses if we follow this strategy. How does the FDS ensure that more community-led initiatives are supported? In its current form, the strategy supports more of the same developer-led housing. |
| 31496 Mrs Petra Dekker | Strongly agree | Refer attachment: I think this is important! I know many people, who simply can't afford a standard house in the suburbs, but there are hardly any other options! Young families, start-ups, single people, elderly people, people that want/need to downsize, none of them have many options other than buying a standard house in the suburbs. There needs to be a better variety of housing options. |
| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless | Strongly agree | |
| 31499 Ms Jane Fisher | Strongly agree | Housing is a right and must be kept within realistic financial capacity. |
| 31502 Ms Caroline Jones | Strongly agree | |
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | Strongly agree | papakainga is not in my Maori dictionary, sorry, I don't understand. a community needs to be diverse and inclusive. The greenfield developments reflect an investor-led approach. The council has to ensure the diversity of the community and affordability for lower income residents. |
| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | Strongly agree | |
| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | Strongly agree | Strongly agree. Nelson Marlborough has a higher proportion of its population in the 65+ year age group than other New Zealand regions. Consideration needs to be given to providing a number of 1 and 2 bedroom units to cater for older people. In addition, larger units could be added to cater for those with larger families and those living in multi-generational households. Encouraging the development of |
| | | |

| | | different housing typologies and mulit-generational family housing options is important for supporting community diversity and equity by enabling a wide range of community members to live including those from different socio-economic groups and ethnicities. |
|---------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31515 Geoffrey Vause | Strongly agree | This is essential given to date that the current offerings from Te Tau Ihu developers are characterised by 3 bedroom/ two bathroom/ double garage. Small families, single persons and retirees who need small and more adaptable housing are disadvantaged. The social focus of papākāika is an exemplary model of housing for older persons that should be incorporated into all housing developments irrespective of ethnicity of residents, not only for the models benefits to residents, but also for it's engagement between community, developers, designers and builders. |
| 31516 Mr Peter Lole | Strongly agree | Certainly more affordable, but also mixed socio-economically. No ghettoes please- whether for wealthy or poor. e.g All current apartment developments in Nelson central seem to be for the rich only. |
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers | Strongly agree | nothing worse than a mono culture of houses, look the same, painted differently, need variation in land size, height, intensity to keep things open for all members of our community |
| 31520 Andrew Stirling | Strongly agree | |
| 31523 Ms karen steadman | Strongly agree | Yes a wide range is required as one size does not fit all. The way in which people live is often dictated by the recreational activities people are attracted to and it is often a huge part in their mental well being. |
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | Strongly agree | I support a range of housing options to meet the different needs of the community but I am convinced we will only get more developer-led large stand-alone houses if we follow this strategy in its current form. |
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | Strongly agree | Of course society needs a range of housing. Incomes, circumstances & aspirations vary across society, so we have to accommodate all. We do however need to place much greater emphasis on making good quality housing achievable for those on lower incomes & not just build for people who can afford a holiday home & AirBnB. |
| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard | Strongly agree | |
| 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery | Strongly agree | The gaps in affordability of housing are growing markedly in the Tasman district, with soaring property prices. I would prefer to live in a balanced community with people from all socio economic backgrounds rather than see rich and poor neighbourhoods develop. |
| 31549 Mr Ian McComb | Strongly | There is an increasing demand for smaller lot sizes/houses that reflect the changing make-up of our |
| | | |

| | agree | population and a desire for many to live less wastefully and to facilitate alternative living opportunities such as community living. |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | Strongly agree | Any new developments must provide opportunities for a socially diverse community. Social well being has long been regarded as an essential factor in any modern development both national and internationally. It is time our region got creative and stopped leaving it to developers to dictate 'how we live'! |
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | Strongly agree | Living in areas with mixed residential housing options is good for everyone. It adds diversity and vibrance to the economic sector in these areas. |
| 31560 Ms Steph Watts | Strongly agree | There should definitely be more affordable housing options specifically for home ownership as well as government owned rentals or rent to buy. |
| | | For new sections (rural and urban) the covenant on minimum house sizes should be removed to allow for smaller sized homes that have less impact on the land. |
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | Strongly agree | |
| 31562 Grant palliser | Strongly agree | council needs to take the lead. Do not use the excuse of 'market driven or leave it to developer driven for outcomes. |
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | Strongly agree | This is so important! I know so many people, who simply can't afford a standard house in the suburbs, but there are hardly any other options! However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve much more diversity of housing options or support community-led housing initiatives and social housing. Building a lot of housing development on the edge of towns is nothing new. So why should we expect lots of housing choices all of a sudden? I think we will only get more developer-led large standalone houses if we follow this strategy. How does the FDS ensure that more community-led initiatives are supported? In its current form, the strategy supports more of the same developer-led housing. |

| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | Strongly agree | This is so important! I know so many people, who simply can't afford a standard house in the suburbs, but there are hardly any other options! However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve much more diversity of housing options or support community-led housing initiatives and social housing. Building a lot of housing development on the edge of towns is nothing new. So why should we expect lots of housing choices all of a sudden? I think we will only get more developer-led large stand-alone houses if we follow this strategy. How does the FDS ensure that more community-led initiatives are supported? In its current form, the strategy supports more of the same developer-led housing. |
|--------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett | Strongly agree | Yes. All opportunities to partner with government agencies and NGOs to provide affordable housing for people in Tasman/Nelson region should be taken but only on the provision that it is medium or high density. The council should actively pressure these opportunities to ensure that as many people in our region have a chance to secure homeownership. |
| 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham | Strongly agree | Some areas, such as Mapua, are unaffordable to people on low incomes and thus create ghettos of priveledged people that do not represent the people of New Zealand |
| 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart | Strongly agree | |
| 31580 Jenny Long | Strongly agree | I strongly agree with this. All the developments I've seen over recent years are creating more and more of the same type of dwelling: sprawling single-level standalone housing with giant garages and no garden, far from town centres, and not at all affordable. |
| | | We need to create more variety in our housing, including affordable non-luxury apartments in town centres. |
| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | Strongly agree | Council need to take positive action on encouraging affordable options for housing |
| 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | Strongly agree | Shouldn't we have a different FDS that actually allows for a range of housing close to city/town centres |
| 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | Strongly agree | So many people simply can't afford a standard house in the suburbs, but there are hardly any other options! However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve much more diversity of housing options or support community-led housing initiatives and social housing. Building a lot of housing development on the edge of towns is nothing new. So why should we expect lots of housing choices all of a sudden? We will only get more developer-led large stand-alone houses if we follow this |
| | | |

| | | strategy. How does the FDS ensure that more community-led initiatives are supported? In its current form, the strategy supports more of the same developer-led housing. |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31593 Mr William Samuels | Strongly agree | This is so important! I know so many people, who simply can't afford a standard house in the suburbs, but there are hardly any other options! However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve much more diversity of housing options or support community-led housing initiatives and social housing. Building a lot of housing development on the edge of towns is nothing new. So why should we expect lots of housing choices all of a sudden? I think we will only get more developer-led large standalone houses if we follow this strategy. How does the FDS ensure that more community-led initiatives are supported? In its current form, the strategy supports more of the same developer-led housing. |
| 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner | Strongly agree | We need this! However, I'm not sure that the proposed FD strategy is achieving this outcome. New housing developments on the edge of towns aren't new, nor sprawling out more and more i.e. along SH6, so how would the proposed FDS change these housing choices? I think it rather supports more developerled large stand-alone houses, which often don't take into account a community environment – i.e. include playgrounds, places to gather, places to enjoy entertainment, etcif we follow this strategy, more community-led initiatives are not encouraged nor new ideas of co-living. |
| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | Strongly agree | This is so important! I know so many people, who simply can't afford a standard house in the suburbs, but there are hardly any other options! However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve much more diversity of housing options or support community-led housing initiatives and social housing. Building a lot of housing development on the edge of towns is nothing new. So why should we expect lots of housing choices all of a sudden? I think we will only get more developer-led large standalone houses if we follow this strategy. How does the FDS ensure that more community-led initiatives are supported? In its current form, the strategy supports more of the same developer-led housing. |
| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | Strongly agree | This is so important! I know so many people, who simply can't afford a standard house in the suburbs, but there are hardly any other options! However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve much more diversity of housing options or support community-led housing initiatives and social housing. Building a lot of housing development on the edge of towns is nothing new. So why should we expect lots of housing choices all of a sudden? I think we will only get more developer-led large stand-alone houses if we follow this strategy. How does the FDS ensure that more community-led initiatives are supported? In its current form, the strategy supports more of the same developer-led housing. |
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | Strongly agree | I would be interested to know how the FDS will achieve this. |

| | | And what is the link between 'outcomes' and the strategy itself: will Councils measure themselves against these outcomes to check they are performing? |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31608 Robbie Thomson | Strongly agree | We must have more affordable housing. This may mean smaller houses, smaller sections, intensification (multi-storey, multi units) Large houses for small numbers of occupants should be discouraged. It fuels house prices and wastes resources. Our house build prices are some of the highest in the developed world. More use of prefabricated housing, reducing cost of regulation, breaking up supply cartels would all help. |
| 31609 Mrs Sonja Antonia Lamers | Strongly agree | see feedback under question no. 40 |
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | Strongly agree | I strongly agree with this principle but do not see it in evidence when I look at any Greenfields developments in Nelson, Marsden Valley area, Richmond, Berryfields etc. They are all 3-4 bedroom houses, often with covenants prohibiting smaller houses and are not affordable to many potential house buyers. |
| 31614 Mr mark Morris | Strongly agree | See attached submission. Summarised - T-112 Residential Intensification Future Development Area on the church property at 123 Salisbury Road, Richmond. |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | Strongly agree | This is so important! So many people simply can't afford a standard house in the suburbs, but there are hardly any other options! However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve much more diversity of housing options or support community-led housing initiatives and social housing. Building a lot of housing development on the edge of towns is nothing new. So why should we expect lots of housing choices all of a sudden? We will only get more developer-led large stand-alone houses if we follow this strategy. How does the FDS ensure that more community-led initiatives are supported? In its current form, the strategy supports more of the same developer-led housing. |
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | Strongly agree | Providing more affordable housing is extremely important in the current housing environment. I am concerned that the strategy does support developer-led housing. The proposed strategy does not support this principle. |
| 31617 Ms steph jewell | Strongly agree | More choice for today's society which is not the nuclear family of the 1950s. I lived in a 44sq metre apartment with a small balcony in Wellington with my ex-husband for THREE years and it wasn't difficult. More one and two bedroom units and more catering for the sectors of community with few choices. "The rich" have plenty of choices and don't need any more! Concentrate on improving the lives of the less well off, with warm and light housing. |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | Strongly | This is so important! I know so many people, who simply can't afford a standard |
| | | |

| | agree | house in the suburbs, but there are hardly any other options! However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve much more diversity of housing options or support community-led housing initiatives and social housing. Building a lot of housing development on the edge of towns is nothing new. So why should we expect lots of housing choices all of a sudden? I think we will only get more developer-led large stand-alone houses if we follow this strategy. How does the FDS ensure that more community-led initiatives are supported? In its current form, the strategy supports more of the same developer-led housing. |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | Strongly agree | Some of the newer developments in Tasman have very large sections and use up a lot of valuable land space. Lets copy the Europeans where high urban populations does NOT mean a reduction if public green space. |
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | Strongly agree | |
| 31628 Mr Daniel Levy | Strongly agree | |
| 31632 Ms Jacquetta Bell QSM | Strongly agree | |
| 31633 Ms Jacquetta Bell QSM | Strongly agree | Many older people would like to downsize but cannot afford \$1-2million apartments. If their needs are met through well planned intensification their homes are freed up for young families. |
| 31636 Joanna Santa Barbara | Strongly agree | We are pleased to see the inclusion of housing types that will provide greater urban intensity - townhouses, apartments. We hope duplexes, clustered houses, conversion of large houses into apartments, cooperative housing (where households share some facilities such as laundry, garden etc.). We would like to see provision for clustered tiny houses too. |
| | | We support the suggestion of NelsonTasman 2050 advocating council ownership of some housing through a Nelson Tasman Urban Regeneration Agency |
| | | Urban sprawl is the route to unaffordable housing, with high costs of land, construction and infrastructure accessible to upper decile families, unreachable for the rest. In our region according to the Massey Home Affordability Index in 2019 the Tasman district was the second least affordable region in the New Zealand after Auckland with Nelson in third place. It's not just about more choices of housing types. The future development strategy needs to consider a range of models and pathways to make decent and affordable housing available to everyone. It's already a justice |

| | | issue and the pressures created by the imperative of taking climate change into account will make the justice issue even bigger. |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31637 Ms Frances Kemble Welch | Strongly agree | |
| 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin | Strongly agree | We have great need for alternative and cheaper housing options. Especially tiny home villages or multiple tiny homes on sites as long as appropriate services can be provided. |
| 31640 Mr Ryan Brash | Strongly agree | This is so important! I know so many people, who simply can't afford a standard house in the suburbs, but there are hardly any other options! However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve much more diversity of housing options or support community-led housing initiatives and social housing. Building a lot of housing development on the edge of towns is nothing new. So why should we expect lots of housing choices all of a sudden? I think we will only get more developer-led large standalone houses if we follow this strategy. How does the FDS ensure that more community-led initiatives are supported? In its current form, the strategy supports more of the same developer-led housing. |
| 31644 Murray Poulter | Strongly agree | |
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | Strongly agree | This is so important! So many people simply can't afford a standard house in the suburbs, but there are hardly any other options! However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve much more diversity of housing options or support community-led housing initiatives and social housing. Building a lot of housing development on the edge of towns is nothing new. So why should we expect lots of housing choices all of a sudden? We will only get more developer-led large stand-alone houses if we follow this strategy. How does the FDS ensure that more community-led initiatives are supported? In its current form, the strategy supports more of the same developer-led housing. |
| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | Strongly agree | Housing is overpriced and homeless people are in the rise. It's hard to keep your family afloat if you cannot afford to pay rent. It can be a huge stress for people. |
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | Strongly agree | |
| 31656 Mr brad malcolm | Strongly agree | |
| 31662 Joe Roberts | Strongly agree | Support, as not everyone wants to live in an apartment or townhouse, and so a wide range of housing typologies is essential. |
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | Strongly | Strongly agree |

| | agree | This is so important! So many people simply can't afford a standard house in the suburbs, but there are hardly any other options! However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve much more diversity of housing options or support community-led housing initiatives and social housing. Building a lot of housing development on the edge of towns is nothing new. So why should we expect lots of housing choices all of a sudden? We will only get more developer-led large stand-alone houses if we follow this strategy. How does the FDS ensure that more community-led initiatives are supported? In its current form, the strategy supports more of the same developer-led housing. |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31667 barbara nicholas | Strongly agree | I want a community that provides for, and encourages, diversity |
| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | Strongly agree | Strongly agree This is so important! So many people simply can't afford a standard house in the suburbs, but there are hardly any other options! However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve much more diversity of housing options or support community-led housing initiatives and social housing. Building a lot of housing development on the edge of towns is nothing new. So why should we expect lots of housing choices all of a sudden? We will only get more developer-led large stand-alone houses if we follow this strategy. How does the FDS ensure that more community-led initiatives are supported? In its current form, the strategy supports more of the same developer-led housing. |
| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | Strongly agree | This is so important! So many people simply can't afford a standard house in the suburbs, but there are hardly any other options! The proposed strategy is not going to achieve much more diversity of housing options or support community-led housing initiatives and social housing. We need to curb the green field developments and keep the high productivity horticultural land at the edge of town and incentivize actual high density building in our centers and on arterial vehicular access ways. Building a lot of housing development on the edge of towns is nothing new. We will only get more developer-led large stand-alone houses if we follow this strategy. The FDS needs to ensure that more community-led initiatives are supported and that these are supported by Council. In its current form, the strategy supports more of the same developer-led housing. |
| 31688 Gerard McDonnell | Strongly agree | Smaller houses are required - most families don't need a large house - but that's what the housing companies tell them they want! (for resale!) |
| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | Strongly | I strongly agree but leaving this to the whim of the developers has not worked and will continue to not |

| | agree | work. We need to have a strategy to get investment into social housing and affordable options for the good of our society. |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | Strongly agree | This is essential and cannot be left to the "housing market" to implement |
| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | Strongly agree | |
| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | Strongly agree | The focus needs to be on affordable housing, Nelson has enough housing for the wealthy. Affordable housing also means easy access to public transport and making active transport a viable option by creating housing close to city centres. |
| 31703 Ms Paula Holden | Strongly agree | Housing un-affordability is hurting our society. People need good quality, warm, stable & inexpensive housing. |
| 31704 Mr Paul Bucknall | Strongly agree | At present the range of housing choices seems to be being steered by developers and their profit margins. There has to be more strategy and direction from councils to provide these different forms, in a way that doesn't create mistakes of urban development from the last century. |
| 31710 Ms Angela Fitchett | Strongly agree | Very important, however I am not sure how the strategy will help this happen in an environment where developers seemingly do what they think will bring them profit with no regard for the region's actual needs. Not blaming them, they'll do what they do. The planning though needs to facilitate other needed options. |
| 31711 Sara Flintoff | Strongly agree | All types of housing & section sizes. |
| 31713 Mrs Debora Scholl Dos Santos | Strongly agree | For individual and small families who would like to buy their first house, that is an impossible dream at the current market. There are not affordable options. I believe that a great option for those would be tiny and small houses built in town. |
| 31717 Mr Frank Ryan | Strongly agree | Not everyone is a cashed up out of town buyer and local people need the ability to be able to start on the property ladder otherwise they will leave the area |
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | Strongly agree | The FDS needs to actively support social and community based housing solutions. The current model only supports developer led housing solutions. |
| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | Strongly agree | This is so important. I know so many people, who simply can't afford a standard house in the suburbs, bu there are hardly any other options! This proposed strategy is not going to achieve much more diversity of housing options or support community-led housing initiatives and social housing. Building a lot of housing development on the edge of towns is nothing new. So why should we expect lots of housing choices all or a sudden? I think we will only get more developer-led large stand-alone houses if we follow this strategy |
| | | |

| | | How does the FDS ensure that more community-led initiatives are supported? In its current form, the strategy supports more of the same developer-led housing. |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | Strongly agree | This is so important! I know so many people, who simply can't afford a standard house in the suburbs, but there are hardly any other options! However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve much more diversity of housing options or support community-led housing initiatives and social housing. Building a lot of housing development on the edge of towns is nothing new. So why should we expect lots of housing choices all of a sudden? I think we will only get more developer-led large stand-alone houses if we follow this strategy. How does the FDS ensure that more community-led initiatives are supported? In its current form, the strategy supports more of the same developer-led housing. |
| 31736 Ms Carol Curtis | Strongly agree | goes without question, but these housing choices also need to meet 01 and 02 objective, and 03. |
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | Strongly agree | We need more varied housing - terrace housing; affordable flats; conversion of commercial heritage buildings in central Nelson; small houses, community houses such as papakianga housing as well as stand alone houses. My elderly parents would love to move out of their 2-storied terrace house into something on the flat within walking distance of Nelson amenities (library, doctor etc). There is nothing available that is not hugely expensive and impractical. My husband and I would also love the option in the future to be in a townhouse with only a small garden that was within walking or biking distance of town. My children when they buy their first homes would also love to be in a flat in inner city Nelson (a heritage building preferably) or a small townhouse. They don't want a large house on a small section miles out of town in a cookie cutter suburb. The developer friendly strategy of stand-a-lone houses on a separate section should only be a small proportion of new housing stock. |
| 31744 Mrs Lorna CRANE | Strongly agree | Murchison as a community thrives on co-existence of people from all ages, ethnicities and occupation and ideologies. We do not want to see exclusive settlements established to the detriment of social cohesion. |
| 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert- Watene | Strongly agree | I think it is important to provide housing for all ages and stages, this helps a community feel within communities |
| 31754 Ms Joanna Hopkinson | Strongly agree | Housing must meet the needs of a wide range of the population - life style blacks, high density urban and affordable. |
| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | Strongly agree | Emphasis on affordable - most housing built for investment or as a 2nd, 3rd home being empty much of year. Suggest inventory unoccupied houses and increase rates to encourage renting these empty buildings. |
| 31756 Ronald Alfred & Phylis | Strongly | You need a choice and range of housing to support budgets. |
| | | |

| Kinzett | agree | |
|------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31761 Karen Steadman | Strongly agree | Yes all ranges - price - location |
| 31762 Mr Mark Hewetson | Strongly agree | access to a range of housing options is a basic human right |
| 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | Strongly agree | I am concerned that building new homes does not have as great an impact on poor people as we hope. Arguments I have heard are based on new homes increasing supply, and having some vague effect through the market. Why can we not directly target those who we most want to help? What new development caters directly to the most vulnerable? Consider how affordable tiny homes are. Though, I have not compared a dozen tiny homes to an apartment complex - perhaps the latter would out perform the former. I encourage you to support those who are trying community living. That is - people who are trying to share facilities etc this can bring efficiencies in use of land and resources. |
| | | In expectation of difficult times ahead: I have observed that in times of crisis people become more active locally. I believe that having buildings that a community can use - and having one near you - is an amazing resource. What building did Kai Rescue start in? Where do people meet in civil emergency etc etc. I mention this, because I do not see any type of community hall or similar included in new subdivisions. Why? This is such a loss. |
| 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | Strongly agree | |
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | Strongly agree | This is really important, but there is not much planning for this in the strategy. Your strategy, with it's focus on suburban sprawl, will not achieve much diversity of housing options or support community-led housing initiatives and social housing. Building a lot of housing developments on the edge of towns is nothing new. So why should we expect lots of housing choices all of a sudden? How does the FDS ensure that more community-led initiatives are supported? In its current form, the strategy supports more of the same developer-led housing. |
| 31771 Colleen Shaw | Strongly agree | There are not enough options for people in the Nelson and Richmond cities for people on low and middle incomes to have affordable accommodation. This should be a priority rather than the high priced accommodation and builds. |

| 31784 Ms Teresa James | Strongly agree | From a Golden Bay perspective it is extremely important that issues of affordability are given upmost consideration as the current housing crisis is very acute (very inadequate amount of housing stock to buy or rent, resulting in locals needing to leave the district or overcrowd with friends etc). |
|--|----------------------|--|
| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | Strongly agree | We need to move away from developer led housing - unaffordable large houses - but support community led social housing initiatives. |
| 31801 Joan Skurr | Strongly agree | Please see attached First priority is to determine the needs of the community. Second priority is to plan how best to meet these needs. Third priority is to plan and design where and what best meets these needs. This means also planning where amenities will be sited, work, green spaces, small shops, cafes, etc. |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | Strongly agree | But don't support large foot-print low density housing - reduce related impervious surfaces. |
| 31835 Mr Ian Wishart | Strongly agree | Please see attached: Facilitate people into tiny homes, unusual style homes, communal homes. Please do not encourage the continuation of building the large mansions by the large building companies. |
| 31219 Mrs kate windle | Strongly disagree | we have such a housing shortage, soo many people in Golden bay currently needing rental properties or smaller properties as they are aging |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | Strongly disagree | Concentrate on social housing |
| 31294 Stephen Gray | Strongly disagree | The ability to build multi storey apartments together with allowing up to 3 three storey apartments on sections of 600sqm or greater across the area identified will destroy the current amenity of those areas and should not proceed. The appeal of central Nelson is the low profile of housing that sees few properties dominated and overlooked by large multi storey structures. Current residents must retain the right to submit for and against any development that fundamental changes the nature of the area particularly as shading and lose of privacy are important to an occupier's right to enjoyment of their own property. The statur quo should be retained. |
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | Strongly disagree | The current method speculative building by developers in a free market will not provide a range of housing types, nor will it force / encourage development of less 'easy' projects like brownfeild development, urban change of use etc. It's run by money making not urban strategy / community need. |
| 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | Strongly disagree | If by affordable options the TDC approves subdivision of productive food growing land - e.g lower Queen Street - then I strongly oppose this strategy. Stand alone housing developments need to be minimised. If the TDC continues to allow the subdivision of land around "small centres' rather than Nelson and Richmond it will only add the the already overcrowded roads with people commuting in Richmond and Nelson to work or services those centres. Further - we know from extensive research world wide - that building more roads are increasing the lanes in exisiting roads only invites more traffic and increase the |

| | | cars and vehicles that use them. |
|---------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31570 Ms Annabel Norman | Strongly disagree | |
| 31747 Mr (Tom) Neil BRETT | Strongly disagree | Reality check. The proposal for high rise intensification is not related to affordable options in housing. As already indicated by the new high rise block in Beach Road. |
| 31763 Susan Rogers | Strongly disagree | Survey is flawed from the beginning. You need to redesign this entire line of questioning. It leads only to answers desired by the maker of the survey. |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Strongly disagree | Please see attached: Multi story accommodation is not suitable for the very young and elderly. Green space and fresh air should be priority. |

05 Please indicate whether you support or do not support Outcome 5: Sufficient residential and business land capacity is provided to meet demand. Please explain your choice:

| • | | • |
|-----------------------------|-------|---|
| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | Agree | |
| 31114 Ms Jill Rogers | Agree | Provided you confirm the demand is there and outline that to the public |
| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | Agree | I agree that land needs to be made available to meet demand; however, it is imperative not to develop productive land. |
| 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren | Agree | As long as it is not on greenfield areas |
| 31130 Trevor James | Agree | |
| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson | Agree | Self evident. |
| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | Agree | |
| 31173 Mr Roderick Watson | Agree | |
| 31174 Ms Alison Westerby | Agree | |
| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | Agree | |
| 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | Agree | Business and residential needs to be high density but only in urban situations. |
| 31227 Ms Lee Eliott | Agree | |
| 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | Agree | Again, see my response to 02 if you want to increase space, go upward instead of outward, but not so tall that trees can't shade the homes and businesses. I don't want Nelson to start looking like Honolulu or Manhattan gross! |
| 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | Agree | |
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | Agree | So long as it is in the right place. |
| 31248 Mr Will Bosnich | Agree | |
| 31261 Mr John Weston | Agree | Careful consideration and research in to the demands is essential. |
| 31262 Mr Martin John Shand | Agree | I agree with the principal but how do you estimate how much land is going to be required for future use. |
| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | Agree | But growth projections are just estimates and it should be actual growth that drives the release of greenfield sites for development. But it should be a last resort. |
| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | Agree | |
| | | |

| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | Agree | |
|---|-------|---|
| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley | Agree | |
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | Agree | But where? Richmond are building on a flood plain. If that is acceptable why not build a housing estate adjacent o the Boulder Bank. More will need to be done to combat the effects of climate change such as flooding, rising water levels, storm surges. |
| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | Agree | I believe it has been indicated that the core development plan meets projected increased demands (at the higher estimate of projected growth) without the need to develop the expensive and unnecessary secondary option of a completely new village at Tasman. |
| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | Agree | |
| 31285 Dr Hamish Holland | Agree | The T136 proposal is said to be over and above projected demand. |
| 31286 Mr David Short | Agree | This makes sense too. |
| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | Agree | A balance of residential and business to support the population but some of these areas can be integrated in the future so making use of the existing buildings eg flats above offices, apartments over shops, warehouses, carparks etc. Making use of the land and building and the existing infrastructures needed |
| 31309 Mr & Mrs Rose & Phillip Windle | Agree | |
| 31316 John Heslop | Agree | There needs to be better ways to ensure the use/outcome of the land is assessed at the early stages. Land banking and high value housing in recent times is just another way of capitalizing/profiting on investment rather than focus on the required demand and community/district needs. Low interest rates on savings has seen big change in property development becoming a bank rather a need in recent times. |
| 31318 Mrs Isobel Mosley | Agree | However you are not doing this for Motueka! |
| 31355 Mr Barney Hoskins | Agree | I support in principle however I do not support intensification to 6 stories in Tahunanui. This would take away from the community feel as well as create issues with access and safety, particularly if intensification took place around the intersection at Tahunanui drive and Bisley Ave. There are many young children and families that use this area and congestion is already an issue without the additional of this level of intensification. I do however support the intensification up to 3 stories and in some cases 3-4 story low rise residential intensification (including mixed use). Focus on intensification in main centres should be the key focus (Nelson city and Richmond in particular) as this will ensure that transport requirements and emissions are reduced and dwellings are in the most appropriate locations in relation to employment opportunities and services. This will also ensure that when investment in infrastructure is required it is not to geographically broad. As NCC can no longer require developers to provide off street |

| | | parking, this creates a large potential burden on the parking at Tahunanui beach and will reduces access for visitors. |
|---------------------------------------|-------|---|
| 31356 Stephen Williams | Agree | If we have to grow, then this is clear. |
| 31360 Ms Thuy Tran | Agree | Agree if demand from other big cities such as Auckland and Wellington is not actively ENCOURAGED with plentiful housing options. Why on earth would Nelson and Tasman do that? |
| 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | Agree | As long as development is not to the detriment of maintaining existing open spaces and recreation areas. |
| 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett | Agree | Agree only on the condition that good productive land is never used for these purposes. |
| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling | Agree | Making provision for growth is sound, but this depends on what and where it is and what constraints there are on supply of land. |
| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling | Agree | We have a surplus of stand alone 3 bedroom houses, driven by developers intent of being able to sell high price houses. Surely we need to protect the scenic beauty of our district. |
| 31415 Mrs Zanahe Ruth Galloway | Agree | It is a matter of retro fitting what is already there not expanding further into narrow valleys. |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | Agree | |
| 31431 Katerina Seligman | Agree | However there needs consideration about when centres have reached an optimal size and stop there. |
| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn Ball | Agree | Land should not be re-zoned for development based on predicted growth that may not eventuate. |
| 31438 Aleisha Hosie | Agree | Agree - this needs to exceed demand. land prices are excessive. |
| 31441 Mr Chris Head | Agree | As long as it isn't just continued greenfield expansion. |
| 31449 Mr John Chisholm | Agree | |
| 31457 Mr J Santa Barbara | Agree | There needs to be recognition that business and residential can coexist, hence the emphasis on mixed use medium density |
| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | Agree | For a 30 year plan, sure. But if demand keeps growing, the 'supply more land' approach is ultimately unsustainable. |
| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | Agree | To meet demand I think is good - there is a shortage currently. Any more than what is needed is unnecessary. The TDC has stated that the Tasman Village proposal is not strictly needed to meet demand so therefore should not be considered. |
| 31487 Ms Heather Spence | Agree | I agree provided there are a range of sizes and prices so a wide range of people can afford or choose to live and work in an area. And primary focus should be within existing residential/urban centres, NOT developing more non-urban land. |
| | | |

| 31508 Mr Roger Barlow | Agree | But not on good productive land. |
|-----------------------------|-------|--|
| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | Agree | Agree. Consideration needs to be given to providing for a mixed use of activities in new residential areas so that essential services such as health centres, community spaces, cafes and small supermarkets are close by. Having mixed use developments improves people's access to work opportunities, especially low income earners. Mixed use can also help create more socially diverse environments as everyone can have equal access to facilities regardless of whether they own a car. Local employment creates strong connections with the community which in turn enhances individual wellbeing |
| 31520 Andrew Stirling | Agree | |
| 31529 Mr Steven King-Turner | Agree | |
| 31533 Wendy Trevett | Agree | To provide work. |
| 31537 Mrs Juliana Trolove | Agree | |
| 31549 Mr Ian McComb | Agree | Not all areas of proposed growth are supported and the greater supply of a variety of housing will to some extent encourage greater demand. |
| 31551 Mrs Jo Kitchen | Agree | |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | Agree | Residential should first focus on intensification to preserve the fabric of communities and rural villages. I understand that more growth = more business opportunity needed but please not along our foreshores o gobbling up the productive food basket of our region |
| 31558 Mr Steve Jordan | Agree | |
| 31560 Ms Steph Watts | Agree | With a priority on building up rather than sprawling outwards. Particularly don't need bussiness and industrial sprawl at the detriment of natural beauty and a healthy environment as seen in some poorly planned bigger cities eg Auckland. |
| | | With regards to residential areas if we give preference to smaller, we'll built, environmentally sustainable homes we can cater for more residents and have a healthier environmental for us to live in. |
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | Agree | |
| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | Agree | As above that's the way it is nowallow natural progressiondon't force it, Wait for demand don't actively create it. I don't believe there is a need for this. Tail doesn't wag the dog! |
| 31595 Gary Clark | Agree | Both are needed and the Mapua FDS work failed to provide for commercial land that is needed. |
| 31617 Ms steph jewell | Agree | I know we need it but "land capacity" might also mean more covering greenfield with asphalt, which is |

| | | increasing our carbon foot print. Business landdoes this mean 'big box' businesses? In which case they have to go Up too. Eg Kmart on top of Farmers, on top of Westpac, on top of Mitre 10. We cannot go on doing each business with its own roading and carpark. Some will have to be on the flat but many others can go Up. |
|--------------------------------|-------|---|
| 31620 Mr Paul Baigent | Agree | |
| 31622 Peter Butler | Agree | |
| 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | Agree | |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | Agree | |
| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | Agree | |
| 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin | Agree | |
| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | Agree | |
| 31662 Joe Roberts | Agree | Support, however this is a requirement of the NPS-UD. It is also crucial that there is sufficient supply to avoid the inflation costs experienced in recent years. The target should therefore be to exceed forecasted demand. |
| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | Agree | We need to differentiate between demand that we NEED and demand that we WANT. Demand that we NEED is demand for affordable housing, for low income workers. Demand that we WANT would be for the retirement sector or rural residential/lifestyle options where demand is most likely coming from out of town. Yes we should provide housing to meet demand, however first and foremost, our focus should be providing for demand that we NEED. This means more intensification and affordable options in Nelson and Richmond CBD, more affordable housing in Motueka, Murchison etc. |
| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | Agree | Agree in principle, but the growth projections that underpin the estimate of land required are questioned. The past 2-3 year have seen major demographic and economic changes associated with the global pandemic, many of which has resulted in "one-off" movements of people and changes in their employment choices. Use the data to project future population growth trends is potentially flawed and may result in a massive oversupply of homes in areas which don't need and/or cannot support them. |
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | Agree | Capacity should be achieved through intensification in existing main hubs wherever possible, and expansion into greenfield sites should be far less than indicated in the FDS |
| 31692 Mr Alasdair Gardiner | Agree | |
| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | Agree | |
| 31697 Robert King-Tenison | Agree | |
| | | |

| 31716 Mr Alan hart | Agree | |
|--------------------------------------|----------|--|
| 31721 Ms Jill Cullen | Agree | |
| 31741 Mr Robert Stevenson | Agree | |
| 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert- Watene | Agree | It is important to keep up with the regions growth to not run into bigger problems in the future |
| 31747 Mr (Tom) Neil BRETT | Agree | Obviously, there is a requirement for residential and business land. It is the methodology of providing this land that is the real debate. |
| 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | Agree | In the correct location |
| 31759 Mr Damian Campbell | Agree | |
| 31762 Mr Mark Hewetson | Agree | assume this means sufficient capacity is provided by the FDS, rather than at present |
| 31774 Mrs Jane Sutherland | Agree | |
| 31777 Mr David Lucas | Agree | |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | Agree | Open-ended growth is unacceptable re impacts on the host natural environment. Importantly: calculate and apply carry-capacity determinants, with precaution. |
| 31830 K.M. McDonald | Agree | The assumption that "a high growth pattern continues into the future" is not necessarily correct. Recent trends are showing a slowing of population growth. |
| 31835 Mr Ian Wishart | Agree | Please see attached: Only in line with your work in section 14.2 |
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | Disagree | The plans as proposed for residential areas such as the Wood are going to wreck neighbourhoods. |
| 31195 Mr Serge Philippe Crottaz | Disagree | Too much housing capacity is provided in the strategy as Aotearoa New Zealand population growth is slowing down. The Greenfield areas N-106 and N-032 should be removed from the draft of the Future Development Strategy 2022-2052 |
| 31219 Mrs kate windle | Disagree | TDC needs to rezone approp areas to allow this, especially Park Avenue |
| 31257 Mr Kent Inglis | Disagree | Rezoning to allow Residential Intensification in areas with (or with the ability to easily increase) existing Infrastructure is required, in addition to rezoning to allow increased business/commercial capacity (which will be required with additional population growth). Greenfields development is also needed 'in the mix' to meet the needs of the forecast population growth, particularly for those seeking 'traditional family homes'. |
| 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman | Disagree | This sounds logical until one tries to define 'demand'. There would be many thousands of people who would love to come to live in this area, but we cannot |
| | | |

| | | accommodate all of them without destroying the amenity of the district. Meeting demand must not be ar objective. Meeting the needs of communities is our requirement. |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--|
| 31278 Wendy Ross | Disagree | I don't know what the above means without more explanation. |
| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | Disagree | Am a little cautions around the word 'demand'. Demanded by exploitive capitalist forces isn't quite right. Demand by a healthy and just society is quite another matter. |
| 31322 Mrs BARBARA AND TIM ROBSON | Disagree | We must temper demand and growth expectation if we are to meet our emissions targets. |
| 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | Disagree | NZTA has not provided the region with city and town bypasses, flyovers etc. to let the existing traffic and freight flow freely, slowing traffic to a snails pace, creating more greenhouse gas emissions and freight inefficiency's. Councils should not allow any further rural subdivisions until this is rectified and should lobby NZTA to upgrade our outdated roading system. It has been stated that T136 is not required to meet future housing needs and certainly should not be approved. |
| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | Disagree | Residental land should be supplied mostly via intensification rather than greenfield. This will reduce costs to council, reduce transportation emissions and provide safer high density environs. |
| 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | Disagree | There is too much planning for large, stand-alone housing. This is in line with the current trend to accommodate the rich, unproductive population and forget about the people who want to work here. I'm urging the council to re-write the plan to allow for more growth WITHIN the existing towns and centres that offer all the amenities within easy reach. |
| 31346 Martin Hartman | Disagree | There is too much planning for large, stand-alone housing. This is in line with the current trend to accommodate the rich, unproductive population and forget about the people who want to work here. I'm urging the council to re-write the plan to allow for more growth WITHIN the existing towns and centres that offer all the amenities within easy reach. |
| 31349 Laurien Heijs | Disagree | Endorse NelsonTasman2050 submission. |
| 31364 Mrs Christine Tuffnell | Disagree | However, I disagree with the plans for suffocating existing residential areas (such as The Wood area where I live). There is sufficient land available for a greenfields policy for residential land development for housing. |
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | Disagree | Look for areas that don't creep into greenspace areas, or utilise areas that can be intensified. |
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | Disagree | Disagree with the objective. I'm not sure about that. We seem to predominantly provide for large standalone houses, but there is a lot of demand in not only this community for smaller, more affordable, and other housing options. It seems like the character and productivity of the beautiful landscape is selling out to accommodate everybody who wants to buy a house here. Maybe it should be protected what makes this region so special and the focus should be on providing cheaper housing options in towns and centres |
| | | |

| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | Disagree | Demand may be very large and cannot be supported by the region. Following the demand path will not help with reducing our carbon footprint. |
|------------------------------------|----------|--|
| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | Disagree | too open-ended |
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin | Disagree | Does this mean, to "meet the demand of developers"? If so, this is not currently providing us with the best solutions. |
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | Disagree | You may never meet all the demand for residential and business land and endlessly building on greenfiel sites isn't the answer. |
| 31416 Tim Leyland | Disagree | More thought is required on the character of housing. Tapawera has a unique and valued town layout. The local community would like to preserve open green space and tree lined character of the township. The FDS needs to better explain how it will retain the character and productivity of our area whilst also providing housing options for the young (as in affordable) and elderly (as in linked to the services they need). |
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | Disagree | Too much land will be provided by this proposal. Our productive land and recreational land need to be protected. We are a tourist destination and our natural areas make us special - eg the land around the Great Taste Trail. Far too much land on the Richmond plains is already covered in houses - this proposal does nothing to reassure me that this will not continue. We need to work creatively to accommodate more people in our towns and cities in healthy and attractive ways. |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas Hollyman | Disagree | We know of people who would like to live at Hira but there aren't enough new infrastructures planned |
| 31435 Mr Alan Eggers | Disagree | In the past the Tasman district has not provided enough residential and business land fro development which has pushed up prices. The FDS and the proposed additional future development areas (FDAs) will go along way to meet that demand, but there is a need to be flexibility in the planning rules to allow areas to be quickly andeasily devloped. |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | Disagree | Offer does not necessarily have to meet demand. |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | Disagree | |
| 31484 Mr Gavin Brent Cook | Disagree | |
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | Disagree | I'm not sure about that. We seem to predominantly provide for large stand-alone houses, but there is a lot of demand in our community for smaller, more affordable, and other housing options. It appears that we are selling out the character and productivity of our beautiful landscape to accommodate everybody who wants to buy a house here. Perhaps we should protect what makes our region so special and focus |

| | | more on providing cheaper housing options in our towns and centres, that our community so clearly needs (and closer to the sources of employment) |
|--------------------------------|----------|---|
| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | Disagree | It seems to me that the strategy is catering for the needs of those who wish to move to the region (possibly retiring here with lots of money) rather than for the needs of those who already live and work here. |
| 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | Disagree | We seem to predominantly provide for large stand-alone, increasingly unaffordable houses, but there is a lot of demand in our community for smaller, more affordable, and other housing options. It seems like we are selling out our precious land, it's quality soils and productivity to accommodate everybody who wants to buy a house here. Maybe we should protect the productive land that feeds our people and makes our region so special and focus more on providing cheaper housing options in our towns and centres, that our community so clearly needs. |
| 31497 Mrs Uta Purcell | Disagree | I prefer a community that has already got it's heart, it's services in place, is developing naturally, not a development that caters for the demands of people that don't yet live here. |
| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | Disagree | The Plan should encourage growth only where it is not environmentally and socially damaging. We need to encourage consolidation within existing residential and business land areas. In the future no all demands will be able to be met. |
| 31523 Ms karen steadman | Disagree | This hasn't been the case in the past in Murchison but the current plan will help. It will be interesting to see the growth in Murchison in the next 5 years. My thoughts are it could be quite exceptional. |
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | Disagree | I disagree with the objective because we seem to predominantly provide for large stand-alone houses, bu there is a lot of demand in our community for smaller, more affordable, and other housing options. We should focus more on providing cheaper housing options in our towns and centres that our community so clearly needs. |
| 31554 Wendy Barker | Disagree | I think you are over estimating the need. Figures from Christchurch region and elsewhere suggest that there will be an oversupply of housing in the near future. |
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | Disagree | I think we are not using land effectively at present. We need to intensify urban areas, connect our urban centres with better public transport and keep unused land for its best possible uses as either wildlife refuges or productive land. Humans need to learn to share land instead of bulldozing every acre. |
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | Disagree | I'm not sure about that. We seem to predominantly provide for large stand-alone houses, but there is a lot of demand in our community for smaller, more affordable, and other housing options. |
| | | |

| | | Maybe we should protect what makes our region so special and focus more on providing cheaper housing options in our towns and centres, that our community so clearly needs. |
|------------------------------------|----------|--|
| 31572 Mr David Todd | Disagree | Demand must not be the primary objective. Land capacity with careful planning may not meet all demands. |
| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | Disagree | I do not support greenfield expansion in any way. |
| 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | Disagree | There is a lot of demand in our community for smaller, more affordable, and other housing options. But the FDS seems to be more focused on the usual standalone housing concept. It does not show enough consideration for climate change. We cannot keep on using up productive land and encroaching on rural areas, more balance is required. |
| 31588 pene Greet | Disagree | land is in limited supply. It should be used for the best purpose and not necessarily be on demand for residential or business purposes. Productive agricultural land should not be used for residential or other business purposes. Demand at what cost??? |
| 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | Disagree | We seem to predominantly provide for large stand-alone houses already, so providing more land for this only facilitates the problem. There is a lot of demand in our community for smaller, more affordable, and other housing options. Maybe we should protect what makes our region so special and focus more on providing cheaper housing options in our towns and centres, that our community so clearly needs. |
| 31593 Mr William Samuels | Disagree | I'm not sure about that. We seem to predominantly provide for large stand-alone houses, but there is a lot of demand in our community for smaller, more affordable, and other housing options. |
| | | It seems like we are selling out the character and productivity of our beautiful landscape to accommodate everybody who wants to buy a house here. Maybe we should protect what makes our region so special and focus more on providing cheaper housing options in our towns and centres, that our community so clearly needs. |
| 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner | Disagree | And rather unsure how the proposed FDS supports this? I can't clearly understand how the demand is measured here? i.e. I don't see the demand for the Tasman Village – there is neither the business there nor the residential demand considering the job situations. This for example seems purely to entertain holiday homes, stand alone once again – tourism, selling the land rather than keeping what makes our landscape beautiful. |
| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | Disagree | I'm not sure about that. We seem to predominantly provide for large stand-alone houses, but there is a |
| | | |

| ons. pe to accommodate region so special our community so |
|---|
| |
| |
| the wrong able by central gov herwise we will be behaviour (e.g. less |
| bellaviour (e.g. less |
| demand in our d protect what our towns and |
| nore affordable |
| y and Orchard Flats |
| |
| ess to Nature. They on that this must be as required by the while minimising |
| all he be ded do not not not not not not not not not no |

| | | expanded land use. This is achieved in many cities in the world, and we can do it too, without providing more greenfield land. |
|-------------------------|----------|--|
| | | (ii) Expanding population. We might pause for a moment to consider our approximately 2% annual growth figures. This means doubling the population every 35 years. We will surely want to continue to welcome refugees, including forced climate migrants, and to enable family reunification, but we may wish to question immigration settings that intend to increase population as a means of economic growth. |
| | | In addition, it is likely that the portion of our population growth from internal migration will be driven by the release of greenfield land. Minimising availability of greenfield land may decrease population growth and thus reduce our region's ecological and carbon footprint. |
| | | (iii) Infinite carrying capacity. We are considering the future of our region at a time of shocking political events, as well as daily bad news about the state of the biosphere. As a matter of resilience in case of scenarios requiring self-sufficiency, we need to estimate the carrying capacity of our region for its human population in terms of food, water, energy and other basic needs. This should inform future planning. Methodologies for doing this are developing. |
| | | (iv) Humans are the only species with needs for habitat. We share this beautiful region with thousands of other species whose habitat we have progressively encroached upon, polluted or destroyed. The more we use, the less there is for other species. It's not only our direct land use that affects other species; it's also our impact on fresh water, wetlands, estuaries and ocean shore. We must consider human needs with humility as one part of the web of life, and use all means possible to lower our ecological footprint. We note with approval that the draft Tasman Biostrategy has this goal: 'By 2030 environmental limits to growth have been defined and all subdivision and land development respects those limits.' |
| 31640 Mr Ryan Brash | Disagree | I'm not sure about that. We seem to predominantly provide for large stand-alone houses, but there is a lot of demand in our community for smaller, more affordable, and other housing options. It seems like we are selling out the character and productivity of our beautiful landscape to accommodate everybody who wants to buy a house here. Maybe we should protect what makes our region so special and focus more on providing cheaper housing options in our towns and centres, that our community so clearly needs. |
| 31644 Murray Poulter | Disagree | Not without detailed sustainability, carrying capacity, economic and community development evaluation. |
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | Disagree | Please see other fields |

| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | Disagree | I'm not sure about that. We seem to predominantly provide for large stand-alone houses, but there is a lot of demand in our community for smaller, more affordable, and other housing options. Maybe we should protect what makes our region so special and focus more on providing cheaper housing options in our towns and centres, that our community so clearly needs. |
|--------------------------------|----------|---|
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | Disagree | Disagree I'm not sure about that. We seem to predominantly provide for large stand-alone houses, but there is a lot of demand in our community for smaller, more affordable, and other housing options. Maybe we should protect what makes our region so special and focus more on providing cheaper housing options in our towns and centres, that our community so clearly needs. |
| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | Disagree | Disagree I'm not sure about that. We seem to predominantly provide for large stand-alone houses, but there is a lot of demand in our community for smaller, more affordable, and other housing options. Maybe we should protect what makes our region so special and focus more on providing cheaper housing options in our towns and centres, that our community so clearly needs. |
| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | Disagree | Need to include the secondary Braeburn Block T-136 to allow fro growth of Motueka. |
| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | Disagree | I'm not sure about that. We seem to predominantly provide for large stand-alone houses, but there is a lot of demand in our community for smaller, more affordable, and other housing options. Maybe we should protect what makes our region so special and focus more on providing cheaper housing options in our towns and centres, that our community so clearly needs. |
| | | higher density on main traffic routes can feed into public transport. |
| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | Disagree | We are in a climate emergency, we need to limit the provision of capacity not allow it to be driven by demand. Much of our land is at or near to sea level, we should be planning how our current community copes with this and how those that are vulnerable to climate change are transitioned to more sustainable locations. Endless growth needs to end. |
| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | Disagree | We should not be providing more land for green field developments. |
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | Disagree | The criteria should not be what the external demand is, as this area would become like California |
| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | Disagree | I am endorsing the Nelson Tasman Climate Forum's view . Forum response: Disagree |

| | | (i) Land. We agree that people need safe, healthy, comfortable places to live, and access to Nature. They need places for services, commerce and industry. But we question a hidden assumption that this must be via provision of more land. This seems to conflict with the imperative to decarbonise as required by the Zero Carbon Act We must accomplish the goal of providing places to live and work while minimising expanded land use. This is achieved in many cities in the world, and we can do it too, without providing more greenfield land. (ii) Expanding population. We might pause for a moment to consider our approximately 2% annual growth figures. This means doubling the population every 35 years. We will surely want to continue to welcome refugees, including forced climate migrants, and to enable family reunions, but we may wish to question immigration settings that intend to increase population as a means of economic growth. (iii) Infinite carrying capacity. We are considering the future of our region at a time of shocking political events, as well as daily bad news about the state of the biosphere. As a matter of resilience in case of scenarios requiring self-sufficiency, we need to estimate the carrying capacity of our region for its human population in terms of food, water, energy and other basic needs. This should inform future planning. Methodologies for doing this are developing. |
|--------------------------|----------|--|
| 31710 Ms Angela Fitchett | Disagree | This outcome sounds like a license to release land to meet uncontrolled demand. Before the region expands business and residential land, what we have already needs to be better used and planning etc needs to actively facilitate and incentivise this process. It should be easier and more cost-effective to intensify and redevelop land for housing and businesses than to build on greenfield land. |
| 31711 Sara Flintoff | Disagree | In Murchison not currently. |
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | Disagree | The only housing typology that is supported and and actively encouraged is the stand alone dwelling. By making more rural land available for this typology we are slowly eating into what is most attractive to this regain, that is its rural character, viticulture and fruit growing industry, coastal environemnt and national parks. The classification of what is classified as "productive land" does not seem robust enough to prevent the loss of this asset, both financial and character, as we now see evident in the creep of Richmond towards the west and what is proposed further south. |
| 31726 Mr John Jackson | Disagree | The plan appears to be a 'predict and provide' model i.e. demand is predicted. A preferred planning model is to plan for what people desire i.e. a desired future for our communities. |
| | | Personally, I do not want more housing if it simply means getting more people into homes. Communities must be designed for what people want in terms of wellbeing, accessibility, equity, Nature services and liveability. |
| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | Disagree | I'm not sure about that. We seem to predominantly provide for large stand-alone houses, but there is a |
| | | |

| | | lot of demand in our community for smaller, more affordable, and other housing options. It seems like we are selling out our valuable and irreplaceable productive land to accommodate everybody who wants to buy a house here. Maybe we should protect what makes our region so special and focus more on providing cheaper housing options in our towns and centres, that our community so clearly needs. |
|------------------------|----------|---|
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | Disagree | I'm not sure about that. We seem to predominantly provide for large stand-alone houses, but there is a lot of demand in our community for smaller, more affordable, and other housing options. It seems like we are selling out the character and productivity of our beautiful landscape to accommodate everybody who wants to buy a house here. Maybe we should protect what makes our region so special and focus more on providing cheaper housing options in our towns and centres, that our community so clearly needs. |
| 31739 Philippa Hellyer | Disagree | Who decides what "demand" is? This whole exercise is just like the bloke who decides to build a new shed with lots of storage space even though he doesn't have stuff to put in it. But do it anyway and sure enough the stuff will materialise to fill the space created! Remember you are planning to spend someone else's money and try and tell that someone else that there is a "demand" for whatever you are using the money for. |
| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | Disagree | Please see attached: Meeting demand not a godd idea. Best to meet need. Essential to determine the maximum and optimum population. Infinite growth is no longer as option (and it never was). Make plans based on optimum populations. |
| 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | Disagree | The Nelson Tasman area does not have the capacity to support a significant increase in population size. New homes and developments should be focussed in bigger cities like Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch. |
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | Disagree | I'm not sure about that. The demands (especially of housing developers with their profit first focus) needs to be balanced with protection of the environment, with the accordant priority on green, town centre living. Housing developers seem to predominantly prefer to provide large stand-alone houses on the outskirts of town, but there is a lot of demand in our community for smaller, more affordable, accessible, and different types of housing options. |
| 31769 Ms Jo Gould | Disagree | It sounds like this means making more land available to meet demand. If so, demand might be the wrong driver. Our future development strategy should be clear on the constraints for residential and business capacity and clear on how much development is enough. Whilst strategic constraints are identified and discussed in the Strategy (Fig 22), the constraints exercise should be carried out at a more granular level. |
| 31775 Dr Thomas Carl | Disagree | |
| | | |

| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | Disagree | We need smaller, cheaper housing options in our towns and centres, not everywhere. |
|--|---------------|--|
| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | Disagree | Please see attached - determined Disagree from submission: A: No we strongly oppose this as its not land that matters, but housing - both for businesses and people. We can house people without sprawl, without adding new land on the periphery of our centres. There is actually a lot of unbuilt on land in the conurbation of Nelson, Stoke, Richmond and this needs to be used first. And as we have argued elsewhere, though simple partitioning of existing thousands of new dwellings can be created in the sizes that we are short of - 1 and 2 bedroomed houses (if 1 in 4 of the some 30,000 existing houses in Nelson-Stoke-Richmond was partitioned into 2 and 1in 12 into 3, then that is 12,500 new dwellings. Add that to the 14,000 already catered for in existing residential zoned land, and you are up to 26,500 when you claim we need 24,000. And this is without allowing for any apartments, any townhouses and none of the few thousand tiny houses in the back or fronts of existing houses or in flood prone and liquefiable land unsuitable for other buildings. It is important to keep in clear focus that this is over 30 years, a generation. |
| 31809 Mr Andrew Spittal | Disagree | It is submitted that it is not adequate to only aim to provide "sufficient" residential (and business land). What we have learnt over the last 5 years is that the region has fallen well behind on meeting needs for housing, which has had a significant detrimental impact on the cost of housing. Outcome 5, as drafted, will not therefore adequately address the matter of affordability. The only way to address housing affordability to ensure there is ample supply. The property at 49 Stafford Drive should therefore be included in the FDS 2022. This site provides a valuable contribution to meeting needs while also, importantly, achieving a number of the other Outcomes. |
| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | Don't know | |
| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | Don't know | |
| 31325 Dr Ann Briggs | Don't know | Although I have read and understood the technical document provided, and the HBA data, I cannot see the rationale behind the projected level of demand. In an area such as Nelson Tasman, housing development opportunities will be taken up, and people (and maybe businesses) will re-locate. But that does not constitute a need. The increase in housing needed for new families, the single and the elderly is necessary, but largely this is not the type of development currently envisaged. See my response to Item 4. |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | Don't know | How can it be "provided" unless owned by TDC? You should not force a landowner to sell their property. |

| 31406 Ms Floortje van Lierop | Don't know | Unclear statement |
|---------------------------------|---------------|---|
| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | Don't know | This is a vague question and I would need more information on what land capacity is being considered. |
| 31473 Mr Andrew Downs | Don't know | |
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | Don't know | |
| 31488 Annette Starink | Don't know | |
| 31502 Ms Caroline Jones | Don't know | |
| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard | Don't know | What does this question even mean? Does it refer to green field developments? Or to intensification? I do not support continued greenfield developments in horticultural or recreational areas such as the Maitai Valley. |
| 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett | Don't know | |
| 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart | Don't know | |
| 31598 Mrs Nicola Worsfold | Don't know | |
| 31606 Mr Trent Shepard | Don't know | |
| 31641 Mr Stephen (Steve) Hayden | Don't know | |
| 31643 Inge Koevoet | Don't know | |
| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | Don't know | Neutral as I don't know the business sector, less important than other factors. |
| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | Don't know | Not answering any of these leading questions |

| 31761 Karen Steadman | Don't know | Yes Murchison needs more residential lite industrial and rural residential land made available. |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|---|
| 31784 Ms Teresa James | Don't know | |
| 31363 Mr Steve Cross | N/A | I reject the premise of this question |
| 31460 Kris Woods | N/A | infrastructure must be able to support any additions. |
| 31623 Ms Lucy Charlesworth | N/A | I am wary of answering these questions as I cannot be sure of how they will be interpreted. So I will state I do not agree with developing green spaces. These spaces need to be reserved and protected to allow for sustainable biodiversity and for future generations. Intensification within Nelson CBD needs to be a priority. I do not agrees with building on Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. I do not agree with housing development on green fields. There is a climate emergency. Remove these areas from the FDS. |
| 31122 Mr Johan Thomas Wahlgren | Neutral | If this means building on greenfields no. |
| 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | Neutral | |
| 31129 Mrs Gaynor Brooks | Neutral | |
| 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward | Neutral | |
| 31185 Myfanway James | Neutral | We want to avoid urban spreading as much as possible |
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | Neutral | This would depend greatly on whose opinion you consider for each option. |
| 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan | Neutral | |
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | Neutral | See my answer to question 3 |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | Neutral | You can never know what sufficient is |
| 31284 Mr Jarmo Saloranta | Neutral | The new land capacity should NOT include rezoning Rural Residential 3 zones into dense new residential towns. |
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | Neutral | As long as horticultural/agricultural productive land is not compromised, even if it is not used for this purpose at the time of demand. |
| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | Neutral | |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | Neutral | |
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | Neutral | |

| 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman | Neutral | |
|----------------------------|---------|---|
| 31347 Ms Paula Baldwin | Neutral | In what context? Given the layout of Nelson/Tasman; the means of travel available ie: cycle lanes/tracks, cars/trucks and very very few buses - Nelson/Tasman's land capacity is being used well. The introduction of a centralised sports field complex has been a great development. Where is the public transport system to get there? Walking through/via the walkways, at night, isn't the safest means of transport, but that's society today. There's land available at Wakatu Estate, but very limited options to get in and out of the area. Intensification of existing land footprints in both Main Centres is there, just waiting to be developed. Councils, encourage this. Other cities have shown that both residential and commercial can co-existing in an existing development ie: the main city CBDs. But, for the love of God, leave good balanced, clean, healthy, pleasant living areas, like Tahunanui, ALONE. Those living on the hillside, looking out at the Tasman Sea vista do not want tall ugly buildings in their view. Those living at "ground level", enjoying sun and fresh air, do not want to live next to tall ugly buildings not to mention the many many more people all trying to live in this beautiful area where there's not enough services or infrastructure to support density living. |
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | Neutral | |
| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | Neutral | Demand is not the only thing at play here. We have an escalating climate crisis, and much of what you are suggesting will make it worse. The Councils need to heed the IPCC's message and not just keep playing a 20th century stuck record on growth. It would be better to build up, not out, and resist infinite growth. Reduction is the name of the 21st century game - you need to learn how to play it. So, no, no more rezoning and building on rural land at all. This FDS goes to 2050 - this area will be very different by 2050 - according to James Hansen we are likely to be nudging 2.4C by then, our weather here will be very different - hugely wetter, hugely drier and hotter, and the sea will have moved up more than expected. You need to play your part in reduction, NOT growth. |
| 31365 michael monti | Neutral | |
| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | Neutral | Demand needs to be sustained before these decisions are made. Otherwise land is released ahead of demand on the backs of speculators, subsequently it lies empty, abandoned and wasted. Focus on the areas already available, and make better use of these. |
| 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer | Neutral | |
| 31400 Miss Heather Wallace | Neutral | Depends. This land must be non productive land and within current areas that have appropriate amenities. Urban sprawl to be minimised. |
| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors | Neutral | |

| 31423 Mr Roger Frost | Neutral | |
|------------------------------|---------|--|
| 31430 Muriel Moran | Neutral | In projecting growth is it a matter of, having made areas available, more people will come as opposed to the number of people who can live in these areas dependent on what the area can sustainably, and the infrastructure provide. Is the door open for never ending growth? Is that the only choice? |
| 31454 Mrs Tracey Koole | Neutral | |
| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | Neutral | |
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | Neutral | |
| 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon | Neutral | |
| 31480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | Neutral | |
| 31483 Debbie Hampson | Neutral | |
| 31491 Ms Annette Milligan | Neutral | I am not in favour of relentless growth. In the 40 years I have lived in this area, there has been a significant increase in the population and lack of growth in supportive infrastructure. I do fear that there is no end to 'demand' - there needs to be consideration of the 'quality of life' factors too |
| 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | Neutral | |
| 31505 Cheryl Heten | Neutral | |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne | Neutral | |
| 31515 Geoffrey Vause | Neutral | A vague question that needs clarity. This all depends on whether demand is based on need or want for the latter is strongly influenced, for residential, by fashion and social competition. Business land need is a little more quantifiable for staple business e.g. commercial property but can be problematic for industry. |
| 31521 Mrs Marie Waterhouse | Neutral | |
| 31562 Grant palliser | Neutral | I have reservations about the validity of 'to meet public demands response. It is chicken and egg stuffwhich comes first,is demand artificially a response purely based on supply rather than supply being a result of demand? Build large stand alone housespeople will buy them if there are no other optionsthe perceived demand is artificial. It is imperative that if the demand is high, council understands why this is so and plans to provide without destroying what drove the desires in the first placeand makes our region unique. |
| 31574 Mr David Bolton | Neutral | |
| | | |

| 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz | Neutral | |
|---------------------------|---------|--|
| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | Neutral | This is often a trick question leading to unscrupulous development of Greenfield areas such as the Maitai valley, Kaka, and Orchard flats. Anyone can agree with this in principle but in practice important to be sensitive to existing recreational use of Greenfields areas. |
| 31604 Mr Peter Moot | Neutral | |
| 31608 Robbie Thomson | Neutral | Business land is where a lot of jobs are created, so, contary to views expressed later, some flat land should be put aside for commercial and industrial activities. Residential land should be the lowest quality land available that is not hazard prone. |
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | Neutral | I do not know if enough business land has been allocated to meet demand. If the Greenfields developments on the edges of towns are solely residential, then there are no corner shops or dairies or variation to the rows of 3-4 bedroom houses. Blending business and residential would seem a more natural growth model as per CHC rebuild mentioned above. |
| | | I think there are currently not enough affordable or more modest first home or social housing options. |
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | Neutral | I think that builders only want to build standalone houses eg in Richmond, the recent developments at the bottom of Queen Street. This only accommodates single families but uses a lot of land and is potentially inefficient. We need different kinds of housing and different styles. If we expect to support a younger population, then perhaps higher density, inner city housing would be better. Forming a targeted, deliberate strategy for Housing, rather than letting private enterprise dictate the form of housing, would be important. |
| 31614 Mr mark Morris | Neutral | |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | Neutral | 'Repeat after me "One does not merely open up more land"' - Meant tongue and cheek, but with real frustration; I wonder when this paradigm will end. |
| | | We must establish a clear, quantified understanding of the nature and CAPACITY of our region (nb. I believe this information is available, we have many good souls on the task), and a picture of what we wish our lifestyle to be for future generations. |
| | | Acknowledging that's what the FDP is: My point is that it's not what people want or like that should run this. First, before all else, what is the reasonable self sustaining population which exists with a good level of resilience against coming impacts of climate change; reduced energy availability; compromised international trade routes etc. I suggest find that. |

| | | Find how many of us can life a reasonable existence here if the 'proverbial hits the fan'. Find out what function without main arterial routes looks like for a period. If the Transpower main line goes down. |
|-------------------------------|---------|--|
| | | With this in mind, how is the corresponding low-impact sustainable population best distributed; and how to we plan and provide the right stimulus and opportunity to allow growth within and to those limits. No past. Because we have a very real set of challenges coming; ones where having too much growth and not enough local sufficiency is going to really hurt. Why would we invite that? |
| | | Growth and equity. We must not have growth at the expense of equity either. |
| 31628 Mr Daniel Levy | Neutral | Whilst I agree it is important to provide for a realistic growth in demand, it is also important to recognize the potential for demand to outstrip an achievable increase in the level of supply beyond which faster growth would unacceptably negatively impact the quality of life of current and future residents e.g. If in the future there is an unexpected and/or unreasonably high demand for housing from residents wishing to move from other regions, it should not be an obligation to meet this demand at any cost. No large scale future greenfield developments (such as in the proposed Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats areas) in the Nelson City region should be included in any future FDS including the FDS 2022. |
| 31637 Ms Frances Kemble Welch | Neutral | |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | Neutral | |
| 31647 Mrs Rebecca Parish | Neutral | |
| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | Neutral | Isnt this obvious? |
| 31651 Dr Patrick Conway | Neutral | |
| 31667 barbara nicholas | Neutral | |
| 31673 Mike Drake | Neutral | Don't understand this question. Does this mean limitations are imposed? TDC need to stop developing food growing land. |
| 31683 Richard Davies | Neutral | Demand may have to be limited by other needs such as food processing and protection from climate hazards. |
| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | Neutral | |
| 31703 Ms Paula Holden | Neutral | |
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | Neutral | See attached submission. Summarised - suggested change: "to meet demand with the capacity provided |
| | | |

| | | in areas that avoids existing incompatible activities". |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31718 Kathryn & Keith Quigley | Neutral | |
| 31736 Ms Carol Curtis | Neutral | this Outcome needs to be weighed up with the first 4 Outcomes, and "business" needs to be defined, as sustainable, low carbon, future forward/ flexible and climate conscious, as per the residential outlook. |
| 31744 Mrs Lorna CRANE | Neutral | While it appears that provision has been made for foreseeable growth in Murchison, there may be need for more sections within the centre of town. There is scope for subdivision of several sections but this is hindered by cost and lack of vision. Lifestyle options may also be insufficient as families moving to the country are more likely to thrive with a larger area of land than provided in current residential subdivisions. |
| 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | Neutral | |
| 31765 Mrs Lorna Ivy Cooper | Neutral | |
| 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | Strongly agree | |
| 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | Strongly agree | more than enough land is allocated. More intensification rather than sprawl is needed. N-106 $\&$ N-032 turn rural into residential - against the wished of more than 12,000 ratepayers |
| 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert | Strongly agree | |
| 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | Strongly agree | Areas need to have red tape removed and development allowed to encourage an ever enhancing Tasman encouraging a developing city to stay ahead of its time. Currently Tasman needs a face lift. |
| 31250 Mr Richard Wyles | Strongly agree | It is clear that demand outstrips supply in Takaka and the proposed extra-urban locations are too far from the town to meet the objective of being close to amenities and reducing climate change emissions. 89 Abel Tasman Drive should be considered for rezoning. It is opposite Sunset Crescent and already has a strip of residential housing on its perimeter. |
| 31306 Mr Jaye Barr | Strongly agree | |
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | Strongly agree | |
| 31358 George Harrison | Strongly agree | |
| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | Strongly | My main point is this: the document says the there is a risk is that 50% of the growth won't come from |
| | | |

agree

intensification because the market won't deliver. It's not clear what Council will do if that figure is not attained.

Second, and most important, in the three weeks we've lived here and talking to people involved in development, I've been struck by the desire to avoid doing anything that involves consent. I know that in Auckland, the biggest constrain on growth is the Council. So i was interested in what Council would do, and right at the end there are things like:

Support intensification by Undertaking reviews of RMPs and/Or progress plan changes to enable intensification. This will reduce regulatory barriers to intensification that currently exist in the RMPs Identify priority areas for neighbourhood planning in those parts of Nelson and Tasman identified for intensification and undertake (sic - the sentence doesn't finish). This will Provide a detailed framework for infrastructure planning and amendments to the RMPs

Review and update the Nelson and Tasman Intensification Action Plans which will Enable progress to be tracked and the Intensification Action Plans to be updated where needed in response to the FDS PROVIDING GREENFIELD OPPORTUNITIES

Identify priority areas for structure planning in greenfield locations and undertake (sic again - the sentence doesn't finish). Whatever it is that is undertaken will Provide a detailed framework for infrastructure planning and amendments to the RMPs

II'm sure the unfinished sentences are drafting rather than thinking areas, but i am interested to know more about the detailed work plans that the Councils will be undertaken. They are described as short term timeframes, but that's not defined.

This is not trivial: the attractiveness to developers of both intensified and green fields developments will be influenced by their perception of ease of working with the RMPs in both policy and process. I would like to see a summary of the areas of the RMP known to be constraints, and the work plan to remove these as a matter of urgency. I would also like to see how the two councils could design processes that reduce consent times while maintaining regulatory integrity.

31403 Mr Richard Deck

Strongly agree

| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless | Strongly agree | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | Strongly agree | if there is not sufficient capacity it can't be affordable to live somewhere. There is not enough focus on affordable housing in the FDS, that our community needs. |
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers | Strongly agree | Our people need somewhere to live |
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | Strongly agree | Of course such land is needed. It's the locations that matter in relation to existing & projected infrastructure. |
| 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery | Strongly agree | As I said in question 2, unless there is sufficient business land attached to the big residential developments being planned for small/ medium urban areas the increased traffic will have major consequences. |
| 31563 Mrs Loretta Anne Hogg | Strongly agree | Yes it is there already. There is sufficient residential and business capacity. You don't need to develop more houses on N-106 and N-032 for people, and take away from the healthy lifestyle of people who have worked hard and created lives for themselves. The people don't have houses yet can do this too for themselves too. |
| 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham | Strongly agree | There simply needs to be an intensification of land use |
| 31589 Mrs Renee Edwards | Strongly agree | |
| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | Strongly agree | |
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | Strongly agree | |
| 31656 Mr brad malcolm | Strongly agree | |
| 31688 Gerard McDonnell | Strongly agree | Smarter intensive development is required |
| 31695 Christine Horner | Strongly agree | |
| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | Strongly agree | |

| 31704 Mr Paul Bucknall | Strongly agree | If we don't free up capacity then one of the biggest challenges we are leaving for future generations will continue to get worse. It's easy for people with property and equity to say we need to limit the supply. |
|---|----------------------|---|
| 31717 Mr Frank Ryan | Strongly agree | But not limited to the main areas so that rural communities can continue to thrive. |
| 31734 Eric Thomas | Strongly agree | Yes, not just for today growth is rampant in NZ. We here in Murchison have some older buildings so need to be mindful of not only current needs growth but likely replacement of some of those. |
| 31754 Ms Joanna Hopkinson | Strongly agree | The housing shortage is directly by the lack of land. The main reason why in Christchurch there is no lack of land is because the council freed up land after the earthquakes. this has also kept access down. |
| 31756 Ronald Alfred & Phylis Kinzett | Strongly agree | We have lived in Murchison for over 50 years and sections have never been so short. |
| 31111 Mr Tony Reilly | Strongly disagree | There has been little progress in allowing for the growth in coastal holiday home demand and first home land capacity. Golden Bay looks to be a last minute add-on to the Tasman Bay part of TDC Future Development Plan! |
| 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS | Strongly disagree | PER MY ABOVE COMMENTS YOU ARE SHOWING NO REGARD FOR THE AGRICULTURAL COMMUNITY NOR QUALITY OF LIFE FOR THE EXISTING POPULATION. EQUALLY PLEASE ILLUSTRATE WHERE THIS BUSINESS/ECONOMIC DEMAND IS COMING FROM THAT WILL CREATE EMPLOYMENT. THIS IS NOT A "FIELD OF DREAMS" STRATEGY OF "IF WE BUILD IT THEY WILL COME "APPROACH. |
| 31192 Ms Rebecca Patchett | Strongly disagree | Just because someone wants to live or do business there doesn't mean they should. Community cohesion and environmental considerations must be taken into account. |
| 31216 Ms Judith Holmes | Strongly disagree | Greater intensification is needed to prevent so much travel to and from housing and services. |
| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | Strongly disagree | Disagree if it includes any additional housing with more than 2 storeys in any existing residential area. STRONGLY disagree with the specifications allowing for multiple storeys ANYWHERE apart from light industrial & industrial. Instead we should be building row houses, giving people access to outside, your own garden or outside entertainment area etc. And avoiding lack of socialisation, unwanted shadows & shade, cold, wind tunnels, lack of outdoor access etc |
| 31247 Mr yuri aristarco | Strongly disagree | Intesification is the only answer, We already using enough land. |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | Strongly disagree | In the future that require a large reduction in Carbon emissions it concerns me that there is no plan for low or no growth. |
| | _ | |

| 31328 Ms Karen du Fresne | Strongly disagree | 'Meet demand' is the wrong way to approach this. We have to focus on what is sustainable! |
|----------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31334 Diane Sutherland | Strongly disagree | "Meet demand" is the wrong metric to decide the future of our region. It encourages a growth economy which is |
| | | environmentally and socially damaging, and has major downsides (e.g. traffic congestion, resource depletion). |
| | | Rather we should be protecting what makes our region so special and focus more on |
| | | providing cheaper and more diverse housing options in our towns and centres. |
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | Strongly disagree | You simply need to change the word Demand into Need. Then I would agree. The use of the word demand implies that the market, ie where the money sits, will demand where the developments happen. Totally unacceptable for what the people need. |
| 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | Strongly disagree | The people must be educated about the reality of climate change, and the definition of "demand" and also "meet demand" will need to be moderated, in order to ensure we stay withn the limits of what's tolerable for th environment. Growth strategy, implied in the term "meet demand" needs reassessing. We ar ocpoing with demand, but we will not be able to meet it, unless people mdify their goals. |
| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | Strongly disagree | You have rezoned residential 8 mtrs zones to 6 story 18mtr plus. Absolutely appalling. Thats not balanced its build as high as you can and over ride residents in there right for good quality planning and enhancement in there community |
| 31373 Ms Jenny Daniell | Strongly disagree | Provision of land capacity should be matched with environmental protection and positive social outcomes rather than the nebulous economic indicator of "meet demand". |
| 31384 Mr Jace Hobbs | Strongly disagree | I do not support the greenfield expansion housing anywhere in the Maitai Valley, especially Kaka tributary or Orchard Flats. |
| | | The Nelson Council and then the NZ Government has declared a climate emergency. Extreme weather events are increasing world wide. Nelson Council needs to be evaluating how to mitigate the effects of increased flooding in the very near future, particularly around rivers and particularly around the Maitai river. This is quite apparent when one considers the ongoing flooding crises in New South Wales and Queensland currently and also across all parts of New Zealand. |
| | | It is the duty of the Nelson Council to protect the current housing stocks and not to inflame the situation by allowing further development that will add to the current stock of highly at risk property in the Nelson region. |

| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | Strongly disagree | Many people in Golden Bay are living "under the radar" because there is no viable option for them to afford a legal and healthy dwelling. |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann | Strongly disagree | There undoubtedly is demand for housing. However, there seems to be rather strong demand for smaller houses, eg. townhouses, which not only are usually more energy-efficient but also cheaper to build and maintain! Also, there are not many housing options in the town centre, but the demand for thosre is clearly there. |
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle | Strongly disagree | I'm not sure about that. We seem to predominantly provide for large stand-alone houses, but there is a lot of demand in our community for smaller, more affordable, and other housing options. It seems like we are selling out the character and productivity of our beautiful landscape to accommodate everybody who wants to buy a house here. Maybe we should protect what makes our region so special and focus more on providing cheaper housing options in our towns and centres, that our community so clearly needs. |
| 31410 Mr Scott Smithline | Strongly disagree | Strongly oppose. "Meeting Demand" puts our environmental future in the hands of a 'economic-driven' model & not BIG PICTURE socially responsible. We're suffering from this antiquated model. |
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | Strongly disagree | I disagree with the growth / demand for housing forecast. It will be a fraction of that forecast. There is over provision for more high value /low density housing. |
| 31422 Mrs Marga Martens | Strongly disagree | Disagree, why should we destroy our landscape and natural environment including the coastal area to cater for everyone who wants to buy a house in the region. |
| 31434 Mrs cushla Moorhead | Strongly disagree | The first thing that needs to be protected is the need to safeguard the productive land. Once we loose that we loose everything. That is what has happened in the past - productive land has been sold for new developments and rates on productive land has often force people to sell as well. |
| 31443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | Strongly disagree | There is enough land available within the present city borders that, if well used can accomodate the predicted population growth |
| 31452 Mr David Bartle | Strongly disagree | Supply creates its own demand in housing, as people migrate within NZ. There is unmet need in housing demand in the current market. Business composition will also change, such as fisheries as temperature change in key fishing areas reduce fish stock Outcome 5 should focus on vibrant and sustainable community needs |
| 31464 Mr David Matulovich | Strongly disagree | |
| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | Strongly disagree | I strongly oppose this. "Meet demand" is the wrong metric to decide the future of our region, and puts much of that future in the hands of people who don't yet live here. It also encourages a growth economy which is environmentally and socially damaging, and has major downsides (e.g. traffic congestion, resource |

| | | depletion). |
|---|----------------------|---|
| 31472 Dr David Briggs | Strongly disagree | Demand for housing is simply the monetary expression of the desires of people from anywhere in the world who might want to live in a specified area. But the effect of providing for that demand falls entirely on the existing population. Both have to be considered, but the over-riding priority is to support the public good of people currently living within the area. It is not the job of a Council, therefore, to satisfy demand for housing. Instead, the role of the Council is to MANAGE that demand, and decide what part of it can be satisfied and what can't, in order to safeguard the social and cultural interests of the existing population, as well as wider environmental interests. |
| 31481 Mrs Lucy Harrhy | Strongly disagree | It shouldn't be provided at the expense of good, fertile land in the area. |
| 31485 Ms Robin Schiff | Strongly disagree | "meeting demand" should not be how we decide the future of our region. Needs to be environmentally thought through and planned in a way that does not increase traffic congestion, and air pollution. Should be at least neutral or even better - environmentally positive. |
| 31492 Anton, Benni, Shalom, AJ Bank, Bonnin, Shalom Davis | Strongly disagree | "Meet demand" is the wrong metric to decide the future of our region, It also encourages a growth economy which is environmentally and socially damaging, and has major downsides (e.g. traffic congestion, resource depletion). |
| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | Strongly disagree | releasing more greenfield sites is not the solution. TDC continues to use a traditional approach which results in large stand-alone houses, more demand in the community for smaller, more affordable houses. |
| 31496 Mrs Petra Dekker | Strongly disagree | refer attachment: I disagree if this about more greenfield development areas. I agree if this is about a more efficient use of existing brownfield areas, but I don't think that is intended here. |
| 31499 Ms Jane Fisher | Strongly disagree | Intensification must be favoured. Given the climate crisis, the concept of exponential 'growth' is dangerous and outdated. We must aim to create infrastructure that will reduce our carbon emissions. This would do the opposite. |
| 31516 Mr Peter Lole | Strongly disagree | If this means green-field productive land being made available miles from work and services, then NO. |
| 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | Strongly disagree | I do not support the economic growth model used to support the Future Strategy. It is flawed to allow economic growth and the desire to make more and more money as a healthy way forward for the future. Both for the environment and our communities, the TDC needs to provide leadership for a different approach to wellbeing and a sustainable future for our planet and the communities that live in Tasman. |
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | Strongly | I'm not sure about that. We seem to predominantly provide for large stand-alone |
| | | |

| | disagree | houses, but there is a lot of demand in our community for smaller, more affordable, and other housing options. It seems like we are selling out the character and productivity of our beautiful landscape to accommodate everybody who wants to buy a house here. Maybe we should protect what makes our region so special and focus more on providing cheaper housing options in our towns and centres, that our community so clearly needs. |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31570 Ms Annabel Norman | Strongly disagree | |
| 31580 Jenny Long | Strongly disagree | I strongly disagree with greenfields expansion. There is so much scope for building upwards in our town centres - the vast majority of town centre buildings are single-level or at most two storeys. We need to protect our productive cropland/farmland for food production, and protect our natural areas for the biodiversity that fundamentally supports our society and our lives. If we can't curb our population growth then we absolutely must start building upwards rather than wasting more green space on low-rise housing/industrial developments. |
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins | Strongly disagree | I strongly oppose this as "Meet demand" is the wrong metric to decide the future of our region as this does not account for reducing greenhouse gas to an acceptable level for the regions economic survival. This metric puts the decision making power into the hands of people, and corporations, who don't yet live here. It also encourages a growth economy which is totally inappropriate given the climate crisis that we face as this is environmentally and socially damaging, and has major downsides such as increasing carbon emissions by increasing traffic congestion, increasing use of fossil fuel for transportation and resource depletion. |
| 31621 Dr Kath Walker | Strongly disagree | There will never be any end to demand as the worlds population grows. And yet the resources of the Nelson/Tasman region are , like every other place on earth, clearly finite. Nelson Bays has only a small area of arable land, and limited fresh water resources, and the NCC surveys show people who already live here value most all the things that greater population size would decrease. |
| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | Strongly disagree | Council may have certain plans, but developers seem to not have reasonable constraints and build to make a profit rather than a pleasant, save and planet friendly environment. |
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | Strongly disagree | Current plans are lazy and show short term, blinkered thinking. Up, not out. |
| 31633 Ms Jacquetta Bell QSM | Strongly disagree | We need to move away from allowing demand to force the city into growth. If Nelson continues to grow at 2% it will soon be anything but a Smart Little City. |
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | Strongly | Strongly oppose this. It is the type of housing that is permitted more than the amount of land that needs |
| | | |

| | disagree | more allocation. Make provision for intensification of larger areas within the Nelson - Richmond stand before new land is added on the periphery of the of the currently developed land. |
|----------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31705 Mr Lindsay Wood | Strongly disagree | We strongly oppose Outcome 5. Even though framed by the NPS-UD, "Meet demand" is the wrong metric to decide the future of our region in these challenging times, compounding various problems of the region (such as loss of arable land, water supply, pollution and traffic congestion) and proportionately increases the already-formidable challenge of decarbonisation - all on the basis of forecasts to accommodate the theoretical behaviour of people who don't even live in the region. It also encourages a growth economy which is environmentally and socially damaging in a way that we cannot sustain. |
| 31706 Paul Donald Galloway | Strongly disagree | its not about demand or endless growth its NOW or NEVER about affordability sustainability in a Climate Change Emergency Reality. |
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | Strongly disagree | I think the FDS is providing too much greenfield development land. If we look at other housing options then there is already enough land either already consented, or within the urban boundaries. We should not be providing a stand alone house on a separate section for "everybody". Not all want it and we can't justify the urban sprawl (and all the appalling outcomes that goes with it) to cater for a perceived need. |
| 31751 Hazel Pearson | Strongly disagree | Demand is not know to be a driver of environmentally conscious outcomes. |
| 31752 Jill Pearson | Strongly disagree | It should not be demand driven. |
| 31763 Susan Rogers | Strongly disagree | Survey is flawed from the beginning. You need to redesign this entire line of questioning. It leads only to answers desired by the maker of the survey. |
| 31771 Colleen Shaw | Strongly disagree | Land use should in my opinion should not be planned for on solely on a 'growth' basis as we need to scale back our unsustainable demands on the environment which we are depleting as though we had $11/2$ planet's resources. |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Strongly disagree | Please see attached: Infrastructure and employment should come before more residential building. |
| 31801 Joan Skurr | Strongly disagree | A government directive to provide such land may be in force. This supports those who speculate by buying land close to cities in order to capitalise. Re-use of land where there is change must be encouraged. |

06 Please indicate whether you support or do not support Outcome 6: New infrastructure is planned, funded and delivered to integrate with growth and existing infrastructure is used efficiently to support growth. Please explain your choice:

| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | Agree | |
|----------------------------|-------|--|
| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | Agree | I agree existing infrastructure should be used to support growth. I strongly disagree that productive land should be developed where there is no existing infrastructure, eg T136 in the draft FDS. |
| 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | Agree | |
| 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren | Agree | |
| 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert | Agree | |
| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | Agree | |
| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | Agree | |
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | Agree | |
| 31227 Ms Lee Eliott | Agree | |
| 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | Agree | Only as long as you include suburbs see my response to 03. |
| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | Agree | As long as allowance made for transport, schools, shops nearby; and no increase of traffic on any Nelson roads that are already busy. |
| 31248 Mr Will Bosnich | Agree | |
| 31257 Mr Kent Inglis | Agree | I believe development should be encouraged where existing infrastructure can be best utilized to capacity, and increased ratings revenue received as a result. I think Councils should be wary of carrying all of the cost burden of 'new' infrastructure for greenfields sites, where the infrastructure cost per HUD is high (and other ratepayers end up subsidizing the cost as a result). |
| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | Agree | |
| 31262 Mr Martin John Shand | Agree | Will only work if the existing infrastructure can cope with the extra development going on top of it. |
| 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman | Agree | There are two questions here. I support new infrastructure to integrate with the needs of the population. Again growth is not a given. Where do we draw the line with growth? Our water supply for a start is not enough to support unlimited population growth. If we are to have enough food, we need agricultural land. We can have growth or infrastructure to support the population, not both. |

| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | Agree | As long as developers are paying for the new infrastructure. |
|---|-------|--|
| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | Agree | |
| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | Agree | Growth has to be affordable in terms of infrastructure development. |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | Agree | New infrastructure must be planned to be as low energy and resilient as possible. This involves more personal responsibility for water, less reticulation of storm water, less hard surfaces. Existing infrastructure must be used efficiently |
| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | Agree | |
| 31286 Mr David Short | Agree | This is also logical. |
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | Agree | And ideally planned for well in advance of need so infrastructure can be funded and delivered in a timely manner to cement the future habits of the intended users. |
| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | Agree | AGREE as in time the existing systems will need upgrading and new required as the increase of the population supports this |
| 31309 Mr & Mrs Rose & Phillip Windle | Agree | Would be difficult to get to places without a good infrastructure. |
| 31318 Mrs Isobel Mosley | Agree | |
| 31325 Dr Ann Briggs | Agree | I agree with this as an aim. But I see no evidence of this type of infrastructure planning in current or immediate future developments. No new development should be permitted without provision for schooling, health, recreation, public transport and walk/cycleways. Largely the existing infrastructure is not sufficient to support growth. |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | Agree | |
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | Agree | Sure, how can one not agree with that. |
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | Agree | Yes, this is important, but we need to make sure that we focus is on infrastructure that we can afford in the long term. Our rates keep going up because maintaining the spread out infrastructure in our sprawling suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more up front to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is also cheaper to maintain in the long term - infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. |

| 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | Agree | Yes, we want that - and we want to see investment in public transport, walking, cycling etc instead of roads. |
|------------------------------|-------|---|
| 31346 Martin Hartman | Agree | Yes, we want that - and we want to see investment in public transport, walking, cycling etc instead of roads. |
| 31349 Laurien Heijs | Agree | Endorse NelsonTasman2050 submission. |
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | Agree | |
| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | Agree | Well I suppose this is obvious. But the infrastructure we have now cannot cope with the level of cars and trucks we already have, and this has been caused by Council and Waka Kotahi allowing growth beyond the existing infrastructure's capacity. The IPCC makes it very clear, the ICE traffic MUST be halved in 8 years. This suggests the existing infrastructure will cope as it is because everyone has to leave their car or ute at home. Perhaps NZ will have run out of diesel by then anyway, like Sri Lanka has this month. "Growth" itself is becoming incompatible with a liveable future, so, no, demand must be controlled and limited. Even reversed. |
| 31358 George Harrison | Agree | |
| 31360 Ms Thuy Tran | Agree | |
| 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | Agree | |
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | Agree | Agree with the objective. Yes, this is important, but the focus should well be on affordable infrastructure long term - infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. |
| 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer | Agree | |
| 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann | Agree | |
| 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett | Agree | Agree on the condition that yes, some growth will happen but growths should not be the target. The earth cannot sustain growth, policies must discourage growth, particularly that of population. |
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle | Agree | Yes, this is important, but we need to make sure that we focus is on infrastructure that we can afford in the long term. Our rates keep going up because maintaining the spread out infrastructure in our sprawling suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more up front to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is also cheaper to maintain in the long term - infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbonintensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. |

| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling | Agree | We need to keep infrastructure costs down by limiting spread of housing. |
|---------------------------------------|-------|---|
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | Agree | |
| 31416 Tim Leyland | Agree | Maintaining the spread of infrastructure in spreading suburbs costs a lot. It would be better to pay a more up front to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is also cheaper to maintain in the long term - infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. Tapawera no longer has any public transport and the commute to Richmond and Nelson generally consists of single occupant cars. |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | Agree | |
| 31422 Mrs Marga Martens | Agree | Prioritize infrastructure that supports walking, cycling and public transport rather then infrastructure to support people using cars as needed when developing areas away from work. Don't build in areas that have lack of water, no infrastructure for waste water and therefore need to rely on individual water treatment systems. Ifrastructure needs to be affordable in the long term. |
| 31434 Mrs cushla Moorhead | Agree | |
| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn Ball | Agree | |
| 31438 Aleisha Hosie | Agree | |
| 31449 Mr John Chisholm | Agree | |
| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | Agree | |
| 31472 Dr David Briggs | Agree | Another badly worded question because iof the vagueness of some of the terms. In general, it's easy to support the notion that infrastructure should be planned, funded and delivered as part of development; if you don't do this, the existing population suffer greatly due to pressure on their services throughout the development process. That is what happens now. Likewise, it's evident that existing infrastruture needs to be used efficiently. However, it's all a question of what you mean by efficiency. Currently, efficiency invariably means 'for the ease of the developer'. It should mean 'for the benefit of the resident population.' |
| 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon | Agree | |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | Agree | |
| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | Agree | Infrastructure is expensive and long lasting. |
| | | |

| | | Also, let's try not to create problems for town planners next century when they have a million residents to manage. |
|----------------------------|-------|--|
| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | Agree | |
| 31484 Mr Gavin Brent Cook | Agree | |
| 31487 Ms Heather Spence | Agree | It's got to be affordable in both monetary and climate terms. Current developments are anti-affordable for many, and definitely NOT affordable in climate terms. eg Mapua housing development, Waimea area west of the Richmond urban centre. |
| | | ALL FUTURE housing development needs to be much less spread out to create shorter distances to get to work, and places of activity. PROHIBIT all further greenfield development. STAND UP to the developers who transform productive land to large, low density, one-size-fits-all, housing suburbs. |
| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | Agree | I agree that infrastructure should be well planned and used efficiently but do not support unlimited growth that will ultimately destroy the environment which makes this place so special. I would like to know what the projections for growth are based on. |
| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | Agree | yes this is important but we need to make sure that we focus on infrastructure that we can afford in the long term. urban sprawl leads to a more spread out infrastructure network, costing more to build, costing more to operate and maintain and is costing more to renew. |
| 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | Agree | Yes, this is important, but we need to make sure that we focus is on infrastructure that we can afford in the long term. Our rates keep going up because maintaining the spread out infrastructure in our sprawling suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more up front to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is also cheaper to maintain in the long term - infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. |
| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless | Agree | |
| 31502 Ms Caroline Jones | Agree | |
| 31516 Mr Peter Lole | Agree | Growth has to be planned as well. Which comes first - infrastructure to support growth, or growth followed by infrastructure? |
| 31520 Andrew Stirling | Agree | |
| 31521 Mrs Marie Waterhouse | Agree | |
| 31523 Ms karen steadman | Agree | Yes the planned changes will help but more infrastructure will be required and a total revamp of |
| | | |

| | | Murchison is needing forward planning, cycle ways on all streets, beautification of the town, a planned town centre etc. We are the gate way to the Tasman district and should be developed into an attractive village. This will require the services of a enthusiastic planner with a desire to leave his or her mark on our town. |
|-------------------------------|-------|--|
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | Agree | This objective is important but we need to make sure that we focus is on infrastructure that we can afform in the long term and which supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. |
| 31529 Mr Steven King-Turner | Agree | |
| 31533 Wendy Trevett | Agree | Richmond has been allowed to develop without addressing the traffic flow etc. |
| 31537 Mrs Juliana Trolove | Agree | |
| 31551 Mrs Jo Kitchen | Agree | |
| 31554 Wendy Barker | Agree | Existing infrastructure being used efficiently would be a good start. Why fund more when what we have could be improved. |
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | Agree | |
| 31562 Grant palliser | Agree | infrastructure must support less carbon intensive modes of building and transport |
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | Agree | Agree with the objective. Yes, this is important, but we need to make sure that we focus on infrastructure that we can afford in the long term. Our rates keep going up because maintaining the spread-out infrastructure in our sprawling suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more up front to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is also cheaper to maintain in the long term - infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. |
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | Agree | Yes, this is important, but we need to make sure that we focus is on infrastructure that we can afford in the long term. Our rates keep going up because maintaining the spread out infrastructure in our sprawling suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more up front to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is also cheaper to maintain in the long term - infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. |

| to rate payers. New infrastructure will be essential to meet the demands of growth but it must be done with a long term focus, ensuring it is "needs" not "wants", making smart spending decisions that ensure that centres are sustainable for the next 50 years. The dam has affected the affordability of rates so infrastructure must be on essential services. 31572 Mr David Todd Agree 31579 Jane Tate Agree 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson Agree But only to support outcomes 1, 2 and 3 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson Agree Yes, this is important, but we need to make sure that we focus is on infrastructure that we can afford in the long term. It would be better to pay a little bit more up front to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is also cheaper to maintain in the long term - infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking and cycling. 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz Agree Maximum use of existing infrastructure should be ensured before new infrastructure is planned, funded and delivered. 31592 Mr Lee Woodman Agree Agree with the objective. Yes, this is important, but we need to make sure that we focus on infrastructure that we can afford in the long term. Our rates keep going up because maintaining the spread-out infrastructure in our sprawling suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more upfront to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is cheaper to maintain in the long term. Most importantly, we need to focus on infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transports, but we need to focus on infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking and cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. 31593 Mr William Samuels Agree Ves, this is important, but we need to make sure that we focus is on infrastructure in our sprawling suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more up front | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------|---|
| 31579 Jane Tate Agree 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson Agree But only to support outcomes 1, 2 and 3 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson Agree Yes, this is important, but we need to make sure that we focus is on infrastructure that we can afford in the long term. It would be better to pay a little bit more up front to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is also cheaper to maintain in the long term - infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking and cycling. 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz Agree 31588 pene Greet Agree Maximum use of existing infrastructure should be ensured before new infrastructure is planned, funded and delivered. 31592 Mr Lee Woodman Agree Agree with the objective. Yes, this is important, but we need to make sure that we focus on infrastructure in our sprawling suburbs costs on much. It would be better to pay a little bit more upfront to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is cheaper to maintain in the long term. Most importantly, we need to focus on infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking and cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. 31593 Mr William Samuels Agree Yes, this is important, but we need to make sure that we focus is on infrastructure that we can afford in the long term. Our rates keep going up because maintaining the spread out infrastructure in our sprawli suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more up front to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is also chaper to maintain in the long term infrastructure in our sprawli suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more up front to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is also chaper to maintain in the long term infrastructure that support healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenie | 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett | Agree | with a long term focus, ensuring it is "needs" not "wants", making smart spending decisions that ensure that centres are sustainable for the next 50 years. The dam has affected the affordability of rates so |
| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson Agree But only to support outcomes 1, 2 and 3 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson Agree Yes, this is important, but we need to make sure that we focus is on infrastructure that we can afford in the long term. It would be better to pay a little bit more up front to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is also cheaper to maintain in the long term - infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking and cycling. 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz Agree Maximum use of existing infrastructure should be ensured before new infrastructure is planned, funded and delivered. 31592 Mr Lee Woodman Agree with the objective. Yes, this is important, but we need to make sure that we focus on infrastructure that we can afford in the long term. Our rates keep going up because maintaining the spread-out infrastructure in our sprawling suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more upfront to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is cheaper to maintain in the long term. Most importantly, we need to focus on infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking and cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. 31593 Mr William Samuels Agree Yes, this is important, but we need to make sure that we focus is on infrastructure that we can afford in the long term. Our rates keep going up because maintaining the spread out infrastructure in our sprawling suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more up front to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is also cheaper to maintain in the long term - infrastructure that support healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner Agree Yes, to better pay up front to have a more efficient infrastructure towards intensificat | 31572 Mr David Todd | Agree | |
| Agree Yes, this is important, but we need to make sure that we focus is on infrastructure that we can afford in the long term. It would be better to pay a little bit more up front to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is also cheaper to maintain in the long term - infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking and cycling. Agree Maximum use of existing infrastructure should be ensured before new infrastructure is planned, funded and delivered. Agree With the objective. Yes, this is important, but we need to make sure that we focus on infrastructure that we can afford in the long term. Our rates keep going up because maintaining the spread-out infrastructure in our sprawling suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more upfront to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is cheaper to maintain in the long term. Most importantly, we need to focus on infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking and cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. Agree Yes, this is important, but we need to make sure that we focus is on infrastructure that we can afford in the long term. Our rates keep going up because maintaining the spread out infrastructure in our sprawling uppers to maintain in the long term our prawling uppers to maintain in the long term our prawling uppers to maintain in the long term our prawling uppers to maintain in the long term our prawling uppers to maintain in the long term our prawling uppers to maintain in the long term our prawling uppers to maintain in the long term our prawling uppers to maintain in the long term our prawling uppers to maintain in the long term our prawling uppers to maintain in the long term our promite that support healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. | 31579 Jane Tate | Agree | |
| the long term. It would be better to pay a little bit more up front to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is also cheaper to maintain in the long term - infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking and cycling. 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz Agree Maximum use of existing infrastructure should be ensured before new infrastructure is planned, funded and delivered. 31592 Mr Lee Woodman Agree Agree with the objective. Yes, this is important, but we need to make sure that we focus on infrastructure that we can afford in the long term. Our rates keep going up because maintaining the spread-out infrastructure in our sprawling suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more upfront to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is cheaper to maintain in the long term. Most importantly, we need to focus on infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transport. Agree Yes, this is important, but we need to make sure that we focus is on infrastructure that we can afford in the long term. Our rates keep going up because maintaining the spread out infrastructure in our sprawling suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more up front to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is also cheaper to maintain in the long term - infrastructure that support healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. Agree Yes, to better pay up front to have a more efficient infrastructure towards intensification and infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. | 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | Agree | But only to support outcomes 1, 2 and 3 |
| 31588 pene Greet Agree Agree Maximum use of existing infrastructure should be ensured before new infrastructure is planned, funded and delivered. Agree Agree with the objective. Yes, this is important, but we need to make sure that we focus on infrastructure that we can afford in the long term. Our rates keep going up because maintaining the spread-out infrastructure in our sprawling suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more upfront to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is cheaper to maintain in the long term. Most importantly, we need to focus on infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking and cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. Agree Yes, this is important, but we need to make sure that we focus is on infrastructure that we can afford in the long term. Our rates keep going up because maintaining the spread out infrastructure in our sprawli suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more up front to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is also cheaper to maintain in the long term - infrastructure that support healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. Agree Yes, to better pay up front to have a more efficient infrastructure towards intensification and infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. | 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | Agree | the long term. It would be better to pay a little bit more up front to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is also cheaper to maintain in the long term - infrastructure that supports |
| and delivered. Agree with the objective. Yes, this is important, but we need to make sure that we focus on infrastructure that we can afford in the long term. Our rates keep going up because maintaining the spread-out infrastructure in our sprawling suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more upfront to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is cheaper to maintain in the long term. Most importantly, we need to focus on infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking and cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. Agree Yes, this important, but we need to make sure that we focus is on infrastructure that we can afford in the long term. Our rates keep going up because maintaining the spread out infrastructure in our sprawli suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more up front to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is also cheaper to maintain in the long term - infrastructure that support healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. Agree Yes, to better pay up front to have a more efficient infrastructure towards intensification and infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. | 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz | Agree | |
| that we can afford in the long term. Our rates keep going up because maintaining the spread-out infrastructure in our sprawling suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more upfront to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is cheaper to maintain in the long term. Most importantly, we need to focus on infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking and cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. 31593 Mr William Samuels Agree Yes, this is important, but we need to make sure that we focus is on infrastructure that we can afford in the long term. Our rates keep going up because maintaining the spread out infrastructure in our sprawli suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more up front to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is also cheaper to maintain in the long term - infrastructure that support healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. Agree Yes, to better pay up front to have a more efficient infrastructure towards intensification and infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. | 31588 pene Greet | Agree | Maximum use of existing infrastructure should be ensured before new infrastructure is planned, funded and delivered. |
| the long term. Our rates keep going up because maintaining the spread out infrastructure in our sprawli suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more up front to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is also cheaper to maintain in the long term - infrastructure that support healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. Agree Yes, to better pay up front to have a more efficient infrastructure towards intensification and infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. | 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | Agree | infrastructure in our sprawling suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more upfront to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is cheaper to maintain in the long term. Most importantly, we need to focus on infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking and cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public |
| Braunsteiner infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. | 31593 Mr William Samuels | Agree | the long term. Our rates keep going up because maintaining the spread out infrastructure in our sprawling suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more up front to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is also cheaper to maintain in the long term - infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as |
| | | Agree | infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. |

| | | entertainment, etc |
|-------------------------|-------|---|
| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | Agree | Yes, this is important, but we need to make sure that we focus is on infrastructure that we can afford in the long term. Our rates keep going up because maintaining the spread out infrastructure in our sprawling suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more up front to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is also cheaper to maintain in the long term - infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. |
| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | Agree | Yes, this is important, but we need to make sure that we focus is on infrastructure that we can afford in the long term. Our rates keep going up because maintaining the spread out infrastructure in our sprawling suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more up front to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is also cheaper to maintain in the long term - infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. |
| 31608 Robbie Thomson | Agree | Obviously upgrades of major routes will be needed to motorway status. Networks of walking/cycling routes.Potentially a light rail network?The terrain for rail in Nelson Bays is pretty easy compared to say,Wellington,whose rail system has a long history. |
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | Agree | We need to deliberately think things through with respect to 8nfrsstructure. It has to last, long term, this is our last chance to get it right. If we want people to reduce car transport use, we need to intensify, in town centres, with existing facilities e.g. supermarkets, to be successful, not more dormitory suburbs. Development also has to be planned so that the projects aren't outstripped be demand or uptake before the projects are finished. |
| 31614 Mr mark Morris | Agree | See attached submission. Summarised - T-112 Residential Intensification Future Development Area on the church property at 123 Salisbury Road, Richmond. |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | Agree | Agree with the objective. Yes, this is important, but we need to make sure that we focus on infrastructure that we can afford in the long term. Our rates keep going up because maintaining the spread-out infrastructure in our sprawling suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more upfront to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is cheaper to maintain in the long term. Most importantly, we need to focus on infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking and cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. |

| 31620 Mr Paul Baigent | Agree | |
|----------------------------|-------|---|
| 31622 Peter Butler | Agree | |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | Agree | Yes, this is important, but we need to make sure that we focus is on infrastructure that we can afford in the long term. Our rates keep going up because maintaining the spread out infrastructure in our sprawling suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more up front to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is also cheaper to maintain in the long term - infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. |
| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | Agree | But currently the planning seems to be more in the hands of developers. |
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | Agree | |
| 31628 Mr Daniel Levy | Agree | |
| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | Agree | |
| 31636 Joanna Santa Barbara | Agree | File uploaded. |
| 31640 Mr Ryan Brash | Agree | Yes, this is important, but we need to make sure that we focus is on infrastructure that we can afford in the long term. Our rates keep going up because maintaining the spread out infrastructure in our sprawling suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more up front to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is also cheaper to maintain in the long term - infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. |
| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | Agree | |
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | Agree | Agree with the objective. Yes, this is important, but we need to make sure that we focus on infrastructure that we can afford in the long term. Our rates keep going up because maintaining the spread-out infrastructure in our sprawling suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more upfront to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is cheaper to maintain in the long term. Most importantly, we need to focus on infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking and cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. |

| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | Agree | Goes without saying. |
|--------------------------------|-------|---|
| 31651 Dr Patrick Conway | Agree | |
| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | Agree | Yes, we need some.new infrastructure in some places, but the first choice should be to reuse and grow existing infrastructure. |
| 31656 Mr brad malcolm | Agree | |
| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | Agree | |
| 31662 Joe Roberts | Agree | Support, so long as this does not impede the opportunity for the private sector much needed growth as the need arises and with appropriate levels of infrastructure servicing. |
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | Agree | Agree Agree with the objective. Yes, this is important, but we need to make sure that we focus on infrastructure that we can afford in the long term. Our rates keep going up because maintaining the spread-out infrastructure in our sprawling suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more upfront to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is cheaper to maintain in the long term. Most importantly, we need to focus on infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking and cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. |
| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | Agree | Agree Agree with the objective. Yes, this is important, but we need to make sure that we focus on infrastructure that we can afford in the long term. Our rates keep going up because maintaining the spread-out infrastructure in our sprawling suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more upfront to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is cheaper to maintain in the long term. Most importantly, we need to focus on infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking and cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. |
| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | Agree | Council funded Upgrades such as Tasman View Road upgrade and Motueka trunk water and services extension to the Braeburn Block are vital to allow the development to go ahead. |
| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | Agree | Yes, this is important, but we need to make sure that we focus on infrastructure that we can afford in the long term. Our rates keep going up because maintaining the spread-out infrastructure in our sprawling suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more upfront to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is cheaper to maintain in the long term. Most importantly, we need to focus on infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, |

| | | prioritising walking and cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. |
|--------------------------------|-------|--|
| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | Agree | |
| 31683 Richard Davies | Agree | Of course but circumstances (see above) may have to limit "growth". |
| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | Agree | |
| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | Agree | Only if by growth you mean unavoidable growth in population and not economic growth. We also need to ensure that infrastructure is sustainable and affordable in the long term i.e. not going to require protection or relocation due to the impacts of climate change. |
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | Agree | Growth, including through intensification, is not possible without adequate infrastructure |
| 31692 Mr Alasdair Gardiner | Agree | |
| 31695 Christine Horner | Agree | |
| 31697 Robert King-Tenison | Agree | |
| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | Agree | Any growth would need to focus on using our existing transport infrastructure efficiently, the best way to do that is through active and public transport. We should not be encouraging sprawl from both an economic and environmental perspective. |
| 31703 Ms Paula Holden | Agree | |
| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | Agree | I am endorsing the Nelson Tasman Climate Forum's view . Forum response: Agree Building new infrastructure requires 100+ years long term planning, longer than the 30 yr FDS. This real long term planning should be carried out before any new infrastructure is built. The problem with patching up existing pipes & raising existing roads is that it commits the councils to keeping what they have until they fail completely and then not having the future land and available energy & resources set aside to replace these assets. Development that requires more roads will be responsible for increasing carbon emissions as the roads are made. This is also true for subdivisions: pipes, footpaths,concrete curb and channel. To be planning for growth that includes infrastructure is problematic at a time when globally, we should be halving our emissions by 2030 to keep global warming below 1.5 degrees. (IPCC 2018) Sewage treatment at Bells Island. Any additional residential and industrial growth is going to increase the quantity of sewage for treatment Fig 23 shows upgrading of the pipes to Bells Island treatment facility, however the integrity of the base of the oxidation ponds will be compromised by rising sea level before the ponds are over topped. Our |

| | concern is that if we keep on using this facility until it fails we could have to pipe the sewage into the estuary as an emergency response because we won't have built the on-land treatment facility in time. The infrastructure of pipes, pumps and replacement treatment facility should be built before 2050, that is within this FDS, and before Aotearoa will be operating in a net zero carbon environment under the Zero Carbon Act. This recommendation would protect the estuary from the current discharge of treated effluent, and the future likelihood of raw or screened sewage entering the sea. Any sewage discharge into estuaries will also impact negatively on carbon sequestration from the salt marsh/seagrass ecosystems found there, increasing net emissions. Proposed stormwater pumping station in Nelson City It is not clear from Fig 23 exactly where it is situated, and from Fig 5a it would appear to be pumping out Maitai flood water. This may not be the best or preferred long term option, and should wait for the DAPP process which could result in different long term plans for the inundation zones in the Maitai and York stream deltas. Airport Nelson airport is currently located at sea level. This will need to be relocat |
|-------|--|
| Agree | This is an obvious outcome to include, but again, infrastructure needs to have the aim of supporting a low carbon region. We must be prepared to change the way we do things to make the future better for our children and grand children. |
| Agree | |
| Agree | The long term proposal here seems to invest in infrastructure that supports the NEED for a car to access the urban sprawl proposed. What is important is a more concentrated focus within our existing settlements that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. |
| Agree | |
| Agree | I have no problem with growth |
| Agree | Infrastructure must be one step ahead of growth to avoid the deficit which is prevalent across New Zealand. |
| Agree | Yes, this is important, but we need to make sure that we focus is on infrastructure that we can afford in the long term. Our rates keep going up because maintaining the spread out infrastructure in our sprawling suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more up front to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is also cheaper to maintain in the long term - infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. |
| | Agree Agree Agree Agree |

| the long term. Our rates keep going up because maintaining the spread out infrastructure in our sprawling suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more up front to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is also cheaper to maintain in the long term - infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. 1 agree that infrastructure needs to keep up with growth - it certainly is not at the moment. However, the rate payer / tax payer base cannot afford to cater for far flung development requiring huge costs to insta the infrastructure. I object to paying large amounts extra rates to provide services to greenfield developments because developers get a better profit margin and people "want" (NOT need) a stand alone house. There also needs to be better consideration of requiring any new housing more self sufficient i.e. requiring all houses, and where possible multi-unity on have rain water tanks and solar power. All new Housing must be supported with appropriate infrastructure esp roads and 3 waters 1757 Mr Duncan Thomson Agree 1758 Mr Duncan Thomson Agree 1759 Mr Damian Campbell Agree 1768 Ms Julie Cave 1769 Ms Jo Gould 1760 Agree 1760 Agree Agree, this makes sense. Particularly safe and dedicated cycle routes. Provision for green, open space needs to be integrated into development as this is important for wellbeing. 1770 Mr David Lucas 1771 Mr David Lucas 1772 Agree 1772 Affordable infrastructure is important. It costs a lot more in sprawling suburbs and greenfield developments. 1773 Mr David Lucas 1774 Agree 1775 Agree 1776 Affordable infrastructure is important. It costs a lot more in sprawling suburbs and greenfield developments. | | | |
|--|--|-------|---|
| rate payer / tax payer base cannot afford to cater for far flung development requiring huge costs to instathe infrastructure. I object to paying large amounts of extra rates to provide services to greenfield developments because developers get a better profit margin and people "want" (NOT need) a stand alone house. There also needs to be better consideration of requiring any new housing more self sufficient i.e. requiring all houses, and where possible multi-units, to have rain water tanks and solar power. All new Housing must be supported with appropriate infrastructure esp roads and 3 waters All new Housing must be supported with appropriate infrastructure esp roads and 3 waters Agree Agree Yes, but this new infrastructure needs to enable intensification and also be cheaper to maintain in the long term - infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. Agree, this makes sense. Particularly safe and dedicated cycle routes. Provision for green, open space needs to be integrated into development as this is important for wellbeing. Agree Agree Affordable infrastructure is important. It costs a lot more in sprawling suburbs and greenfield developments. Agree Agree New infrastructure needs to be efficient, sufficient, and long-lasting. Less infrastructure is needed if intensification to reduce the need for roads and future travel is carried out. Think ahead 30 years. | 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | Agree | the long term. Our rates keep going up because maintaining the spread out infrastructure in our sprawling suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more up front to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is also cheaper to maintain in the long term - |
| 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson Agree 31759 Mr Damian Campbell Agree 31768 Ms Julie Cave Agree Yes, but this new infrastructure needs to enable intensification and also be cheaper to maintain in the long term - infrastructure that supports healthlier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. 31769 Ms Jo Gould Agree Agree, this makes sense. Particularly safe and dedicated cycle routes. Provision for green, open space needs to be integrated into development as this is important for wellbeing. 31774 Mrs Jane Sutherland Agree 31777 Mr David Lucas Agree 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner Agree Affordable infrastructure is important. It costs a lot more in sprawling suburbs and greenfield developments. 31801 Joan Skurr Agree New infrastructure needs to be efficient, sufficient, and long-lasting. Less infrastructure is needed if intensification to reduce the need for roads and future travel is carried out. Think ahead 30 years. | 31737 Ms Amanda Young | Agree | developments because developers get a better profit margin and people "want" (NOT need) a stand alone house. There also needs to be better consideration of requiring any new housing more self sufficient i.e. |
| 31759 Mr Damian Campbell Agree 31768 Ms Julie Cave Agree Yes, but this new infrastructure needs to enable intensification and also be cheaper to maintain in the long term - infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. 31769 Ms Jo Gould Agree Agree, this makes sense. Particularly safe and dedicated cycle routes. Provision for green, open space needs to be integrated into development as this is important for wellbeing. 31774 Mrs Jane Sutherland Agree 31776 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner Agree Affordable infrastructure is important. It costs a lot more in sprawling suburbs and greenfield developments. 31801 Joan Skurr Agree New infrastructure needs to be efficient, sufficient, and long-lasting. Less infrastructure is needed if intensification to reduce the need for roads and future travel is carried out. Think ahead 30 years. | 31741 Mr Robert Stevenson | Agree | All new Housing must be supported with appropriate infrastructure esp roads and 3 waters |
| Agree Yes, but this new infrastructure needs to enable intensification and also be cheaper to maintain in the long term - infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. 31769 Ms Jo Gould Agree Agree, this makes sense. Particularly safe and dedicated cycle routes. Provision for green, open space needs to be integrated into development as this is important for wellbeing. 31774 Mrs Jane Sutherland Agree 31776 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner Agree Affordable infrastructure is important. It costs a lot more in sprawling suburbs and greenfield developments. 31801 Joan Skurr Agree New infrastructure needs to be efficient, sufficient, and long-lasting. Less infrastructure is needed if intensification to reduce the need for roads and future travel is carried out. Think ahead 30 years. | 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | Agree | |
| the long term - infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. 31769 Ms Jo Gould Agree Agree, this makes sense. Particularly safe and dedicated cycle routes. Provision for green, open space needs to be integrated into development as this is important for wellbeing. Agree 31774 Mrs Jane Sutherland Agree 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner Agree Affordable infrastructure is important. It costs a lot more in sprawling suburbs and greenfield developments. Agree New infrastructure needs to be efficient, sufficient, and long-lasting. Less infrastructure is needed if intensification to reduce the need for roads and future travel is carried out. Think ahead 30 years. | 31759 Mr Damian Campbell | Agree | |
| needs to be integrated into development as this is important for wellbeing. 31774 Mrs Jane Sutherland Agree 31777 Mr David Lucas Agree 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner Agree Affordable infrastructure is important. It costs a lot more in sprawling suburbs and greenfield developments. 31801 Joan Skurr Agree New infrastructure needs to be efficient, sufficient, and long-lasting. Less infrastructure is needed if intensification to reduce the need for roads and future travel is carried out. Think ahead 30 years. | 31768 Ms Julie Cave | Agree | the long term - infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and |
| 31777 Mr David Lucas Agree 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner Agree Affordable infrastructure is important. It costs a lot more in sprawling suburbs and greenfield developments. Agree New infrastructure needs to be efficient, sufficient, and long-lasting. Less infrastructure is needed if intensification to reduce the need for roads and future travel is carried out. Think ahead 30 years. | 31769 Ms Jo Gould | Agree | |
| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner Agree Affordable infrastructure is important. It costs a lot more in sprawling suburbs and greenfield developments. 31801 Joan Skurr Agree New infrastructure needs to be efficient, sufficient, and long-lasting. Less infrastructure is needed if intensification to reduce the need for roads and future travel is carried out. Think ahead 30 years. | 31774 Mrs Jane Sutherland | Agree | |
| Dorothea Ortner Ortner developments. 31801 Joan Skurr Agree New infrastructure needs to be efficient, sufficient, and long-lasting. Less infrastructure is needed if intensification to reduce the need for roads and future travel is carried out. Think ahead 30 years. | 31777 Mr David Lucas | Agree | |
| intensification to reduce the need for roads and future travel is carried out. Think ahead 30 years. | 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | Agree | |
| 31835 Mr Ian Wishart Agree | 31801 Joan Skurr | Agree | |
| | 31835 Mr Ian Wishart | Agree | |

| 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | Disagree | There is insufficient new infrastructure funded by the people who make money out of new developments - the developers. |
|------------------------------|----------|---|
| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson | Disagree | Growth for it's own sake is not desirable, conservation and sustainability are more important. |
| 31174 Ms Alison Westerby | Disagree | |
| 31192 Ms Rebecca Patchett | Disagree | Existing infrastructure should be made fit for purpose. For instance sewerage pumping stations. |
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | Disagree | Why are we on this track? California towns of similar size have been trying to restrain growth after years of over-development such as what is proposed in these plans. |
| 31219 Mrs kate windle | Disagree | It was soo difficult to get out Park Avenue going and approoved with no support from the council, all at the developers expense. All of the sections were sold prior to titles being issued. TDC needs to support willing developers |
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | Disagree | Why are we wedded to endless growth? |
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | Disagree | I don't believe this region has the resources to achieve this. |
| 31278 Wendy Ross | Disagree | existing infrastructure is not something to be ignored if there is not an updated plan to replace aging pipework, again with a view to all the land around the city being liable to flood. |
| 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | Disagree | Existing infrastructure is not coping adequately now without any future growth. |
| 31334 Diane Sutherland | Disagree | Again this is growth-focussed and in a climate crisis, with planetary overshoot, catering for growth is entirely the wrong focus. Well-planned infrastructure is important though, especially infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport. |
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | Disagree | Again, that would be ideal but not everyone wants to live in an 'efficient' setting. |
| 31364 Mrs Christine Tuffnell | Disagree | I disagree if it means current ratepayers bear the cost of this new infrastructure. New infrastructure costs should be born by developers. |
| 31373 Ms Jenny Daniell | Disagree | Efficient and well planned infrastructure is necessary to support a healthy lifestyle, not for the purpose of supporting economic growth. |
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | Disagree | Infrastructure is needed to support growth, but it needs to be reined in so we can address climate change. Growth as usual will not reduce our overshoot in using resources. |
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | Disagree | Deal with the issues of: over use of private vehicles (low intensity transport) and low density housing. |
| 31430 Muriel Moran | Disagree | That a fund such as a Special Purpose Vehicle be set up, that provides an opportunity to have shares in |
| | | |

| | | housing development, such as that used for the Nelson airport and port. New infrastructure must be part of any development but the maintenance of all infrastructure must be sustainable. Growth needs to be limited to a sustainable level. |
|-----------------------------|----------|--|
| 31443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | Disagree | Growth is a problematic term. If there is population growth we need to focus on housing. Economic growth has to be compatible with climate goals. If economic growths implies higher emissions, it has to be halted. |
| 31496 Mrs Petra Dekker | Disagree | refer attachment: The Zero Carbon Act requires us to look at infrastructure differently. New infrastructure should be avoided where possible. B |
| 31505 Cheryl Heten | Disagree | Transparency and public consultation prior to any proposed changes should be mandated. |
| 31563 Mrs Loretta Anne Hogg | Disagree | you say New infrastructure is planned and funded then you say to integrate with existing infrastructure is used efficiently !!!! Which is it. contradiction here. You build for the sake of it and destroy our beautiful lifestyle. There is no room for public transport, to widen nile street, more cars travelling past schools, more trucks, day in day out, all night - past NMIT, no parking etc - what a mess you suggest. |
| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | Disagree | We don't need more road, we need fewer cars. |
| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | Disagree | Support growth where appropriate yes, but don't need a strategy to over-create it |
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | Disagree | I oppose this as it is focussed on growth, the wrong metric. Certainly we need well planned infrastructure, but we need to focus on managing our use of resources and being smart about our infrastructure. If I think of recent local infrastructure planning (the Bateup road redevelopment, the new Hart/Bateup/Pator subdivision stormwater failures, the long closure of Queen St for redevelopment, and of course the Waimea Dam) I am not filled with confidence in Council ability to meet this outcome in any regard. |
| 31617 Ms steph jewell | Disagree | Lets maximise efficiency on existing infrastructure before getting new stuff. I'm not anti-progress but I'm anti nice-to-haves. And I suppose it's all ratepayer funded. So eg replacing the asbestos plumbing affecting drinking water needs doing first. |
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | Disagree | This poorly framed outcome cannot be supported because it lacks context. Infrastructure for new growth within existing areas of development would be supported where existing infrastructure could be upgraded or expanded to service such areas. Infrastructure for greenfield developments will most likely be tagged onto the end of existing lines of infrastructure rather than creating more efficient circular networks . |
| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | Disagree | I suspect that regarding 'growth' as necessarily positive isn't always good. Depends who benefits and what the social and environmental costs are. |
| | | |

| 31716 Mr Alan hart | Disagree | Funneling more and more cars trucks and buses towards the port across the coastal zone in the face of sea level rise that is likely to impact the region within 30 years, and having that roading past areas proposed for intensification causing gridlock along rocks road seems insane. |
|------------------------|---------------|--|
| | | Already in some areas people find it hard to exit drives on to the main road. Intensification has a big impact on traffic feeding onto an inadequate coastal route through rocks road. |
| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | Disagree | Please see attached: Need to work towards stability not growth. Do not build at or near sea level. For example present sewage infrastructure inadequate for present population with untreated overflows not regularly in coastal areas. |
| 31761 Karen Steadman | Disagree | I think the infrastructure you deliver needs to look at new options for the future of Murchison. |
| 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | Disagree | |
| 31775 Dr Thomas Carl | Disagree | |
| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | Disagree | Please see attached - determined Disagree from submission: A: No you are conflating population growth here with economic growth which is normally measured in the increase in GDP. We do not believe increasing GDP is compatible with the 1.5°C climate increase imperative and we actually need de-growth, we need prosperity without growth, we need growth in Gross Mutual Happiness not growth in more things, more stuff. The government issued a Wellbeing budget suggesting a move away from GDP. So GDP growth should specifically not be supported, degrowth should be promoted, making better use of what we already have rather than making new subdivisions, building new infrastructure. |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | Disagree | Again, growth per se is not defensible. It is progressively responsible for eco-collapse/climate change. "Carrying capacity" - as above based on science & Mātauranga Māori. |
| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | Don't know | |
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | Don't know | |
| 31454 Mrs Tracey Koole | Don't know | |
| 31473 Mr Andrew Downs | Don't know | |
| | | |

| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | Don't | |
|---------------------------|---------------|--|
| | know | |
| 31488 Annette Starink | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31508 Mr Roger Barlow | Don't | |
| <u> </u> | know | |
| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard | Don't | Another poorly worded question. The answers to this question will be meaningless unless you define |
| | know | 'growth'. I do not support infrastructure for urban sprawl or green field developments, but I do support |
| | | infrastructure for active transport and intensification. |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | Don't | Not quite sure on the wording of this outcome but support existing infrastructure being enhanced rather |
| | know | than destroying the living fabric of communities. |
| 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31598 Mrs Nicola Worsfold | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31606 Mr Trent Shepard | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31643 Inge Koevoet | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | Don't | |
| 31702 Wil Momas Brach | know | |
| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | Don't | Not answering any of these leading questions |
| 31/23 Wil Tilli Bayley | know | Not answering any or triese leading questions |
| 24724 Fair The area | | New yourselve and a second and the s |
| 31734 Eric Thomas | Don't know | Not sure the meaning behind this. |
| 0.75 | | |
| 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31784 Ms Teresa James | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31216 Ms Judith Holmes | N/A | A ridiculous statement that could mean anything! |

| 31363 Mr Steve Cross | N/A | I reject the premise of this question |
|-----------------------------|---------|--|
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | N/A | Yes, this is of importantance, however we need to make sure that the focus is on infrastructure that we can afford in the long term. Our rates keep going up because maintaining the spread out infrastructure in our sprawling suburbs costs so much. It would be better to pay a little bit more up front to have a more efficient system that enables intensification and is also cheaper to maintain in the long term - infrastructure that supports healthier and less carbon-intensive modes of transportation, prioritising walking, cycling, as well as efficient and convenient public transport plus green spaces. |
| 31549 Mr Ian McComb | N/A | Obviously needed but subject to three waters reforms |
| 31623 Ms Lucy Charlesworth | N/A | I am wary of answering this question as I cannot be sure of how my answer will be interpreted. So I will state - I do not agree with developing green spaces. These spaces need to be reserved and protected to allow for sustainable biodiversity and for future generations. Intensification within Nelson CBD needs to be a priority. I do not agrees with building on Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. I do not agree with housing development on green fields. There is a climate emergency. Remove these areas from the FDS. |
| 31632 Ms Jacquetta Bell QSM | N/A | as above |
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | N/A | Please see other fields |
| 31114 Ms Jill Rogers | Neutral | These are meaningless words - |
| 31129 Mrs Gaynor Brooks | Neutral | |
| 31250 Mr Richard Wyles | Neutral | |
| 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan | Neutral | Ratepayers looking forward cannot afford to fund these upgrades unless other projects go by the wayside |
| 31284 Mr Jarmo Saloranta | Neutral | |
| 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman | Neutral | |
| 31355 Mr Barney Hoskins | Neutral | As NCC can no longer require developers to provide off street parking, this creates a large potential burden on the parking at Tahunanui beach and will reduces access for visitors. |
| 31356 Stephen Williams | Neutral | People should be encouraged to travel and consume less, process their own grey water, and generate their own power, thereby reducing the requirement for new infrastructure. |
| 31365 michael monti | Neutral | |
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | Neutral | Any new housing utilises existing infrastructure although upgrading would be necessary to manage population growth. |
| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | Neutral | THis depends on your planning model, and what you regard as "efficient", as in who defines "efficiency"? |
| | | |

| | | e.g a bike lane adjacent to a heavy road use road may appear "Efficient" but if no one uses it because the trucks go past you too fast, then its a fail. Much current infrastructure is not ideal so it may be difficult and very compromising to use it to "efficiently support growth". |
|--------------------------------|---------|--|
| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | Neutral | |
| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | Neutral | New infrastructure where necessary |
| 31406 Ms Floortje van Lierop | Neutral | I find it difficult to answer when the statement consists of two components. I'm not sure what 'integrating new infrastructure with growth' exactly means. I am in favour of making use of existing infrastructure (and upgrading it where needed) to accommodate growth. In terms of infrastructure: safe bike lanes need to be everywhere, we are hopelessly behind in that respect. |
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin | Neutral | Yes, but the infrastructure models we have used in the past may no longer be relevant in this climate emergency. We need infrastructure that supports the aim of less reliance on motor vehicles and more connection to the natural world. |
| 31423 Mr Roger Frost | Neutral | Unfortunately we have let infrastructure fall way behind the demands placed upon it by recent growth. So we need to seriously upgrade existing infrastructure first to meet current needs. Provision of road traffic capacity between Nelson and Richmond is a glaring case in point. Then we need to ensure that future infrastructure needs are planned, funded and delivered well in advance of projected future need. Only in this way can growth be seen to be of any benefit to the community. |
| 31431 Katerina Seligman | Neutral | There needs consideration about when the growth is "enough". When to stop. |
| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | Neutral | It depends on detail. For example increased road development is not necessarily desirable. As economic circumstances are changing the emphasis on growth is open to a broader discussion. |
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | Neutral | |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | Neutral | |
| 31480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | Neutral | |
| 31481 Mrs Lucy Harrhy | Neutral | Agree providing that it's done thoughtfully and with everyone in mind. |
| 31483 Debbie Hampson | Neutral | |
| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | Neutral | Well-planned and funded infrastructure is vitally important, but in a climate crisis the main focus needs to move away from growth. |
| 31558 Mr Steve Jordan | Neutral | |
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | Neutral | This statement sounds like an ideal more than a preference. |
| | | |

| | | Of COURSE we should use existing infrastructure efficiently. New infrastructure should be rigorously put to the efficiency test. |
|---------------------------------|---------|---|
| | | We have a tendency to get excited about new infrastructure as if it will solve all our problems, when it will present the same costs as the existing infrastructure. |
| 31560 Ms Steph Watts | Neutral | I think more money should be spent if it leads to better long term impacts. |
| 31574 Mr David Bolton | Neutral | |
| 31580 Jenny Long | Neutral | I don't support the investment into infrastructure that enables greenfields expansion. I do support investment into infrastructure that enables intensification in town centres. |
| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | Neutral | |
| 31604 Mr Peter Moot | Neutral | |
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | Neutral | I don't know enough about this to comment |
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | Neutral | New infrastructure needs to support lower carbon transport such as public transport and active transport |
| 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | Neutral | Infrastructure should only planned after suitable sites are agreed, not be planned to fit in with infrastructure |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | Neutral | First suitable sites need to be carefully planned to meet the climate change risks. Infrastructure planning starts together with the agreed plans not first infrastructure followed by site to fit in with the infrastructure |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | Neutral | |
| 31641 Mr Stephen (Steve) Hayden | Neutral | Any proposed settlements may meet these aspirations. |
| 31644 Murray Poulter | Neutral | Only if the growth is consistent with detailed evaluation of its consequences. |
| 31647 Mrs Rebecca Parish | Neutral | |
| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | Neutral | |
| 31711 Sara Flintoff | Neutral | |
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | Neutral | See attached submission. Summarised - no key points related to this outcome. |
| 31736 Ms Carol Curtis | Neutral | this Outcome needs to be weighed up with the first 4 Outcomes, and "infrasturcture" needs to be defined/ clarified, as being only sustainable, low carbon, future forward/ flexible and climate conscious. |
| 31744 Mrs Lorna CRANE | Neutral | Funded? By whom? It seems obvious that infrastructure costs should be designed with efficiency in mind but this should not be at the expense of living conditions. For example, it may be really cost-efficient to |
| | | |

| | | service twice as many sections of 500sqm as quarter-acre sections, but the larger sections allow for more family freedom and better relationships between residents. |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31747 Mr (Tom) Neil BRETT | Neutral | I feel that this is already a given irrespective of the other outcomes. |
| 31765 Mrs Lorna Ivy Cooper | Neutral | |
| 31809 Mr Andrew Spittal | Neutral | Mapua has recently upgraded its water and wastewater reticulation and capacity and those systems should now benefit those with the catchment able to be serviced (and rated) for that upgraded infrastructure. Any use of this water supply outside of the supply catchment would be an inefficient use of this water resource. Confirming 49 Stafford Drive as a part of the FDS 2022 will positively achieve Outcome 6. |
| 31830 K.M. McDonald | Neutral | See response to #5. |
| 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | Strongly agree | |
| 31130 Trevor James | Strongly agree | |
| 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward | Strongly agree | Focus is needed on existing infrastructure. |
| 31173 Mr Roderick Watson | Strongly agree | |
| 31185 Myfanway James | Strongly agree | |
| 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | Strongly agree | |
| 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | Strongly agree | Infrastructure must stay ahead of residential and commercial development to not create issues down the track. an ounce of prevention is worth a tonne of remediatoin. |
| 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | Strongly agree | Nelson, like most centres, has always found they are behind the requirements needed. Maintenance existing provisions will often take greater finance than is available, so new expenditure often takes the dollars first. This is where I feel that major expenditure areas should take more consideration before action. Personally I believe that the impact on individuals is not always high enough on the consideration list. |
| 31261 Mr John Weston | Strongly | Very much part of the move to allow for global warming (please see back notes) |
| | | |

| | agree | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley | Strongly agree | |
| 31285 Dr Hamish Holland | Strongly agree | The Nelson-Richmond corridor is an example of inadequate supportive infrastructure for growth. There is no infrastructure in the T136 area, and the supportive infrastructure between there and nearby towns (Motueka, Richmond) is lacking. |
| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | Strongly agree | |
| 31306 Mr Jaye Barr | Strongly agree | |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | Strongly agree | |
| 31316 John Heslop | Strongly agree | Agree totally that infrastructure is the key to growth and should be upgraded ahead to ensure the FDS areas of growth can happen without delays to meet the required demand. |
| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | Strongly agree | See 05 above |
| 31400 Miss Heather Wallace | Strongly agree | |
| 31403 Mr Richard Deck | Strongly agree | Usually one would expect that centralised services will be better maintained and more reliable. |
| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling | Strongly agree | Efficiency should mean avoiding urban sprawl and ribbon development and the development of greenfield sites which are far from existing infrastructure, such as at Tasman |
| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors | Strongly agree | |
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | Strongly agree | Suburban sprawl requires more and more infrastructure. Intensification will not. Prioritise infrastructure that supports healthy lifestyles - pedestrian walkways, cycle paths, not endless roads. |
| 31435 Mr Alan Eggers | Strongly agree | It is really important that Council help fund infrastructure development, because many FDAs are dependent on major infrastructure investments and . |
| 31441 Mr Chris Head | Strongly agree | Again, this must be done either in conjunction with, or prior to, any new development, to enable it to be used sustainably and responsibly from day 1. |
| | | |

| 31460 Kris Woods | Strongly agree | This needs to be first. Otherwise the rest does not work. |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31491 Ms Annette Milligan | Strongly agree | Any growth should be planned rather than relying on a hotch-podge development approach |
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | Strongly agree | we don't want isolated communities that create more traffic, sewage problems and a lack of diversity. These developments need more funding in infrastructure for developer-led interests. |
| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | Strongly agree | Strongly agree. It is essential that there is an integrated approach taken to infrastructure planning and funding and delivery. This provides efficiencies in the networks. Investing in sufficient high quality infrastructure, including the three waters, roading, and public transport supporting infrastructure is ar investment in the future and is essential for the ongoing development of the region. |
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers | Strongly agree | seems logical, what would the other option be ? |
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | Strongly agree | As per Q. 5 response. |
| 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery | Strongly agree | Overloaded infrastructure does not present a healthy option for either people or the environment. |
| 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham | Strongly agree | |
| 31633 Ms Jacquetta Bell QSM | Strongly agree | See above - with the climate crisis we face we must get out of the 'growth is good' mindset. |
| 31637 Ms Frances Kemble Welch | Strongly agree | |
| 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin | Strongly agree | |
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | Strongly agree | This aligns extremely well with the NPS-UD and Government Policy Statement for Land Transport |
| 31673 Mike Drake | Strongly agree | Infrastructure obviously needs to be used efficiently. Going up, rather than out is a good way of using existing infrastructure. |
| 31688 Gerard McDonnell | Strongly agree | We need to plan for future generations |
| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | Strongly | |
| | | |

| | agree | |
|---|----------------------|--|
| 31704 Mr Paul Bucknall | Strongly agree | Would anyone really disagree with this? Can NCC and TDC provide this at the speed we will need without amalgamation and much more central government support? |
| 31713 Mrs Debora Scholl Dos Santos | Strongly agree | Public transport needs to go through a thorough assessment so this outcome can be achieved. Otherwise, we'll have all the new houses, cities packed with people, but also jammed with cars. And the same is valid for water supply, sewers, telecommunications, etc. |
| 31717 Mr Frank Ryan | Strongly agree | There is not much use in doing a future strategy without first investing in infrastructure. The fact that ratepayers also have to spend tens of thousands of dollars when they build a new residence to be able to retain stormwater on site as well as pay development contributions means that infrastructure has been seriously underfunded in the past. |
| 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert- Watene | Strongly agree | Same as previous |
| 31756 Ronald Alfred & Phylis Kinzett | Strongly agree | With growth some new infrastructure will be needed. |
| 31762 Mr Mark Hewetson | Strongly agree | a basic need |
| 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS | Strongly disagree | YOU HAVE AN INFRASTRUCTURE ,ESPECIALLY WATER THAT IS STRETCHED ALREADYADDING MORE PEOPLE TO THE REGION ONLY EXACERBATES THE PROBLEM. WHEN WILL THE COUNCIL TAKE A STAND OF HOLDING POPULATION GROWTH AT OR CLOSE TO WHERE IT IS. GROWTH ONLY MAKES TACKLING YOUR GHG CHALLENGE EVEN MORE PROBLEMATICAL. |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | Strongly disagree | Use existing infrastructure and minimal new infrastructure which only encourages urban sprawl. |
| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | Strongly disagree | The plans for the Tasman Bay village if adopted, would not include improvements to Aporo Rd with hugely increased amount of traffic and risk to cyclists crossing the road at several areas on the Tasman Taste Trail. It will lead to increased traffic on entry to both Richmond and Motueka. In addition the cost to upgrade water / waste water and storm water services would be a huge and unnecessary expense in this area. |
| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | Strongly disagree | Yup. OK. Growth, on a finite planet? Come on guys. |
| 31322 Mrs BARBARA AND TIM ROBSON | Strongly disagree | Again, disagree because we are heading for "overshoot" and we need to change our "growth is good" expectation |

| 31328 Ms Karen du Fresne | Strongly disagree | We should stop focusing on growth - and this applies to the whole country, not just to Nelson Tasman. We're right in the middle of a climate change crisis - we need to consume less, and focus on equitable outcomes for all, not on 'growth', which means more consumption of scarce resources (including productive land) and an adverse impact on the environment. |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | Strongly disagree | Infrastructure should be planned to support growth via intensification, not expansion. The region lacks the population to support expansive residential suburbs. |
| 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | Strongly disagree | I disagree with the focus on growth. That's twenteth-centure thinking. We know better now. We should discourage growth, partly by not accommodating it, if we need to. |
| 31347 Ms Paula Baldwin | Strongly disagree | Tasman District Council is doing this better, mostly because they have the ability and opportunity to use previous examples and mistakes as they develop empty pastures ie: not change an existing area to density urban living because its the latest newfangled idea on a Council list. If NCC is tabling a plan about developing the CBD existing into residential living and commercial |
| | | operations - this would be "New infrastructure is planned, etc" (assuming they included the infrastructure). |
| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | Strongly disagree | Have no problem with planning for growth if reasonable, practical and good planning that includes planting, street view, how integrate openess etc Where is the plan? Just a map of buildings is not enough. |
| 31384 Mr Jace Hobbs | Strongly disagree | We are in the period of drastic climate mitigation. We need to stop expanding wasteful sewers and greenfield development and move towards composting type sewerage and low impact solutions. |
| 31410 Mr Scott Smithline | Strongly disagree | Strongly oppose. Again, please forget the 'antiquated economic model' that got us into the trouble we're facing. Well-planned infrastructure 'yes' but the focus MUST be on CLIMATE above all else. |
| 31415 Mrs Zanahe Ruth Galloway | Strongly disagree | In a "Climate Change Emergency" and with the latest IPCC report uncontrolled population growth is the wrong way to go. It is not a time to support growth but prepare consolidate for a future of extreme weather events. |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas Hollyman | Strongly disagree | We know of no plans to develop new infrastructure in Hira area |
| 31452 Mr David Bartle | Strongly disagree | TDC is currently struggling to fund existing infrastructure on a sustainable basis. This draft strategy, as it stands will seriously undermine rate payer confidence in councils. The strategy should be deferred until there is an accompanying set of financials to show what is needed to ensure sustainable infrastructure. It is also necessary to show how infrastructure can be made resilient to severe weather events |
| 31457 Mr J Santa Barbara | Strongly disagree | We should not be expanding infrastructure to accommodate growth. Use should be made of existing infrastructure and new infrastructure should contribute to the mixed use medium density model. |
| | | |

| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | Strongly disagree | I strongly oppose this as it is growth-focussed (see last answer). Well-planned infrastructure is vitally important, but in a climate crisis, and widespread planetary overshoot, catering for growth is entirely the wrong basion which to predicate it. |
|---|----------------------|--|
| | | All planning has to start from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
| 31485 Ms Robin Schiff | Strongly disagree | Well planned infrastructure is very important, but in the current climate crises, catering for growth is the wrong basis on which to proceed. |
| 31492 Anton, Benni, Shalom, AJ Bank, Bonnin, Shalom Davis | Strongly disagree | I strongly oppose this as it is growth-focussed (see last answer). Well-planned infrastructure is vitally important, but in a climate crisis, and widespread planetary overshoot, catering for growth is entirely the wrong basion which to predicate it. |
| 31499 Ms Jane Fisher | Strongly disagree | |
| 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | Strongly disagree | We don't need more roads but we need facilities for bikes and public transport if we really think GHG emission reduction is important. |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne | Strongly disagree | "Growth is unnecessary and fatal to a "smart little city". |
| 31515 Geoffrey Vause | Strongly disagree | A question with hooks, with the record of the TDC on new infrastructure development, in particular the Waimea Dam, strongly driving our opinion toward opposing this outcome. Existing infrastructure must be maintained and where possible developed to meet demand. Any decision on new infrastructure needs to be undertaken with appropriate governance and management, something that seems to be outside the scope of the TDC. |
| 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | Strongly disagree | The last thing we need is more roads for more cars - and more degradation of the Waimea River, dredging for gravel to build more roads. This model of economic growth is destroying the Tasman Region |
| | | |

| 31570 Ms Annabel Norman | Strongly disagree | |
|----------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins | Strongly disagree | I strongly oppose this as it is growth-focused (see last answer). Well-planned infrastructure is vitally important, but in a climate crisis, and widespread planetary overshoot, catering for "growth" is entirely the wrong basis on which to predicate it. If "growth" were the region's focus, more needs to be done to protect the economic interests of our enterprises which are largely climate dependent. These will suffer and ultimately fail unless greenhouse gas emissions are dramatically reduced. |
| 31705 Mr Lindsay Wood | Strongly disagree | We strongly oppose Outcome 6 as it is growth-focussed (see last answer). Well-planned infrastructure is vitally important, but in a climate crisis, and with widespread planetary overshoot, catering for growth is entirely the wrong basis on which to predicate our long term planning. |
| 31706 Paul Donald Galloway | Strongly disagree | With the latest IPCC report which state quite clearly we are not anymore in a situation of a "support growth" era but in preparedness resilience for an uncertain difficult future. |
| 31739 Philippa Hellyer | Strongly disagree | There should be a lot less talk of "new infrastructure" and lots more talk and action over the failing infrastructure we currently have. Fix what we have first. There is certainly no infrastructure in the Braeburn Road area which can be integrated with. Get real. Money does not grow on trees. Rural areas should not be destroyed by allowing housing areas to be "integrated" where it is clearly inappropriate to try to do so. |
| 31751 Hazel Pearson | Strongly disagree | Growth by itself is not known to be an environmentally conscious driver. |
| 31752 Jill Pearson | Strongly disagree | Can't be demand driven. |
| 31754 Ms Joanna Hopkinson | Strongly disagree | With Regard to Murchison which has ample water + sunshine, the need for respective infrastructure needs to be revaluated. |
| 31763 Susan Rogers | Strongly disagree | Survey is flawed from the beginning. You need to redesign this entire line of questioning. It leads only to answers desired by the maker of the survey. |
| 31771 Colleen Shaw | Strongly disagree | See previous answer. Efficiency is important but not as the handmaiden of growth when we vitally need to pull back as a community to more sustainable lifestyles and use of land. |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Strongly disagree | Most existing infrastructure is in need of updating and upgrading before any new infrastructure is delivered. |
| | | |

07 Please indicate whether you support or do not support Outcome 7: Impacts on the natural environment are minimised and opportunities for restoration are realised. Please explain your choice:

| 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | Agree | |
|----------------------------|-------|--|
| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | Agree | |
| 31174 Ms Alison Westerby | Agree | |
| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | Agree | |
| 31192 Ms Rebecca Patchett | Agree | |
| 31227 Ms Lee Eliott | Agree | |
| 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan | Agree | Do not want to see our rural areas with pockets of subdivisions popping up in random areas with no links to services around them |
| 31262 Mr Martin John Shand | Agree | This would be wonderful if it was possible but I can't see how you could anticipate doing restoration work when everything is been devastated by residential housing and industrial areas. |
| 31279 Mr Jeremy Thompson | Agree | We need More natural land in native (permanent) trees. Not less. |
| 31285 Dr Hamish Holland | Agree | |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | Agree | |
| 31339 Ms Karen Berge | Agree | |
| 31349 Laurien Heijs | Agree | Endorse NelsonTasman2050 submission. Not clear how the strategy is doing this. What areas have been identified as having significant restoration potential? What areas do the community support protecting? Where are all of the SNAs? (the maps identify only a handful through all of Nelson and Tasman which surely is incorrect). This strategy should be integrated with the Nelson and Tasman biodiversity strategies and the work happening as part of the Kotahitanga mō te Taiao Alliance. To align with best practice impact management, impacts on the natural environment should always first be avoided. If this is demonstrably not possible, then minimisation, followed by remediation are considered. |
| 31350 Ms Janet Tavener | Agree | |
| 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer | Agree | |
| 31422 Mrs Marga Martens | Agree | Yes, we have to. This means that the claim on the natural environment for mitigating future flood risks increases and will compete in the future with other uses. Think of room for the river combined with nature development which is really in the long term the only option. This strategy is just developing more of the country side (green permeable) into housing (hard surfaces) |
| | | |

| | | and creating increased runoff of water. |
|---------------------------------------|-------|--|
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas Hollyman | Agree | Impacts on the natural enviroment are minimised as evidenced by plantings along river banks & NCC owned land e.g Council owned land adjacent to 36 Cable Bay Road |
| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn Ball | Agree | But restricting buildings on ridges, returning green spaces and trees among houses. |
| 31449 Mr John Chisholm | Agree | |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | Agree | |
| 31483 Debbie Hampson | Agree | |
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | Agree | |
| 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | Agree | |
| 31502 Ms Caroline Jones | Agree | |
| 31505 Cheryl Heten | Agree | |
| 31508 Mr Roger Barlow | Agree | |
| 31521 Mrs Marie Waterhouse | Agree | |
| 31529 Mr Steven King-Turner | Agree | |
| 31533 Wendy Trevett | Agree | We support preservation. |
| 31551 Mrs Jo Kitchen | Agree | |
| 31572 Mr David Todd | Agree | |
| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | Agree | |
| 31595 Gary Clark | Agree | The development of T-125 as a commercial hub makes logical sense. It is located centrally on arterial road networks. While there are current climate change issues these can be addressed through design. This would allow for the formation of wetlands around these areas and enhance the current situation. |
| 31620 Mr Paul Baigent | Agree | |
| 31622 Peter Butler | Agree | I am however concerned that areas like the Tahuna slump have been mapped for housing infill as they are currently covered by conditions which prevent this for very good reasons of vulnerability to slippage, some of which have proven fatal in the past. |
| 31628 Mr Daniel Levy | Agree | |

| 31631 Mrs Joy Shackleton | Agree | It is important to hold on to the green spaces that Nelson presently has and corridors of greenery, trees and places for people are vital. |
|---|----------|--|
| 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin | Agree | |
| 31641 Mr Stephen (Steve) Hayde | en Agree | In reality new developments will have a huge impact/change to what is currently beautiful countryside. |
| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | Agree | |
| 31643 Inge Koevoet | Agree | |
| 31656 Mr brad malcolm | Agree | |
| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | Agree | |
| 31662 Joe Roberts | Agree | Support, as there are significant ecological/environmental benefits to be gained through the subdivision and development process. |
| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | Agree | |
| 31695 Christine Horner | Agree | |
| 31711 Sara Flintoff | Agree | |
| 31716 Mr Alan hart | Agree | A priority should be to minimise development in the coastal environment both to preserve amenity and avoid natural hazard and sea level rise impending threats |
| 31718 Kathryn & Keith Quigley | Agree | |
| 31721 Ms Jill Cullen | Agree | |
| 31741 Mr Robert Stevenson | Agree | |
| 31744 Mrs Lorna CRANE | Agree | |
| 31747 Mr (Tom) Neil BRETT | Agree | As for Q6. |
| 31751 Hazel Pearson | Agree | If done in a practical way. |
| 31756 Ronald Alfred & Phylis Kinzett | Agree | |
| 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | Agree | |
| 31759 Mr Damian Campbell | Agree | |
| | | |

| 31765 Mrs Lorna Ivy Cooper | Agree | Whatever happens these are considerations that need to be considered |
|----------------------------|----------|---|
| 31774 Mrs Jane Sutherland | Agree | |
| 31777 Mr David Lucas | Agree | |
| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | Agree | Please see attached - determined Agree from submission: A: Yes we strongly support outcome 7. But that is not what this Strategy is based on. Its based on sprawl, on covering more Greenfield land with low density housing. |
| 31830 K.M. McDonald | Agree | Intensification has a maximum impact on the natural environment. Tiny sections offer little opportunity for restoration. |
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | Disagree | This sort of intensification does not enhance the urban environment. |
| 31219 Mrs kate windle | Disagree | Making it very difficult to develop anything!! |
| 31278 Wendy Ross | Disagree | Money and rates will overtake the fine words above - the natural environment will not be improved by inhouse land filling holus bolus. |
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | Disagree | The wording implies that the development is more important than the natural environment. If you change the word minimised (which is such an elastic concept that it has meant nothing in many historical cases of development), for 'restricted', then we have something that can make a difference. |
| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | Disagree | Where is your plan with what to be restored. Do you know what so I can answer this question? |
| 31488 Annette Starink | Disagree | |
| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | Disagree | As above. I don't believe it will reduce GHG emissions and impacts on the natural environment with increase. People will voluntarily use public transport is a pipe dream. More people means more cars. This is time proven. We're rightfully moving towards lower emission vehicles but the belief people will automatically switch to public transport is pie in the sky. Also many more people in new rural areas will inevitably have an impact on the natural environment in areas such as wastewater disposal. Fine if expensive effective systems are put in place by individual developers are deployed but the infrastructure requirements of over intensified rural land development will be unrealistically hard to achieve by profit driven developers and council. |
| 31608 Robbie Thomson | Disagree | Any development degrades the environment.Impacts can be reduced, and good restoration of environments acheived after work has been carried out. Engineered solutions to stormwater runoff, and a good build quality of infrastructure can reduce weather event damage, this being better for the environment and its inhabitants! |
| 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | Disagree | Housing should not be planned where they will cause changes that developers promise to rectify after after the development is finished Especially developments should not be planned by water both rivers |
| | | |

| | | and coastal areas. |
|---------------------------|---------------|---|
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | Disagree | developments should not be approved if there are changes that will have to rectified after the development is finished. for example The Matai Valley development that will degrade the water of the matai river. Increase the risk of flooding in Nelson City, ruin the green recreational area of the residents of and visitors to Nelson which will become even more important as the population grows. |
| 31657 Mrs Andrea Hay | Disagree | Unfortunately, I do not believe that the true impacts and costs to the environment has been recognised. See attached (text copied below): I very strongly support outcome. With its reliance on greenfield development, I consider the FDS 22 does not go nearly far enough regarding impacts on the natural environment. Many community members have already expressed this strongly, in particular with regard to the increased development proposed in the Maitai Valley. |
| 31697 Robert King-Tenison | Disagree | Restoration to what? Left to "regenerate" is not restoration. And this whole area is affected by human activity. Make it look nice and have some parks but not restoration. |
| 31739 Philippa Hellyer | Disagree | See comment under question 1. |
| 31762 Mr Mark Hewetson | Disagree | important, but people come first |
| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | Don't know | |
| 31355 Mr Barney Hoskins | Don't know | |
| 31454 Mrs Tracey Koole | Don't know | |
| 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart | Don't know | |
| 31598 Mrs Nicola Worsfold | Don't know | |
| 31606 Mr Trent Shepard | Don't know | |
| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | Don't know | Not answering any of these leading questions |
| 31784 Ms Teresa James | Don't know | |
| | | |

| 31363 Mr Steve Cross | N/A | I reject the premise of this question |
|---|---------|--|
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | N/A | We need to protect and restore our natural environment. However, it is hard to see where and how the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The best strategy would be to confine development to the already existing urban areas. Turning more of our beautiful countryside into concrete and tarmac monotony will only put further strain on our natural environment. |
| 31623 Ms Lucy Charlesworth | N/A | I am wary of answering this question as I cannot be sure of how my answer will be interpreted. So I will state - I do not agree with developing green spaces. These spaces need to be reserved and protected to allow for sustainable biodiversity and for future generations. Intensification within Nelson CBD needs to be a priority. I do not agrees with building on Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. I do not agree with housing development on green fields. There is a climate emergency. Remove these areas from the FDS. |
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | N/A | Please see other fields |
| 31673 Mike Drake | N/A | All development needs to be cognisant of environmental and climate change implications, plus crating a good space to live. |
| 31129 Mrs Gaynor Brooks | Neutral | |
| 31211 Mrs Alison Pickford | Neutral | See attached. Summarised - Public Transport is essential, with industrial and commercial nodes in Brightwater, Wakefield, Mapua, Motuere, St Arnaud, Tapawera, Kikiwa, Murchison Reduce the need for multilane new roading, adding a reduction in emissions. money for roading expense should be redirected to efficient, cheap public transport. buses could be fitted with cycle trailers to get people between hubs Richmond - Nelson. |
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | Neutral | It is important to maintain green spaces and area of natural beuaty such as the Matai Valley for evryone to enjoy in their natural state, not small areas surrounded by houses. |
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | Neutral | Restoring the land should be a priority for council-owned/publically land. The choice to take on the expense of restoration should not be forced on current landowners. |
| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | Neutral | We really have a duty to the biosphere and our children to be serious about this. It's not an 'affordable option'. It's imperative to our survival. Thus if what we're contemplating isn't to an absolute 'Gold Standard', in the light of everything we have learned in the last century or so, then we'd better start contemplating something that is. |
| 31309 Mr & Mrs Rose & Phillip Windle | Neutral | |
| | | |

| 31403 Mr Richard Deck | Neutral | |
|------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | Neutral | People are part of the environment and must have equal priority |
| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | Neutral | |
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | Neutral | |
| 31480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | Neutral | |
| 31484 Mr Gavin Brent Cook | Neutral | |
| 31523 Ms karen steadman | Neutral | Most of Murchison's environment is in the hills, and very little changes there. The rivers of course should be protected. |
| 31558 Mr Steve Jordan | Neutral | |
| 31574 Mr David Bolton | Neutral | |
| 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz | Neutral | |
| 31604 Mr Peter Moot | Neutral | |
| 31614 Mr mark Morris | Neutral | |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | Neutral | |
| 31647 Mrs Rebecca Parish | Neutral | |
| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | Neutral | |
| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | Neutral | |
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | Neutral | |
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | Neutral | See attached submission. Summarised - no key points related to this outcome. |
| 31734 Eric Thomas | Neutral | Of course must protect current. It is a given that one cares, protects and improves on what is currently there. |
| 31752 Jill Pearson | Neutral | |
| 31761 Karen Steadman | Neutral | Murchison is a town where the natural environment largely takes care of itself - The geography of the area - but the Rivers - defiantly need protecting. |
| 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | Strongly agree | Development should be encouraged in existing settlements and any natural areas of significance be maintained and enhanced. It is quite hard to respond to a strategic document without thinking what |
| | | |

| | | needs to change at a ground level- consenting and planning rules |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | Strongly agree | Key to managing environmental impacts is through good design at the start, particularly with greenfield development. It much easier to design and build environmental infrastructure at the start rather than retrofit ie (stormwater wetlands, rainwater tanks, cycleways etc.) |
| 31114 Ms Jill Rogers | Strongly agree | In the housing development around Hope over the last few years this was clearly ignored. Where good agricultural land was used for housing so, clearly it appears you take no notice of your own reasoning. Also the development on Lower Queen Street in Richmond on the ocean side is clearly a potential for flooding and should never have been built on but, instead planting to stop flooding would have been a better option. But perhaps this is just about money? |
| 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS | Strongly agree | |
| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | Strongly agree | I agree that impact on the natural environment should minimised. With regard to T136 of the draft FDS, there would be devastating impact on the natural environment and productive land, with no opportunity for restoration. |
| 31122 Mr Johan Thomas Wahlgren | Strongly agree | Which obviously is not a serious option considering the plan is suggesting a monster development in the Maitai/Kaka valley and Orchard flats |
| 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren | Strongly agree | Due to our challenges ahead and current climate crisis anything we can do to miminse our impact on the environment is critical for the future of Nelson. |
| 31130 Trevor James | Strongly agree | |
| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson | Strongly agree | As for outcome 6. |
| 31136 Mrs Sophie Bisdee | Strongly agree | Without our natural environment we are nothing. Maanaki whenua, maanaki tangata , haere whakamua |
| 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward | Strongly agree | |
| 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert | Strongly agree | We need to be guardians of our environment for future generations |
| 31171 Ms Sallie Griffiths | Strongly agree | We need more green in our town. Leave the maitai alone. Build up not out. |
| 31173 Mr Roderick Watson | Strongly | |
| | | |

| | agree | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31185 Myfanway James | Strongly agree | |
| 31186 Mr Gary Scott | Strongly agree | Stop using arable land to build awful subdivisionvisions on which destroy the areas where we grow crops |
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | Strongly agree | This should be of the highest priority. To do less would be to steal from the future generations, who already face far greater environmental impacts than any of our generation |
| 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | Strongly agree | Impact clearly needs to be minimal rather than destroyng our beautiful region. Not creating new villages and urban area s !! Expansion of current urban areas and increased density protects the countryside to maintain beauty. |
| 31216 Ms Judith Holmes | Strongly agree | We need to restore huge areas of our district to their natural state to regain a better environmental balance e.g. restore wetlands and native forests. |
| 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | Strongly agree | |
| 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | Strongly agree | ABSOLUTELY! Nelson can lead the way in restoration of land, waterways, CO2 sequestration, etc. |
| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | Strongly agree | Yes- let's remember climate change AND also keep rates down |
| 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | Strongly agree | Nature and natural resources are what enables us to continue as a society. Take them away and we will have a poorly resourced community. |
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | Strongly agree | |
| 31247 Mr yuri aristarco | Strongly agree | We need to restore as much as possible of our lost forest to support our goal of a carbon zero nation |
| 31248 Mr Will Bosnich | Strongly agree | |
| 31250 Mr Richard Wyles | Strongly agree | Instead of grazing a very small herd of cattle 89 Abel Tasman Drive is being planted with trees - it is an ideal location for a low density eco-village. |
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | Strongly agree | Don't build on greenfield sites. |
| | | |

| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | Strongly agree | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31261 Mr John Weston | Strongly agree | Strong Need to protect what's there, for re establishment of environments and to introduce pleasant areas in which to live> plants, trees ect. |
| 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman | Strongly agree | Tasman's efforts at identifying areas of natural environment have been laggardly. A local authority is required to identify and report on areas of ecological significance in its district. TDC has not yet engaged in this survey, a necessary precursor to protection against unsuitable development. At present, any tree or stand of bush is liable to destruction by individuals who perceive that it may preclude their developing their land. As a result, there is very little the council can do to protect areas from change when landowners decide to cut down trees and areas of bush. If this outcome is an indication of future action strongly applaud it. |
| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | Strongly agree | But greenfield sites have the most detrimental impact on the natural environment. |
| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | Strongly agree | |
| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | Strongly agree | A no-brainer; we have to protect the environment as much as possible for future generations. |
| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley | Strongly agree | |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | Strongly agree | Every opportunity to enhance the natural environment must be taken including natural drainage, tree planting in street scapes. Impacts must be minimised to the point that development has a net positive effect |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | Strongly agree | So leave the Maitai as Nelson central park |
| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | Strongly agree | |
| 31284 Mr Jarmo Saloranta | Strongly agree | |
| 31286 Mr David Short | Strongly agree | This must always be uppermost in any future residential development. |
| 31287 Ms Suzanne Bateup | Strongly agree | We need to care more for the environmental values and not degrade the natural environment |

| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | Strongly agree | It is extremely important that we protect natural environments with the rapid development of the region otherwise all will be lost. |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | Strongly agree | Protection of existing natural environments is paramount and restoration work on all our local green areas is essential and this should be locked in. Locked in, Secure so protected for the health of our land and our future grandchildren to benefit and enjoy. |
| 31306 Mr Jaye Barr | Strongly agree | |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | Strongly agree | |
| 31316 John Heslop | Strongly agree | Any area for development should be undertaken with minimizing the effects on the environment. Council current policies generally ensure this. Landscape and restoration are a requirement of any development. Council needs to ensure any development, especially high density, accommodate open outdoor green spaces. |
| 31318 Mrs Isobel Mosley | Strongly agree | |
| 31322 Mrs BARBARA AND TIM ROBSON | Strongly agree | This must be top of the list and other recommendations that counter achieving that goal (cf green field development and intensifying in flood prone areas), must be examined in the light of that |
| 31325 Dr Ann Briggs | Strongly agree | A very worthy aim. Where is the evidence for it happening currently, or in immediate future plans? Any development should retain mature trees and include green areas - particularly green corridors for wildlife 'Non-productive' land is currently seen as a target for development - ie building - rather than for creating enhanced environmental habitats. Previously productive land is left to become 'unproductive' so that it can be used for housing development. Trees are seen as an impediment to 'development' rather than as carbon stores and enhanced habitats for flora and fauna (including humans). Green space becomes concrete - an environmental asset becomes an environmental threat. |
| 31328 Ms Karen du Fresne | Strongly agree | These should be a priority. Restoration of wetlands, for example, is a very effective strategy for reducing flooding and the leaching of toxic chemicals into waterways, as well as protecting native wildlife. Restoration of native forests, and the development of urban microforests (the latter pioneered here in Nelson, but needing funding and a public education campaign to encourage further development) are essential for sequestering carbon. |
| 31334 Diane Sutherland | Strongly agree | This deserves the highest priority. However, I can't see where and how the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The best strategy would be to confine development to our existing urban areas. Turning |
| | | |

| | | more of our beautiful countryside into concrete and tarmac jungles will only put further strain on our natural environment. |
|----------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | Strongly agree | We need to protect and restore our natural environment. However, I can't see where and how the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The best strategy would be to confine development to our existing urban areas. Turning more of our beautiful countryside into concrete and tarmac monotony will only put further strain on our natural environment. |
| 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman | Strongly agree | |
| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | Strongly agree | Council cannot even afford to look after the existing environment, let alone deal with climate change outcomes, that are set in stone more and more as we fail to act and reduce emissions. Expansion into greenfield sites will only exacerbate these issues. |
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | Strongly agree | |
| 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | Strongly agree | Again, the best strategy would be to confine development to our existing urban areas. |
| 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | Strongly agree | Pleasegive high priority. People who feel their "growth" needs were left unsatisfied, might find satisfaction and peace in other areas, the natural environment. |
| 31346 Martin Hartman | Strongly agree | Again, the best strategy would be to confine development to our existing urban areas. |
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | Strongly agree | |
| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | Strongly agree | Sure! But most of your growth projections do exactly the opposite. Providing all growth is restricted to UP in the centres, the "natural environment" will not be further impacted. Richmond West is a classic example of the opposite, and this really only has a max 50 year life expectancy anyway, it will all get washed away. Imagine the level of indictment on those responsible! Green field subdivision must end, now. Older green field suburbs can be redeveloped up to 3 or 4 storeys, and serviced by buses. Restoration does not have a good record. |
| 31356 Stephen Williams | Strongly agree | We don't have enough native bush in the Tasman Bay. More roadsides should be revegetated. Stormwater should be managed by infiltrating in native bush instead of funneling it into the ocean. Subdivisions should include plans for slowing down the runoff of water so we don't end up with erosion and flooding downstream. |

| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | Strongly agree | This is, as. Many will observe, one of the most beautiful places in NZ. It shouldn't need saying but i think its a good guiding principle |
|------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31360 Ms Thuy Tran | Strongly agree | Couldn't agree more |
| 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | Strongly agree | There is no use building houses and supporting population growth if we are not going to protect the environment that makes Nelson/Tasman a desirable place to live. People come here to enjoy access to wilderness areas and recreational areas - forests, beaches, mountains and rivers must be protected. |
| 31364 Mrs Christine Tuffnell | Strongly agree | |
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | Strongly agree | Why would you not agree? |
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | Strongly agree | Strongly agree with the objective. We need to protect and restore our natural environment. However, I can't see where and how the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The best strategy would be to confine development to our existing urban areas. Turning more of our beautiful countryside into concrete and tarmac monotony will only put further strain on our natural environment. |
| 31373 Ms Jenny Daniell | Strongly agree | Our precious natural environment is of extreme importance. |
| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | Strongly agree | Because we have to live within our means (globally, locally), and with nature, not against it. |
| 31384 Mr Jace Hobbs | Strongly agree | |
| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | Strongly agree | |
| 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann | Strongly agree | |
| 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett | Strongly agree | We must nurture the earth or die. |
| 31400 Miss Heather Wallace | Strongly agree | All future development must be climate change sensitive and to ecosystem vulnerable to this. |
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | Strongly | Preserving the natural environment and restoring other areas is important. That is why we need to reduce |
| | | |

| agre | rongly \ | the greenfield developments. We obviously need to put nature first, at all times. |
|---|---------------|--|
| agro | • . | We obviously pood to put nature first, at all times |
| 24.407. NAv. Canala Milaitta | ree | we obviously need to put nature first, at an times. |
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle Stro agro | ree p | We need to protect and restore our natural environment. However, I can't see where and how the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The best strategy would be to confine development to our existing urban areas. Turning more of our beautiful countryside into concrete and tarmac monotony will only put further strain on our natural environment. |
| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling Stro agro | | We have already trashed much of the natural environment around the region |
| 31410 Mr Scott Smithline Stro agro | • , | Strongly support outcome. Crucial & deserving high priority! |
| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling Stro agro | • . | We need to protect our environment. |
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin Stro agro | 0, | Of course! But how does this strategy, with it's increasing greenfield developments, prioritise this? |
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser Stro agro | rongly ree | |
| 31415 Mrs Zanahe Ruth Galloway Stro agro | ree l | Time to stop mindless industrial farming (steep Kaka hills are being strip to bare earth of its regenerative bush of manuka and mahoi right now Monday 11th of April 2022 to beput to grass for sheep grazing) and mono culture of pine forests on steep hills surrounding Nelson. Respecting regenerating the wetland like the valley floor of Kaka valley in the Maitai to allow the Maitai River to flow naturally especially when flooding will occur with extreme weather events happening more often. The Maitai River has flooded in the past and will again with more devastating effects based on the NASA report on the moon cycle wobble. See (https://www.cnet.com > science > nasa-predicts-moon-wobble-and-climate-change-will-lead-to-more-floods-more-often) |
| | | NASA predicts moon 'wobble' and climate change will lead to more floods, more often The slightest change in the moon's orbit could see big problems for coastal regions.) |
| 31416 Tim Leyland Stro agre | | We do want to confine development to existing urban areas. |
| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors Stro | ongly | |

| | agree | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | Strongly agree | |
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | Strongly agree | This strategy does not protect our natural environment. Confine development to our existing urban centres and do not turn more of our land into houses and roads. |
| 31423 Mr Roger Frost | Strongly agree | Absolutely essential, since population and business growth is almost bound to have negative impacts. Once again righting past wrongs and neglects needs to be addressed first. |
| 31430 Muriel Moran | Strongly agree | I would prefer that impacts on the natural environment that are of significance would not occur and would be left intact. |
| 31431 Katerina Seligman | Strongly agree | The natural environment is our greatest asset. |
| 31434 Mrs cushla Moorhead | Strongly agree | |
| 31438 Aleisha Hosie | Strongly agree | Yes - developing land gives great opertunity to take into account existing environment and also provide opportunities of restoration or provide more green spaces. |
| 31441 Mr Chris Head | Strongly agree | |
| 31443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | Strongly agree | Absolutely! But it has to be reflected in the actual strategy. There is too much emphasis on urban sprawl, even into highly valued spaces (Maitai) |
| 31447 Dr David Jackson | Strongly agree | But the proposed development areas up the lower Maitai (Kaka Valley and Orchard Flat) will have a significant effect on the natural and social values of this area. Have any of the authors of the FDS ever swum at Black, Dennes or Sunday Hole, and seen the number of Nelsonians who enjoy these amenities and the land resources around them. |
| 31450 Mr David Clark | Strongly agree | |
| 31452 Mr David Bartle | Strongly agree | The natural environment includes our river systems and both councils have looked closely at urban impacts on our rivers. |
| 31457 Mr J Santa Barbara | Strongly agree | Councils should undertake a carrying capacity study of he region to determine what level of impact we are already having on the natural environment and what level of consumption our region can sustainably support. |
| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | Strongly | There is too little awareness of the impact of even quite small changes in land use. The effects of changes |
| | | |

| | agree | in land use are not always realised until too late. Again more careful planning and research is needed ever |
|----------------------------|-------------------|---|
| | -6 | given the urgent pressure of need. |
| 31460 Kris Woods | Strongly agree | |
| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | Strongly agree | I strongly support outcome 7. These are crucial dimensions of any major planning strategy and deserve high priority. |
| 31472 Dr David Briggs | Strongly agree | I support this 100% - and it's the aim that should trump all other considerations in the development process and plans. Moreover, this must include long-term impacts; so the aim must be to head off climate change by making all new developments carbon neutral from the start. But that requires strict planning and regulation of the development process. Will you do that? |
| 31473 Mr Andrew Downs | Strongly agree | |
| 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon | Strongly agree | |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | Strongly agree | |
| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | Strongly agree | It's too late for most of the natural environment. But I agree with reversing the trend as much as possible |
| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | Strongly agree | Yes, this is of utmost importance. The need for wildlife corridors and the restoration of wetlands and other such environments is needed to ensure biodiversity of both flora and fauna is maintained in the region. |
| 31481 Mrs Lucy Harrhy | Strongly agree | Absolutely this is important. One point that I would like to make, is that restoration is always considered to be native bush without thinking of the impact on the native birds that inhabit paddocks, eg. Pukeko, paradise duck, white faced grey heron, spur winged plove. These birds are rapidly losing habitat and it is therefore important, that the environmental impact on paddock and grass dwelling species are considered as well. |
| 31485 Ms Robin Schiff | Strongly agree | needs to be high priority. this is extremely important in any major planning strategy |
| 31487 Ms Heather Spence | Strongly agree | It's logical. Future food security will depend on sufficient food and to grow enough of it, and for that we will need existing food producing land. Recreation requires natural environment. Cycle trails are good example of restoration of natural environment, eg across the Waimea Inlet. |

| 31491 | Ms Annette Milligan | Strongly agree | The environment is at risk and all aspects of the environment should be protected - land, water, air qualit should be restored with the interests of all inhabitants (human, flora and fauna) |
|-------|---|-------------------|---|
| 31492 | Anton, Benni, Shalom, AJ Bank, Bonnin, Shalom Davis | Strongly agree | This must be top of the list and other recommendations that counter achieving that goal (cf green field development and intensifying in flood prone areas), must be examined in the light of that |
| 31493 | Ms Helen Lindsay | Strongly agree | I agree that we need to protect and enhance our natural environment but I don't see how allowing so much greenfield development is going to achieve that outcome. |
| 31494 | Mr Jan Heijs | Strongly agree | We need to protect and restore the natural environment. I can't see where and how this objective is applied in the strategy apart from one of many attributes in the MCA which results in this outcome contributing very little to the strategy. |
| 31495 | Ms Mary Duncan | Strongly agree | We need to protect and restore our natural environment. However, I can't see where and how the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The best strategy would be to confine development to our existing urban areas. Turning more of our countryside into concrete and tarmac monotony will only put further strain on our natural environment. |
| 31496 | Mrs Petra Dekker | Strongly agree | refer attachment: We need to protect and restore our natural environment. However, I can't see where and how this objective is applied in the Strategy other then one of many attributed in the MDCA, which results in the fact that this outcome has contributed very little to the development of the strategy |
| 31498 | Ms Anne Kolless | Strongly agree | |
| 31499 | Ms Jane Fisher | Strongly agree | Maintaining and regenerating the natural environment, our natural capital, should be at the forefront of all planning. |
| 31500 | Ms Suzan Van Wijngaarden | Strongly agree | That is why I oppose the plan for 50 houses at Rangihaeata. It is too close to the onahau estuary with its natural values. It will be impossible to protect it with all the new houses, sewage, dogs, cats and cars. |
| 31507 | Renatus Kempthorne | Strongly agree | Contact with nature good for people's (mental) health. |
| 31509 | Mrs Michaela Markert | Strongly agree | |
| 31510 | Dr Martin James Grinsted | Strongly agree | These are critical factors that need to be integrated into any major planning strategy and deserve high priority. |
| 31512 | Ms Jane Murray | Strongly | Strongly agree that impacts on the natural environment must be minimised, this is to ensure that |
| | | | |

| agree environmental health is not degraded as a result of development. Freshwater values, including Te Note Wai, need to be protected from inappropriate use and development and those water bodies that degraded water quality and need to be restored. NMH recommends that water sensitive design print are used to mitigate the potential impacts from urbanisation whilst negating the existing degraded quality impacts from current rural land use. The preservation of areas of significant ecological value biodiversity is important for future wellbeing of communities. Preservation and protection should be priortised as approaches and the option to create environmental impacts requiring restoration used where necessary. 31515 Geoffrey Vause Strongly Our natural environment must be protected from degradation and restored where damage. Alas the |
|--|
| 31515 Geoffrey Vause Strongly Our natural environment must be protected from degradation and restored where damage. Alas th |
| agree little in the FDS that identifies how this will be achieved, particularly with the volume of greenfield development being proposed in the FDS. |
| 31516 Mr Peter Lole Strongly The natural environment is a big part of Nelson/Tasman's appeal. Logical not to damage it. agree |
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers Strongly We use to much concrete and asphalt, do we need all that? maybe bigger section and narrower roa agree remove car parking on the streets, less storm water run off generated, more soakage into the earth |
| 31520 Andrew Stirling Strongly agree |
| 31526 Elise Jenkin Strongly I strongly agree with the need to protect and restore our natural environment but this should mean confining development to our existing urban areas and not using more of our natural countryside for more urban style development. |
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement Strongly We have to pay far more attention to preserving & enhancing the environment for the benefit of th planet & future generations. We can't keep destroying nature through pollution & thoughtless "eas development. |
| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard Strongly This is the most important question to date. It is simply wrong to undertake developments that have agree negative impact on the natural environment, and ultimately harms us all. |
| 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery Strongly agree I really appreciate the parks and natural spaces in my community. Well planned developments show working to keep as much of the natural beauty of the areas the are growing as possible. |
| 31549 Mr Ian McComb Strongly agree |
| 31553 Mr Wim van Dijk Strongly agree |
| 31554 Wendy Barker Strongly The rate at which our natural environment is being diminished/destroyed by more and more urban |

| | agree | is outrageous and tragic. No one I know wants to see the sprawl continue to eat up the countryside that people come from all over the world to enjoy. Not only that but what are we going to eat in the future if councils continue to allow houses and factories to be built on highly productive agricultural and horticultural land? It is so, so shortsighted. |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | Strongly agree | We are behind the eight -ball on this. Here is a chance to correct - enhanced wetlands, places for wildlife to flourish/ harbour especially given sea level rises/ and that the current landscapes are protected. We live in a beautiful part of new Zealand /the world - let's protect & enhance what we have and provide good guardianship. |
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | Strongly agree | This is a no-brainer, it is in the DO-ing that we get let down by the Council. By all means keep it as an ideal to aim for and maybe we will achieve it now and then. |
| 31560 Ms Steph Watts | Strongly agree | I feel strongly that we protect and restore our natural environment at every opportunity. |
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | Strongly agree | |
| 31562 Grant palliser | Strongly agree | not only protect but restore our natural and unique environmentwildlife habitats etc. Restrict developments to existing urban areaspreserve environmental and food production security countryside. |
| 31563 Mrs Loretta Anne Hogg | Strongly agree | Yes - yes for areas N-106 and N-032 which are wetlands to be protected at all costs. We need to keep the natural environment! |
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | Strongly agree | We need to protect and restore our natural environment. However, I can't see where and how the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The best strategy would be to confine development to our existing urban areas. |
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | Strongly agree | We need to protect and restore our natural environment. However, I can't see where and how the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The best strategy would be to confine development to our existing urban areas. Turning more of our beautiful countryside into concrete and tarmac monotony will only put further strain on our natural environment. |
| 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett | Strongly agree | IPCC REPORT. It is our responsibility. It is essential. I am very mindful that the Greenfield development in Richmond (and current development in Berryfields) is on productive land. We should be protecting the areas within our region and I do not think that developing over this land is aligned with outcome number 1. The FDS should recognise national and international pressures which include degrading soil quality, decreasing food security, increased floods ect, huge loss of wetlands ect there should be a higher regar for the land that is being proposed to be developed. The impact should be minimised by developing only |

| | | medium and higher density housing that connects with centres, public and active transport networks. |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31571 Ms Susan Drew | Strongly agree | |
| 31573 Mrs Susan Lea | Strongly agree | common sense comments not required |
| 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham | Strongly agree | |
| 31579 Jane Tate | Strongly agree | |
| 31580 Jenny Long | Strongly agree | I strongly support this outcome, as protecting the natural environment is critical to protecting our own individual wellbeing, the economy, and ultimately our society's future. |
| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | Strongly agree | This should be a major focus for Council the proposed FDS is NOT clear that this is the case |
| 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | Strongly agree | We absolutley need to protect the natural environment. However creating a new town centred near Tasman Village is an utter disregard to the natural environment (rural community) and would impact the community and the natural balance of the area in a devastating way. |
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins | Strongly agree | This deserves higher priority in my opinion. I strongly support outcome 7. The FDS needs to detail more about how the natural environment impacts will be minimised, given increased population in the next 30 years and inevitable increase in temperatures/increase in flooding and storms. The FDS also needs to go further in detailing opportunities for restoration and how this will be achieved. |
| 31588 pene Greet | Strongly agree | |
| 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | Strongly agree | We need to protect and restore our natural environment. However, I can't see where and how the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The best strategy would be to confine development to our existing urban areas. |
| 31593 Mr William Samuels | Strongly agree | We need to protect and restore our natural environment. However, I can't see where and how the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The best strategy would be to confine development to our existing urban areas. Turning more of our beautiful countryside into concrete and tarmac monotony will only put further strain on our natural environment. |
| 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner | Strongly agree | Yes please to gate keep, restore our natural environment. However, the proposed strategy doesn't seem to do this. Sprawling out takes away what we should look after & restore all the time on the way. The bes |
| | | |

| | | strategy would be to confine development to our existing urban areas not put further strain on our natural environment to support new housing developments that again support the stand alone house ideas. |
|------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | Strongly agree | We need to protect and restore our natural environment. However, I can't see where and how the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The best strategy would be to confine development to our existing urban areas. Turning more of our beautiful countryside into concrete and tarmac monotony will only put further strain on our natural environment. |
| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | Strongly agree | We have a river is it is a taonga for Nelson. I do not believe intensified developments next to the river should be carried out. |
| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | Strongly agree | We need to protect and restore our natural environment. However, I can't see where and how the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The best strategy would be to confine development to our existing urban areas. Turning more of our beautiful countryside into concrete and tarmac monotony will only put further strain on our natural environment. |
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | Strongly agree | Strongly support. However this should go without saying. What does the strategy propose in this regard? |
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | Strongly agree | Strongly agree with the sentiment but its unclear to me how swapping ex orchards for houses minimises the impact on the natural environment. But choosing to include green corridors to protect wildlife and opting for some multi story or terraced housing to maximise shared green space may be ways to minimise impact on natural environment and retain more green space. Plantings by footpaths and cycleways will also assist here. |
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | Strongly agree | I strongly agree in principle, but in real terms what does this objective mean? This is our last chance to get things right, so we need to build coastal defences, NOT build on greenfield sites where we currently grow our food, look at flood risk e.g. the proposed site of the new library. Intensification of the town centres can help this to happen. Building on greenfield sites is adding to our burden on services with little return. |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | Strongly agree | We need to protect and restore our natural environment. However, I can't see where and how the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The best strategy would be to confine development to our existing urban areas. |
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | Strongly agree | I agree with the objective but cannot see how the proposed strategy will achieve this. Turning our green countryside into roads and houses does not support this principle |
| 31617 Ms steph jewell | Strongly agree | This should be number one. No perhaps two after, how much carbon is this costing? |

| 31621 Dr Kath Walker | Strongly agree | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | Strongly agree | We need to protect and restore our natural environment. However, I can't see where and how the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The best strategy would be to confine development to our existing urban areas. Turning more of our beautiful countryside into concrete and tarmac monotony will only put further strain on our natural environment. |
| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | Strongly agree | The current TDC strategy is far away from achieving this in Mapua with current public green spaces being less than 2% AND the green spaces are scattered - often by the whim of developers. There seems to be no coherent planning on the maintenance or restoration of useful natural environments |
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | Strongly agree | One example where we are being let down is proposed public access to the WCD. How much was that costing rate and taxpayers again? |
| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | Strongly agree | |
| 31632 Ms Jacquetta Bell QSM | Strongly agree | We very strongly support outcome 7. With its reliance on greenfield development, FDS 22 does not go nearly far enough regarding impacts on the natural environment. Many community members have expressed this strongly, in particular with regard to increased development proposed in the Maitai Valley. Any new greenfield housing developments must be designed to ensure rivers and watersheds are protected. |
| 31633 Ms Jacquetta Bell QSM | Strongly agree | I very strongly support outcome 7. With its reliance on greenfield development, FDS 22 does not go nearly far enough regarding impacts on the natural environment. Many community members have expressed this strongly, in particular with regard to increased development proposed in the Maitai Valley. SEE ATTACHED |
| 31635 Mr Joe Hay | Strongly agree | Yes. We definitely need to look after the natural environment, both for its own sake and for the enormous benefits it gives us. |
| 31637 Ms Frances Kemble Welch | Strongly agree | |
| 31640 Mr Ryan Brash | Strongly agree | We need to protect and restore our natural environment. However, I can't see where and how the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The best strategy would be to confine development to our existing urban areas. Turning more of our beautiful countryside into concrete and tarmac monotony will only put further strain on our natural environment. |
| 31644 Murray Poulter | Strongly | Developments to date have paid scant or token regard to this aspect. |
| | | |

| agree | |
|-------------------|--|
| Strongly | We need to protect and restore our natural environment. However, I can't see where and how the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The best strategy would be to confine development to our existing urban areas. |
| Strongly agree | Looking after the environment is paramount and should be the highest priority as it is integral to quality of life and healthy living. |
| Strongly agree | |
| Strongly agree | The environment will only get worse if we don't take it into consideration during all of our actions. So we need this at the forefront, as it is also often irreversible damage that takes places. Nelson and Tasman prides itself on beautiful nature and the environment so we need to uphold this. |
| Strongly agree | Waka Kotahi support Te Tau Ihu iwi feedback in this space, summarised in the FDS |
| Strongly agree | Strongly agree We need to protect and restore our natural environment. However, I can't see where and how the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The best strategy would be to confine development to our existing urban areas. |
| Strongly agree | We are preparing for times of great change due to climate change. We must do all we can to prepare for that with initiatives that build environmental and social resililence |
| Strongly agree | I support this however I note the draft FDS seems more focused on urban sprawl and the creation of too much low density housing which increase degradation of the natural environment. I would like to see the FDS focus more on high density housing that is close to existing services and has |
| Strongly agree | Strongly agree We need to protect and restore our natural environment. However, I can't see where and how the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The best strategy would be to confine development to our existing urban areas. |
| Strongly agree | We need to protect and restore our natural environment. However, I can't see where and how the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The best strategy would be to confine development to our existing urban areas. Supporting trees in our urban spaces can be hugely beneficial to allow for pleasant higher density living. |
| | Strongly agree |

| 31703 Ms Paula Holden | Strongly agree | Restoring & enhancing our natural environment provides benefits to all. |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | Strongly agree | We should encourage any new developments to have as little impact as possible on our natural environment, the focus therefore should be on repurposing and intensifying existing city areas, not on green field developments. We should encourage the repurposing of existing structures and where new buildings are required they should have as little environmental impact as possible (including in the selection of building materials for example). The knock on effect of green field developments, for example building on wetlands (Kaka Valley) and productive farming land should not be underestimated and while opportunities for restoration should be realised, avoiding messing up our natural environment in the first place needs to be the focus. |
| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | Strongly agree | |
| 31692 Mr Alasdair Gardiner | Strongly agree | |
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | Strongly agree | The natural environment is the most significant attraction to those wanting to live and visit Tasman and must be protected and enhanced wherever possible |
| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | Strongly agree | |
| 31688 Gerard McDonnell | Strongly agree | This is essential for survival on this planet! |
| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | Strongly agree | It is critical that existing reserves / wetlands / greenspaces are protected and expanded, and new ones established to offset the planned residential growth. These area can serve not only as public spaces, but also as natural water retention area helping manage the increase hardstand and stormwater runoff from both existing and new residential areas. |
| 31683 Richard Davies | Strongly agree | Care for the environment in all its aspects is essential for the diversity of life forms (including our own). |
| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | Strongly agree | Livable cities. |
| | | We also need to store more stormwater to support the natural environment into our urban centers. the concept of sponge cities can be used in development to avoid the run off created in urban areas where hard surfaces are viewed as the only option for surfacing cities,. |

| 31704 Mr Paul Bucknall | Strongly agree | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31705 Mr Lindsay Wood | Strongly agree | We strongly support outcome 7. These are crucial dimensions of any major planning strategy and deserve high priority. We also note that historical legislation and planning have often stated they will minimise impacts on the natural environment and have failed to do so. It is this incumbent on those implementing such strategies to ensure that they are followed up with suitably robust plans and actions. |
| 31706 Paul Donald Galloway | Strongly agree | Preparedness resilience self sufficiency with strong small green communities with regenerative farming , water conservation, complete recycling facilities, sewage transformation into energy |
| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | Strongly agree | I am endorsing the Nelson Tasman Climate Forum's view . Forum response: Strongly agree. This is why we oppose greenfield development. Ecological restoration requires a focus on indigenous flora (and fauna). We need to build on and expand current projects and initiatives that involve community groups and farmers to actively link patchwork efforts into larger coordinated programmes that make a difference at landscape level. Also relevant here is control of browsing mammals (possums, pigs, deer etc), as their eradication benefits canopy growth and carbon sequestration, as well as enhancing biodiversity. This outcome also includes the estuarine and marine environment, crucial for positive biodiversity and carbon sequestration outcomes |
| 31710 Ms Angela Fitchett | Strongly agree | Obvious and worthy objective. But how does this outcome work with Greenfield's development plans? Not logical. |
| 31713 Mrs Debora Scholl Dos Santos | Strongly agree | I strongly agree with the intensification of houses infill and strongly disagree with expanding it to greenfields. |
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | Strongly agree | The current proposal does not align with this objective, in fact it is quite opposite: ie consolidated growth along SH6, the new village in Tasman, Richmond South, Richmond West all would have and are having a dramataic effect on the depletion of natural environment. This encouraging more vehicles on the road and further carbon emissions. The aging existing housing stock in Richmond is ready for redevelopment. If this can be acquired or further incentives made to develop then this objective will bee firmly met. |
| 31726 Mr John Jackson | Strongly agree | The Dasgupta Report commissioned by the UK government suggests strongly that Nature is vitally important. |
| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | Strongly agree | We need to protect and restore our natural environment. However, I can't see where and how the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The best strategy would be to confine development to our existing urban areas. Turning more of our beautiful countryside into concrete and tarmac monotony will only put further strain on our natural environment. This quote is an example of why we cannot allow |
| | | |

| | | more of our flat productive land to be lost. "Fruit and vegetable growers are warning Auckland's urban sprawl could push prices up sharply and jeopardise the country's produce supply. A new report commissioned by Horticulture New Zealand says vegetable growing land has decreased by nearly a third between 2002 and 2016. It says even more market gardens around Pukekohe are under threat if Auckland's housing advance on Pukekohe's market gardens isn't reined in. Horticulture NZ's chief executive Mike Chapman told reporter Chris Bramwell that report should compel the government and councils to act." We are now facing higher prices for fruit and vegetables. |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | Strongly agree | We need to protect and restore our natural environment. However, I can't see where and how the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The best strategy would be to confine development to our existing urban areas. Turning more of our beautiful countryside into concrete and tarmac monotony will only put further strain on our natural environment. |
| 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert- Watene | Strongly agree | Environment and what makes our area unique needs to be considered as once its lost, there's no going back |
| 31754 Ms Joanna Hopkinson | Strongly agree | |
| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | Strongly agree | Please see attached: Restoration essential and not just left to volunteers as in the past. e.g Marine Reserves by volunteer groups. David Attenborough (with 70+ years experience with world wide ecosystems state human survival requires efforts towards biodiversity wild and away from (?? refer to submission) |
| 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | Strongly agree | This deserves more attention. As an example, the new development near Snowdens Bush is changing the drainage of the area, which is negatively impacting this reserve of low-lying podocarp forest. I also have concerns about the massive increase in cats the new development will bring, so close to a rare preserved(ish!) treasure. |
| 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | Strongly agree | |
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | Strongly agree | This is important for mitigating climate change and wider ecological overshoot, but with all the greenfield development in this strategy, I don't see how this will be achieved. Intensification of existing towns are the best way to achieve this outcome. |
| 31769 Ms Jo Gould | Strongly agree | This is an important outcome. Our wellbeing depends on the health of our natural ecosystems. High freshwater quality is very important. |
| 31771 Colleen Shaw | Strongly | I fully support this outcome as we are stripping away biodiversity and green spaces. The importance |

| | agree | biodiversity to the heath of the environment and human beings is well documented. Also well-documented is the importance of accessible green space to people's mental health and optimum psychological and social functioning. |
|--|----------------------|--|
| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | Strongly agree | To protect our environment we sohuld not allow more greenfield development! |
| 31801 Joan Skurr | Strongly agree | To minimise impacts on the natural environment new building development should remain within current boundaries. In addition the planting of trees and/or shrubs in areas of housing should be increased. |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | Strongly agree | Firstly, a moral responsibility to other species. Partnership engagement with Iwi is essential. |
| 31809 Mr Andrew Spittal | Strongly agree | A central feature of the concept masterplan for 49 Stafford Drive is the provision for stormwater retention and wetland enhancement, with significant beneficial impacts on the natural environment. Combined with walkway/cycleway linkages, these areas will become blue/green assets with long term benefits to the community. |
| 31835 Mr Ian Wishart | Strongly agree | |
| 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | Strongly disagree | Re-zoning agricultural and rural land as residential does not minimise environmental impacts. There is no compunction on developers to pay for remediation of environmental impacts. N-106 & N-032 turn rural into residential - with significant environment impacts that are not mitigated by the developers |
| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | Strongly disagree | Again the core plan of intensifying existing centres seems reasonable, however large increases in housing in both Mapua and Tasman Village/Moutere area will ruin the rural feel and holiday vibe of the area which brings in significant tourist income. |
| 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | Strongly disagree | Not with the T136 development and the destruction of good farmland. |
| 31347 Ms Paula Baldwin | Strongly disagree | Not if the Council is considering it OK to build 6 storey high rise apartments in Tahunanui. |
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | Strongly disagree | New development areas are planned in areas of huge local amenity. Eg N-106, N-032. The value of this local amenity in it's current state far out ways any potential development benefit to the community when there are so many other options available such as brownfield development, urban infill, reuse of existing housing stock, increasing availability of existing housing stock (change from Air BnB use for example). This is a huge resource to the community for the future community of Nelson. |
| | | |

| 31464 Mr David Matulovich | Strongly disagree | |
|----------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | Strongly disagree | Outcome 7 does not provide for this. It is a minimal response to a huge issue. What will help the natural environment is for this strategy to be rethought and completely re developed with sound research that looks a comprehensive approach to the future of our Region - on where economics is not the single or the dominant driver. |
| 31570 Ms Annabel Norman | Strongly disagree | |
| 31636 Joanna Santa Barbara | Strongly disagree | Strongly agree. This is why we oppose greenfield development. Ecological restoration requires a focus on indigenous flora (and fauna). We need to build on and expand current projects and initiatives that involve community groups and farmers to actively link patchwork efforts into larger coordinated programmes that make a difference at landscape level. Also relevant here is control of browsing mammals (possums, pigs, deer etc), as their eradication benefits canopy growth, water-holding capacity and carbon sequestration, as well as enhancing biodiversity. This outcome also includes the estuarine and marine environment, crucial for positive biodiversity and carbon sequestration outcomes. |
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | Strongly disagree | As it stands the impacts on the natural environment are great from the FDS. Development is allowed on our good soils (anywhere on the Waimea Plains) and up valleys such as the Maitai Valley and Marsden which has huge adverse and reversible impacts on the natural environment. For these reasons I do not support any new greenfield development on the Waimea Plans and in the Maitai Valley. |
| 31763 Susan Rogers | Strongly disagree | Survey is flawed from the beginning. You need to redesign this entire line of questioning. It leads only to answers desired by the maker of the survey. |
| 31775 Dr Thomas Carl | Strongly disagree | |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Strongly disagree | Please see attached; Existing natural environment is being ransacked. Green space and tress are disappearing all too quickly. Coastal waters are being pumped full of toxic waste, |
| | | |

08 Please indicate whether you support or do not support Outcome 8: Nelson Tasman is resilient to and can adapt to the likely future effects of climate change. Please explain your choice:

| 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS | Agree | AGREE SO LONG AS THE POPULATION IS KEPT AT OR CLOSE TO EXISTING LEVELS. |
|----------------------------|-------|--|
| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | Agree | |
| 31186 Mr Gary Scott | Agree | Climate change is cyclic and there is nothing we can do about it. You can't fight nature. However we should concentrate on reducing pollution and rubbish in our community and waterways. Climate change has always been a political construct. |
| 31227 Ms Lee Eliott | Agree | |
| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | Agree | |
| 31261 Mr John Weston | Agree | Yes as long as this is planned for and action taken now, rather than putting the cost on future generations |
| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | Agree | This implies retaining agricultural land of all kindsthat is what will give resilience to adapt agricultural output to the changes that will come. |
| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | Agree | |
| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | Agree | |
| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | Agree | |
| 31318 Mrs Isobel Mosley | Agree | |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | Agree | |
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | Agree | Yes, sadly we have to plan for the effects of climate change. Shouldn't we therefore protect our rural and natural land as areas to mitigate future flood risks, fire risks, provide security of local food production, etc.? It seems that the proposed strategy is reducing these areas even more. Wouldn't that do the opposite and increase the overall risk to our assets and population? |
| 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman | Agree | |
| 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | Agree | YES - which means that the strategy needs to be amended without new developments that use rural and natural land that helps mitigate future flood risks, fire risks, is productive etc. |
| 31347 Ms Paula Baldwin | Agree | Yip. We are diverse landscape and areas of occupation; BUT, we have to respect the existing and not try to re-write/develop a plan to change the existing beautiful areas of living, and call it 'adapting to the effects of climate change'. |

| 31350 Ms Janet Tavener | Agree | |
|------------------------------|-------|--|
| 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | Agree | Only with intelligent planning, courage and commitment. |
| 31364 Mrs Christine Tuffnell | Agree | But note previous comments - the contribution to greenhouse gases by residential areas pales in comparison with agricultural and industrial areas. |
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | Agree | Agree with the objective. Yes, sadly we have to plan for the effects of climate change. Shouldn't we therefore protect our rural and natural land as areas to mitigate future flood risks, fire risks, provide security of local food production, etc.? It seems that the proposed strategy is reducing these areas even more. Wouldn't that do the opposite and increase the overall risk to our assets and population? |
| 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann | Agree | |
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle | Agree | Yes, sadly we have to plan for the effects of climate change. Shouldn't we therefore protect our rural and natural land as areas to mitigate future flood risks, fire risks, provide security of local food production, etc.? It seems that the proposed strategy is reducing these areas even more. Wouldn't that do the opposite and increase the overall risk to our assets and population? |
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin | Agree | Again, yes. So lets maximise our ability to produce food locally - don't use our fertile land for housing. |
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | Agree | |
| 31416 Tim Leyland | Agree | |
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | Agree | So, don't build on green fields which should be used for food production, to provide local food security and limit the transportation of food into our towns and cities. |
| 31422 Mrs Marga Martens | Agree | Not sure if the strategy reflects this. |
| 31423 Mr Roger Frost | Agree | But we should not underestimate the power of nature to throw more at us than we have ever envisaged, but probably no less than we deserve! |
| 31430 Muriel Moran | Agree | It is possible but it needs strong and informed direction now to hold emissions at and below 1.5 degrees. |
| 31449 Mr John Chisholm | Agree | |
| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | Agree | It's very hard to estimate what the climate in 2050 will be like, but we should be planning for the worst and changing for the better. |
| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | Agree | This is an important issue for the lower lying areas in our region where future sea rise could affect both biodiversity in the area but also people and their homes. |
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | Agree | |
| 31487 Ms Heather Spence | Agree | TDC's recent walking and cycling strategy plan is a good example of proposed resilience. If TDC applies |
| | | |

| | | simliar common sense to future development that it would be positive for likely future effects of climate change. |
|-----------------------------|-------|--|
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | Agree | Yes, sadly we have to plan for the effects of climate change. Therefore shouldn't we protect our rural and natural land as areas to mitigate future flood risks (water absorption etc), fire risks, provide security of local food production, etc.? It seems that the proposed strategy is reducing these areas even more. Wouldn't that do the opposite and increase the overall risk to our assets and population? |
| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | Agree | We need to protect our rural and natural land areas to mitigate future flood risks, fire risks and provide security of local food production. The strategy is reducing these areas even more. No freeboard has been allowed for uncertainties in the predictions. The strategy is silent on how existing urbanised areas will be future proofed |
| 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | Agree | We need to plan for the effects of climate change. Shouldn't we therefore protect our rural and natural land as areas to mitigate future flood risks, fire risks, provide security of local food production, etc.? Well managed land/soils are the most effective way to store carbon and repairs the hydrology of this planet. It seems that the proposed strategy is reducing these areas even more. Wouldn't that do the opposite and increase the overall risk to our assets and population? |
| 31496 Mrs Petra Dekker | Agree | refer attachment: The Strategy is silent on how existing urbanised areas will be future proofed (or abandoned) |
| 31502 Ms Caroline Jones | Agree | |
| 31505 Cheryl Heten | Agree | |
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers | Agree | yes humans can adapt, but there is a cost and who should pay for this |
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | Agree | I agree with this objective but believe that the proposed strategy is reducing our rural and natural land areas needed to mitigate future flood risks, fire risks, and provide security of local food production, instead of protecting them. |
| 31529 Mr Steven King-Turner | Agree | |
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | Agree | It can adapt. The question is whether it will & I'm not currently confident because there's too much short term thinking. Low lying coastal land is at extreme risk of poor future outcomes due to climate change issues & we are not sufficiently resilient. |
| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard | Agree | This outcome should only be considered after it's companion outcome is addressed: 'Nelson Tasman makes a rapid and equitable transition to a zero carbon society by 2030 to limit the damage resulting from the climate crisis.' |
| | | |

| 31533 Wendy Trevett | Agree | Erosion in Nelson, Mapua, Motueka - low lying areas/erosion. |
|------------------------------------|-------|--|
| 31537 Mrs Juliana Trolove | Agree | |
| 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery | Agree | The future effects of climate change are speculative. While we can do our best to prepare, nature can and will continue to take us all by surprise from time to time. |
| 31551 Mrs Jo Kitchen | Agree | |
| 31562 Grant palliser | Agree | Agree with strategywe have to plan for climate change But the plan seems to be reducing areas that can mitigate future flood risks |
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | Agree | Yes, sadly we have to plan for the effects of climate change. Shouldn't we therefore protect our rural and natural land as areas to mitigate future flood risks, fire risks, provide security of local food production, etc.? It seems that the proposed strategy is reducing these areas even more. Wouldn't that do the opposite and increase the overall risk to our assets and population? |
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | Agree | Yes, sadly we have to plan for the effects of climate change. Shouldn't we therefore protect our rural and natural land as areas to mitigate future flood risks, fire risks, provide security of local food production, etc.? It seems that the proposed strategy is reducing these areas even more. Wouldn't that do the opposite and increase the overall risk to our assets and population? |
| 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | Agree | Yes, unfortunately we have to plan for the effects of climate change. Shouldn't we therefore protect our rural and natural land as areas to mitigate future flood risks, fire risks, provide security of local food production, etc.? It seems that the proposed strategy is reducing these areas even more. |
| 31588 pene Greet | Agree | Why is development occurring in some of the areas closest to sea level in the Waimea estuary and Motueka areas? Council should not be funding infrastructure to ensure resilience, resilience should be ensured by choosing appropriate areas to develop and limiting development in unsustainable places. |
| 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | Agree | Yes, we have to plan for the effects of climate change. Shouldn't we therefore protect our rural and natural land as areas to mitigate future flood risks, fire risks, provide security for local food production, etc.? It seems that the proposed strategy is reducing these areas instead of protecting them. Wouldn't that do the opposite and increase the overall risk to our assets and population? |
| 31593 Mr William Samuels | Agree | Yes, sadly we have to plan for the effects of climate change. Shouldn't we therefore protect our rural and natural land as areas to mitigate future flood risks, fire risks, provide security of local food production, etc.? It seems that the proposed strategy is reducing these areas even more. Wouldn't that do the opposite and increase the overall risk to our assets and population? |
| 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner | Agree | Yes, totally! But it seems the proposed strategy is doing the opposite, reducing these areas even more + increase the overall risk to our assets and population? |
| | | |

| 31595 Gary Clark | Agree | This is all about the design |
|---------------------------|-------|--|
| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | Agree | Yes, sadly we have to plan for the effects of climate change. Shouldn't we therefore protect our rural and natural land as areas to mitigate future flood risks, fire risks, provide security of local food production, etc.? It seems that the proposed strategy is reducing these areas even more. Wouldn't that do the opposite and increase the overall risk to our assets and population? |
| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | Agree | |
| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | Agree | Yes, sadly we have to plan for the effects of climate change. Shouldn't we therefore protect our rural and natural land as areas to mitigate future flood risks, fire risks, provide security of local food production, etc.? It seems that the proposed strategy is reducing these areas even more. Wouldn't that do the opposite and increase the overall risk to our assets and population? |
| 31612 Mr Paul Davey | Agree | Only if decisions that look at whats coming in the future are made and not crazy ideas to build 6 storey buildings in a sea-side location with the effects of climate change and sea level rising coming our way. You may have the watches but nature has the time |
| 31614 Mr mark Morris | Agree | |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | Agree | Yes, we have to plan for the effects of climate change. Shouldn't we therefore protect our rural and natural land as areas to mitigate future flood risks, fire risks, provide security for local food production, etc.? It seems that the proposed strategy is reducing these areas instead of protecting them. Wouldn't that do the opposite and increase the overall risk to our assets and population? |
| 31620 Mr Paul Baigent | Agree | |
| 31621 Dr Kath Walker | Agree | To the extent that that is possible. The better choice is to focus strongly on limiting climate change |
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | Agree | |
| 31628 Mr Daniel Levy | Agree | All future development should be in keeping with the declared Climate Change Emergency. For this reason I do not support any greenfield developments on existing floodplains, regardless of their size. All rural land with fertile alluvial soil (river and stream flats such as in the Waimea plains as well as in Kaka Valley) should be preserved for potential future food production or restored to their former natural state, regardless of the current yields they produce. |
| 31640 Mr Ryan Brash | Agree | Yes, sadly we have to plan for the effects of climate change. Shouldn't we therefore protect our rural and natural land as areas to mitigate future flood risks, fire risks, provide security of local food production, etc.? It seems that the proposed strategy is reducing these areas even more. Wouldn't that do the opposite and increase the overall risk to our assets and population? |

| 31641 Mr Stephen (Steve) Hayden | Agree | The proposed Braeburn settlement is away from areas that have the risks of coastal inundation and flooding |
|---------------------------------|-------|--|
| 31644 Murray Poulter | Agree | And WILL adapt? How about some emphasis on reducing emissions to minimise the future effects of climate change. This includes considering the impact, especially on transport, of proposed developments |
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | Agree | Yes, we have to plan for the effects of climate change. Shouldn't we therefore protect our rural and natural land as areas to mitigate future flood risks, fire risks, provide security for local food production, etc.? It seems that the proposed strategy is reducing these areas instead of protecting them. Wouldn't that do the opposite and increase the overall risk to our assets and population? |
| 31651 Dr Patrick Conway | Agree | This, in my view is a goal, not a given. Attaining this goal will require imagination and innovation. |
| 31656 Mr brad malcolm | Agree | |
| 31662 Joe Roberts | Agree | Support, with a risk-based assessment being used to balance against the conservative climate change modelling. |
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | Agree | Agree Yes, we have to plan for the effects of climate change. Shouldn't we therefore protect our rural and natural land as areas to mitigate future flood risks, fire risks, provide security for local food production, etc.? It seems that the proposed strategy is reducing these areas instead of protecting them. Wouldn't that do the opposite and increase the overall risk to our assets and population? |
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | Agree | Determined from submission "agree" did not answer multi-choice question. Please see attached - Yes support this through identifying already developed are areas that are not flood prone that can be attractively intensified. |
| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | Agree | Agree Yes, we have to plan for the effects of climate change. Shouldn't we therefore protect our rural and natural land as areas to mitigate future flood risks, fire risks, provide security for local food production, etc.? It seems that the proposed strategy is reducing these areas instead of protecting them. Wouldn't that do the opposite and increase the overall risk to our assets and population? |
| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | Agree | |
| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | Agree | Yes, we have to plan for the effects of climate change. Shouldn't we therefore protect our rural and natural land as areas to mitigate future flood risks, fire risks, provide security for local food production, etc.? It seems that the proposed strategy is reducing these areas instead of protecting them. Wouldn't that do the opposite and increase the overall risk to our assets and population? |

| | | We need to keep the arable land at the edge of our cities and then soften the hard surface use in the centers using stormwater gardens to green the cities as we encourage more people to live in the cities. we can achieve a win win with soft green cities without pushing out into more green field land. |
|-------------------------------|-------|--|
| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | Agree | |
| 31688 Gerard McDonnell | Agree | It can adapt but needs to be willing to do so |
| 31695 Christine Horner | Agree | |
| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | Agree | |
| 31706 Paul Donald Galloway | Agree | Agree with strong leadership with Climate Change Emergency guiding our choices and not endless economic and population growth. |
| 31710 Ms Angela Fitchett | Agree | Again there are some contradictions in the plan: reducing rural and natural land areas will not help the region become resilientto the effects of climate change. |
| 31718 Kathryn & Keith Quigley | Agree | |
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | Agree | With rising sea levels, dramatic weather changes we must protect our vulnerable low lying areas from flood risk areas. The protection of productive land from further developmet is also imperative to maintain a strong independence from the effects that climate change will have on imported foods. A resilience of our own is key. |
| 31721 Ms Jill Cullen | Agree | |
| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | Agree | Yes, we have to plan for the effects of climate change. Shouldn't we therefore protect our rural and natural land as areas to mitigate future flood risks, fire risks, provide security of local food production, etc.? It seems that the proposed strategy is reducing these areas even more. Wouldn't that do the opposite and increase the overall risk to our assets and population? |
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | Agree | Yes, sadly we have to plan for the effects of climate change. Shouldn't we therefore protect our rural and natural land as areas to mitigate future flood risks, fire risks, provide security of local food production, etc.? It seems that the proposed strategy is reducing these areas even more. Wouldn't that do the opposite and increase the overall risk to our assets and population? |
| 31744 Mrs Lorna CRANE | Agree | |
| 31748 Jo Brooks | Agree | Question 8 to 9 agree |
| 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | Agree | With good policy and planning, i.e. joining Hill Street and Suffolk Road to provide additional roading resilient |
| 31774 Mrs Jane Sutherland | Agree | Agree we should look to focus on areas that are resilient to climate change. It sounds like Motueka has |
| | | |

| | | some constraints and it is sensible to be cautious with development there. |
|--|----------|--|
| 31777 Mr David Lucas | Agree | |
| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | Agree | To mitigate effects of climate change we have to protect productive land and our natural environment. |
| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | Agree | Please see attached - determined Agree from submission: A: Yes of course, but this is not the only Climate Change impact we need to be cognisant of - We must determinedly push mitigation - measures that reduce climate change emissions at the same time as making us resilient to the effects of Climate Change. |
| 31801 Joan Skurr | Agree | I support this but in order to encourage and ensure adaptation, councils will need to motivate the public to accept the necessary changes and set a good example. |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | Agree | But the first priority for adaption and retreat applies to eco-systems and natural habitat. |
| 31809 Mr Andrew Spittal | Agree | Planning for natural hazards and climate change go hand in hand. The subject site not only provides for intensification of elevated land zoned for residential growth, but also provides for residential growth on the valley floor that would be developed above the flooding risks. |
| 31830 K.M. McDonald | Agree | Large-scale development contributes to the adverse effects of climate change e.g silting of waterways, roads and footpaths can't soak up floodwaters. |
| 31114 Ms Jill Rogers | Disagree | At the present rate of development - not so to continue the rate of building in rural areas where there i not water is madness. We should all be about building areas to collect water - having local recycling plants - community growing gardens and various types of homes for different situations within a community - I dont see this in your plan |
| 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | Disagree | |
| 31171 Ms Sallie Griffiths | Disagree | Climate change, is happening, no more builds along rivers and seasides. |
| 31173 Mr Roderick Watson | Disagree | |
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | Disagree | My University of California degree was in environmental sciences. There are assumptions being made here that are inaccurate. |
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | Disagree | Building a library on a known future climate risk area is beyond belief. I strongly do not support building any future library infrastructure along the Maitai river banks. |
| 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | Disagree | Ruby Bay struggles with storms. Waimea plains will be flood prone with increased sea levels. |
| 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | Disagree | Much is beyond our local control, although we can do much to voice our concerns, and act accordingly in |
| | | |

| | | small local ways to do our bit. To me, the development of areas subject to slippage, water undulation and earthquake, have often been modified to accommodate financial benefit in the immediate term. It never ceases to amaze me where some expensive homes are being built, to the extent of fillage being used in slippage areas, to accommodate large developments. And we are known to be an earthquake zone with inevitable outcomes should we get a combination of rain and earthquake especially considering the geological structure of some areas. As well, the concerns of liquefaction seem overlooked for recent developments in Beach Road for example, with piping and pumping? underground on the edge of the sports grounds. I well remember those areas being underwater at high spring tides in the late 50's. We lived in Waikare Street at the time and repeatedly had high tides overflowing into our street. |
|----------------------------|----------|--|
| 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan | Disagree | Everywhere in NZ along the coasts will be affected by this and all our cities will have some impact by drought, rising water levels with flow on effect of unsaleable properties and no insurance |
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | Disagree | Clearly not true in Nelson. In a climate emergency world, building on flood plains is a complete no no but places like Orchard Flats and Kaka Valley are still being considered for development. This is madness. |
| 31262 Mr Martin John Shand | Disagree | How come to counsel for see you likelihood of more major floods seeing a lot of the housing and the special Richmond area but also around Nelson is on the floodplain to say nothing of going to be vulnerable right around the coast to rising tide and storm surges. |
| 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman | Disagree | Tasman has a long coastline that has been developed for housing at sea level and is very hard to defend. The recent developments along Lower Queen St show a complete lack of prudence and most people recognise the folly of what the council has achieved in the last few years. |
| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley | Disagree | |
| 31284 Mr Jarmo Saloranta | Disagree | Nelson Tasman should not make the effects of climate change even worse by trying to attract very large numbers of new residents from other NZ cities. |
| 31286 Mr David Short | Disagree | I am uncertain whether Nelson Tasman is well enough prepared for the future effects of climate change and whether Councils are doing enough to ensure that residents are well enough aware of the need to be individually prepared for the effects of climate change. |
| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | Disagree | Sea level rise is a real concern. |
| 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | Disagree | The T136 area is resilient as it is being farmed at the moment, if subdivided there would be many issues with concrete curbing, roading creating runoff into small streams. Water supply for this area is another issue. |
| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | Disagree | Nelson Tasman is a sitting duck, and is going to receive some big shocks within years. The first will be the next El Nino - a long and very hot drought, going on for too many months. Unprecedented fires and |
| | | |

| | | temperatures, desperate shortage of water going on for months. No, we having been sitting on our hands, enjoying lots of big new houses spreading everywhere, and importing screeds of utes with big diesel engines. Foolish. The 2nd shock will be either another cyclone that inundates much of our coastline, including Richmond West, or a rain flood that noone would believe until it happens. No, resilience is the wrong word. Our climate is changing rapidly, these Councils have been encouraging it, and just using hip greenwash phrases. Start by closing the petrol stations 3 days a week - get serious at reduction. |
|---------------------------------------|----------|---|
| 31360 Ms Thuy Tran | Disagree | The cyclones of past have proven this assumption to not hold |
| 31365 michael monti | Disagree | A load of codswallop |
| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | Disagree | |
| 31415 Mrs Zanahe Ruth Galloway | Disagree | Many wrong choices being made like as an example building a new library boarding the Maitai river at a very expensive cost when we need to prepare and consolidate for the climate change emergency, changing industrial farming to regenerative farming. Let go of "endless" mindless population economic growth to a more sustainable circular economy. Stop housing developments creating suburbs instead of new villages new cities. |
| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn Ball | Disagree | Planning must take account of sea level rise and extreme weather events, calling into question development on low lying land. eg. Aranui Rd, Mapua. |
| 31441 Mr Chris Head | Disagree | The massive development of Berryfields/Lower Queen St calls that into question, given that most of that development sits on land known to be at significant risk of coastal inundation. It appears that the Council pays lipservice to the projected effects of climate change while prioritising/incentivising shorter-term financial gains from developments in high-risk areas. |
| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | Disagree | I am not confident that the effects of climate change are fully considered. The heavy dependence on fossi fuel transport, use of building materials and the old fashioned ways of building houses and estates does not make the area resilient. |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | Disagree | Environment in Nelson Tasman is regressing and little is done to improve the situation. Too much support for agriculture. |
| 31481 Mrs Lucy Harrhy | Disagree | I think the area used to be resilient until areas such as Lower Queen street in Richmond were developed and flood plains and areas where salt water historically inundates were built upon. I also think our resilience has decreased since a lot of farmers have sold up to developments. |
| 31488 Annette Starink | Disagree | See 9 |
| 31553 Mr Wim van Dijk | Disagree | The winter of 2021, showed that the short term impacts on the district are bigger and more frequent storms. We are coping with those disruptions at present, but the costs will escalate as such events |

| | | become more common. Some infrastructure, for example Rocks Road, will become unusable at the same time as demand for it increases. What is the plan? |
|-------------------------------|----------|--|
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | Disagree | MOANA is an area highly subject to inundation - entry to Nelson has been constrained several times already by coastal flooding and is highlighted as such. Future Access still persists with this being our only SH in and out and through Nelson City? Why commit to spend for what must surely be a short term option. |
| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | Disagree | Unpredictable and difficult to achieve at the best of times. Impossible if profit driven proposals such as these are realised. |
| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | Disagree | A great "aspiration" but there is no basis for the assumption based on our performance in the recent cyclone and flooding events in the region |
| 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz | Disagree | |
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | Disagree | I don't see any evidence to support this, however a good idea it would be to do so. Building on greenfield sites seems to go against this, destroying more of our local eco system for the sake of very few homes. |
| 31622 Peter Butler | Disagree | I see no evidence of this resilience and the insane new library proposal is evidence that NCC is not prepared to adapt |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | Disagree | Nelson Tasman can only adapt if every planned development is only approved if the climate change emergency is the foremost in the planning of the development. |
| 31637 Ms Frances Kemble Welch | Disagree | |
| 31643 Inge Koevoet | Disagree | Don't send me mail in the post about the risk of my house being underwater in 50yrs time and put this risk on my LIM report when you allow new builds to continue in areas right on the coast to continue. |
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | Disagree | Please see other fields |
| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | Disagree | We have many issues that will arise that will need careful planning to mitigate climate change - flooding, slips, our heavy reliance on cars, reliance on heavy carbon dioxide omitting industries. It is the major problem facing the human race. |
| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | Disagree | We can only adapt to it if we consider it every moment of the way. It will not be something that we can suddenly decide to care about and then be successful with. The human and societal influence is huge, and we must not underestimate it. |
| 31657 Mrs Andrea Hay | Disagree | I think with the current focus of NCC, it is not adapting to the crisis of climate change (despite declaring a climate emergency). It could adapt if it changed it's approach. |
| 31673 Mike Drake | Disagree | Development in Lower Queen Street doesn't inspire one with confidence that the TDC have all their ducks in a row. I think, as the scientists are finding out, climate change effects are happening faster than their |
| | | |

| | | models indicate. I haven't seen any indication that TDC has fully embraced climate change. |
|------------------------------------|---------------|--|
| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | Disagree | To date there is little evidence that infrastructure and commercial / residential residential development practices with the Tasman region are changing in a manner that would strengthen climate change resiliency. Greenspaces and Rural land continues to developed for sprawling residential development, engineered rather than natural solutions to stormwater water and runoff management are the norm and development continues within coastal areas that are within predicted coastal inundation zones as sealeverises. |
| 31697 Robert King-Tenison | Disagree | The flood plain will cost \$ to protect and many more \$ to service it with water. |
| 31734 Eric Thomas | Disagree | Is it? Do we even know what will happen? Lets look after what we have and keep working ahead but different areas need different things addressed. One size does not fit all. |
| 31759 Mr Damian Campbell | Disagree | |
| 31765 Mrs Lorna Ivy Cooper | Disagree | Dont agree with the concept of 'climate change'. |
| 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | Disagree | From the science, it is evident that Nelson Tasman is incredibly vulnerable to changes in the climate including increasing temperatures, flooding and land slips. |
| 31775 Dr Thomas Carl | Disagree | |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Disagree | Seems that the current philosophy is to retreat without taking even the simplest of measures to help with erosion. |
| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | Don't know | |
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | Don't know | |
| 31248 Mr Will Bosnich | Don't know | |
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | Don't know | New builds and renovations in areas at risk of coastal inundation are still being approved, so I'm unsure if the ideal above reflects the current reality. |
| 31355 Mr Barney Hoskins | Don't know | |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas Hollyman | Don't know | |
| 31434 Mrs cushla Moorhead | Don't | No one knows there future. |
| | | |

| | know | |
|---------------------------|---------------|---|
| 31473 Mr Andrew Downs | Don't know | |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | Don't know | |
| 31508 Mr Roger Barlow | Don't know | |
| 31572 Mr David Todd | Don't know | A vague statement. |
| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | Don't know | |
| 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart | Don't know | |
| 31598 Mrs Nicola Worsfold | Don't know | |
| 31606 Mr Trent Shepard | Don't know | |
| 31608 Robbie Thomson | Don't know | We have some idea what climate change could throw at us, but we won't know how resilient we are until we get there and deal with some of the major events we have coming. Most communities rally in the face of adversity, but with say Westport, how many times do you clean up before you abandon low ground? |
| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | Don't know | Not answering any of these leading questions |
| 31754 Ms Joanna Hopkinson | Don't know | |
| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | Don't know | Time will tell. One lives in hope. With a growth model no amount of resilience will be effective. |
| 31784 Ms Teresa James | Don't know | |
| 31346 Martin Hartman | N/A | The strategy needs to be amended without new developments that use rural and natural land that helps mitigate future flood risks, fire risks, is productive etc. |

| 31363 Mr Steve Cross | N/A | I reject the premise of this question |
|-----------------------------|---------|--|
| 31460 Kris Woods | N/A | Left to be determined |
| 31563 Mrs Loretta Anne Hogg | N/A | We can adapt and be resilient - Only if we all understand it - and make the necessary changes - that would a good place to put your money and your energy and get the word out how to do that. NCC proclaimed to be The first climate change emergency city! Don't waste money and time on rebranding your 1 year old bike shelter and building expensive unnecessary libraries - it's not hard - educate people. |
| 31623 Ms Lucy Charlesworth | N/A | I am wary of answering this question as I cannot be sure of how my answer will be interpreted. So I will state - I do not agree with developing green spaces. These spaces need to be reserved and protected to allow for sustainable biodiversity and for future generations. Intensification within Nelson CBD needs to be a priority. I do not agrees with building on Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. I do not agree with housing development on green fields. There is a climate emergency. Remove these areas from the FDS. |
| 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | Neutral | Neutral as we have a lots of coastal settlements and coastal flooding issues already. Is the FDS providing sufficient land areas for existing coastal settlements to move to including future general population growth? also is there provision for services to be relocated in the event a coastal area is no longer viable to live nearby? |
| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | Neutral | With climate change comes a move away from fossil fuels which currently the city depends on to move. In 10 years time, there will no longer be the choice to depend on petrol for transport so alternative mechanisms of transport must be prioritised in the immediate future. |
| | | Other factors such as increased rainfall intensity are likely to significant challenges to low lying areas. New developments such as berryfields are very questionable from a flood perspective. |
| 31129 Mrs Gaynor Brooks | Neutral | |
| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | Neutral | |
| 31192 Ms Rebecca Patchett | Neutral | Tasman council doing very little to mitigate the effects of climate change when considering transport options and population growth. |
| 31211 Mrs Alison Pickford | Neutral | See attached. Summarised - Coastal Inundation. we should be planning for worst case scenario as in New Zealand and around the world. We should be removing stranded assets. a fund should be created similar to the earthquake fund with annual contribution from rates plus a larger one from buildings newley constructed in the orange and red zones collected for this purpose. the fund should not be accessible except when needed for stated purpose. |
| 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | Neutral | I'm not sure the public is yet awake to the urgent need for mitigate climate change so we don't see floods |
| | | |

| | | like are happening in Bay of Plenty and NSW. Education is needed, as all of the community can contribute by the way they deal with waste, runoff, gardening, plant planning, regenerative grazing, etc. |
|---|---------|--|
| 31250 Mr Richard Wyles | Neutral | |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | Neutral | I'm not convinced the Councils are fully committed to a low carbon future especially as this strategy is enabling large amounts of growth which will increase the districts GHG emissions |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | Neutral | Outcome 8 is a unrealistic pipe dream. Let market forces do the adaption. Note on titles of potentially flooded houses. Price will be low but some people happy t accept risk. |
| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | Neutral | I note the care than has gone into avoiding flood zones etc, however this level of increased building on rural land is not going to help reduce climate change. |
| 31285 Dr Hamish Holland | Neutral | Nelson Tasman has the potential to be resilient. Urban developments are not resilient to climate change. National parks provide a self regenerative core, and rural land also shares this capacity. The current urban development around Lower Queen St in Richmond does not increase resilience in the face of climate change or the projected rises in sea level in the next 50 years. |
| 31309 Mr & Mrs Rose & Phillip Windle | Neutral | |
| 31316 John Heslop | Neutral | Yes for future council infrastructure but privately owned developments should have the choice whether to design for here and now or climate change. Consent notices can protect ongoing sales of the property if concerns need to be noted. |
| 31358 George Harrison | Neutral | |
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | Neutral | How do we know what the effects of climate change will be? |
| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | Neutral | Not sure it is resilient. Not sure its doing enough to adapt. It would be nice to believe so. |
| 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer | Neutral | |
| 31403 Mr Richard Deck | Neutral | |
| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling | Neutral | It remains to be seen as the TDC and City Council have limited resources and the TDC is heavily indebted. Central government financial help and advice is needed |
| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling | Neutral | Yes, it is urgent that we plan our residential areas so that the houses can survive climate change. TDC is heavily in debt and has imited resources. |
| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors | Neutral | |
| 31438 Aleisha Hosie | | |

| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | Neutral | |
|------------------------------|---------|---|
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | Neutral | |
| 31472 Dr David Briggs | Neutral | I'm less interested in Nelson and Tasman being resilient to future climate change than I am to it fulfilling its duties to avoid and minimise these changes. At present, adaptation and resilience are used as an excuse not to do the more important thing of actively intervening to halt GHG emissions. |
| 31480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | Neutral | |
| 31521 Mrs Marie Waterhouse | Neutral | |
| 31523 Ms karen steadman | Neutral | |
| 31558 Mr Steve Jordan | Neutral | |
| 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett | Neutral | I am unsure how exsisting areas in Tasman/Nelson will be resilient when in hazard-prone areas. ie) Motuekas predicted inundation zone, ruby bay erosion, Nelsons main road along a coast ect. Humans are adaptable but we have a aging population, coastal settlements so we face many challenges to ensure that climate change will effect people equally. |
| 31574 Mr David Bolton | Neutral | |
| 31604 Mr Peter Moot | Neutral | |
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | Neutral | Greenfields developments in rural areas requiring more commuting and increased carbon emissions as opposed to intensifying town centres doesn't feel very resilient to me. |
| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | Neutral | |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | Neutral | |
| 31647 Mrs Rebecca Parish | Neutral | |
| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | Neutral | |
| 31679 TR Carmichael | Neutral | |
| 31681 Seev Oren | Neutral | Tasman Village will support Communities in case of climate change. |
| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | Neutral | |
| 31692 Mr Alasdair Gardiner | Neutral | |
| 31709 Ofer Ronen | Neutral | New Tasman Village Supports for climate change. |
| | | |

| Neutral | |
|-------------------|---|
| Neutrai | See attached submission. Summarised - no key points related to this outcome. |
| Neutral | |
| Neutral | As long as climate change reductions - prevention - is given equal or greater priority. |
| Neutral | |
| Neutral | |
| Neutral | People will always live where there is sun |
| Neutral | New village as Tasman Village will be a support in case of climate change. |
| Strongly agree | It is already effected by climate change and must act now to make the damages minimized for the region |
| Strongly agree | |
| Strongly agree | To achieve this local resources must be conserved e.g farmland, water, forests. |
| Strongly agree | |
| Strongly agree | Sea level rise is inevitable and should be kept in mind in all future developments. |
| Strongly agree | We have tosimple as that |
| Strongly agree | |
| Strongly agree | |
| Strongly agree | The climate changes are evident and it will only get worse. We need to plan and tackle them before is too late. |
| Strongly agree | Significant areas of Nelson City, Tahunanui, Richmond, Mapua and Motueka are close enough to sea leve to be affected by storm surges of ever-increasing size. Heavy rain events will continue to become more frequent and extreme, and streams and rivers have the |
| | Neutral Neutral Neutral Neutral Neutral Neutral Strongly agree Strongly |

| | | potential to cause frequent damage. |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31306 Mr Jaye Barr | Strongly agree | |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | Strongly agree | |
| 31322 Mrs BARBARA AND TIM ROBSON | Strongly agree | If Councils are really taking the idea of Adaptation on board, then much of this strategy needs to be re-examined - as it could in fact increase the need for adaptation measures (cf managed retreat!) For example: Library location When considering the next 30 years it is appropriate to reconsider the location and expense of the proposed new NCC library. Nelson has no need of a "show-piece" library on a riverbank with Sea Level Rise and extreme weather events impacting more frequently IPCC AR6 predicts , and experience in NZ shows, that this is happening now. If this FDS was really talking adaptation and planning wisely, it would be actively promoting 20 minute cities as an adaptive strategy. |
| 31328 Ms Karen du Fresne | Strongly agree | This is essential, but it needs to be reflected in concrete proposals, and we need evidence that the two councils are walking the talk, not just paying lip service to the need for resilience and effective adaptive strategies! |
| 31334 Diane Sutherland | Strongly agree | Unfortunately though the climate crisis is already upon us, more so than the FDS seems to address. If Outcome 8 is taken seriously, large parts of the FDS are counterproductive. Shouldn't we be protecting our rural and natural land as much as possible to help mitigate future flood risks, fire risks, provide security of local food production etc rather than giving that land over to urban sprawl? |
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | Strongly agree | Absolutely this should be the goal. BUT you need a progressive agenda with hard choices and even harder limits to growth to achieve this, and I am not seeing it in your draft documents. |
| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | Strongly agree | |
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | Strongly agree | |
| 31349 Laurien Heijs | Strongly agree | Incredibly important, but again, not sure how the strategy is achieving this. Has a climate change risk assessment been done? Also, resilience is more than just where we decide to put houses. Resilient |

| | | communities are also about quality neighbourhoods, places designed to ensure people connect to each other and have easy access to quality green spaces. Green spaces can also have immense value as carbon stores and ecological diversity can buffer us from the impacts of climate change. The housing, climate change, biodiversity, and mental health crises can and should all be addressed together. |
|------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | Strongly agree | |
| 31356 Stephen Williams | Strongly agree | We are going to get more rain, so we will need to manage it better. By slowing it down and infiltrating it we can reduce the risk of flooding downstream. The changing climate will open up opportunities for different crops. Existing crops will become more troublesome to produce. e.g. increasing frequency of hair storms damaging apple and hops crops. |
| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | Strongly agree | It is clearly unstoppable by human action. Now we must learn to live with it. |
| 31373 Ms Jenny Daniell | Strongly agree | Our resilience in the face of climate change should be addressed before any future development and urban intensification. |
| 31384 Mr Jace Hobbs | Strongly agree | Councils are underestimating climate impacts, and i suppose on purpose, as the required actions are disruptive. |
| 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett | Strongly agree | see 7 above |
| 31400 Miss Heather Wallace | Strongly agree | All decisions must anticipate climate change and minimize our impact on it. |
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | Strongly agree | Adapting to climate change needs to be more prominent in the FDS plan. Adapting means change in individual behaviour. |
| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | Strongly agree | history |
| 31406 Ms Floortje van Lierop | Strongly agree | Agree with this aim. We are currently incapable of dealing with the destruction caused with serious droughts, fires, storms etc, and this will get harder in the future when any given year might contain a number of those challenges. |
| 31410 Mr Scott Smithline | Strongly agree | Strongly support. The climate crisis is real, it's here & problems will escalate. Believe FDS is not addressing climate crisis adequately. |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | Strongly agree | We have no choice but to respond to any future plans with this in mind, if any council ignores this they have failed in their role to serve future generations. |
| | | |

| 31431 Katerina Seligman | Strongly agree | Climate change is upon us now and we need to be prepared for it worsening. |
|---|-------------------|---|
| 31439 Mr Bruce Gilkison | Strongly agree | See attached. However the FDS will not achieve it NZs carbon emissions are continuing to rise. We should be reducing carbon emissions 10 % year on year. When we read the FDS which is for the next 28 years up to 2050, we see many fundamental errors. |
| 31443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | Strongly agree | That should be our foremost goal - and clearly followed by creative solutions. |
| 31447 Dr David Jackson | Strongly agree | |
| 31452 Mr David Bartle | Strongly agree | This is a key strategic outcome |
| 31457 Mr J Santa Barbara | Strongly agree | We need a clearer understanding of what resilience for our region would be - hence the carrying capacity study suggested above. |
| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | Strongly agree | I strongly support this as the impacts of the climate crisis are already upon us, and are almost certain to escalate more extensively – in severity and breadth - than the FDS seems to address. If Outcome 8 is taken seriously, large parts of the FDS are counterproductive, worsening the need for such resilience. |
| 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon | Strongly agree | |
| 31485 Ms Robin Schiff | Strongly agree | The climate crisis is going to affect our region more in the coming years, and resilience is going to become more and more necessary. |
| 31491 Ms Annette Milligan | Strongly agree | I would go further and say that Nelson Tasman should have the aim of reducing climate increase to less than 1.5C. There is clearly a climate crisis and we should not only be resilient, we should be taking much more effective measures to reduce increases in average temperatures |
| 31492 Anton, Benni, Shalom, AJ Bank, Bonnin, Shalom Davis | Strongly agree | I strongly support this as the impacts of the climate crisis are already upon us, and are almost certain to escalate more extensively – in severity and breadth - than the FDS seems to address. If Outcome 8 is taken seriously, large parts of the FDS are counterproductive, worsening the need for such resilience. |
| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | Strongly agree | I agree with that outcome but I see no strategy for managed retreat in the face of sea level rise for places like Motueka. |
| | | |

| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless | Strongly agree | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31499 Ms Jane Fisher | Strongly agree | However, there is no point building resilience if, at the same time, you are creating the need for it by expanding urban sprawl, dependence on motor vehicles and allowing costly (in terms of carbon emissions) building projects. |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne | Strongly agree | Climate change inevitable and already happening |
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | Strongly agree | |
| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | Strongly agree | The impacts of the climate crisis are already upon us, and are almost certain to escalate both in severity and breadth. |
| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | Strongly agree | Strongly agree. It is commendable to see that TDC is addressing climate change through promoting compact urban forms that minimises the need for car travel and it promoting public and active transport modes. This is important as transport is a key contributor to greenhouse gases in the district. In addition, climate change will affect those living in low-lying coastal regions. Locating development away from hazard prone areas is a key component to creating resilient populations. |
| 31515 Geoffrey Vause | Strongly agree | Is the Pope Catholic? Why this question is even being asked is of concern, unless there are elements in the TDC who are climate deniers? |
| 31516 Mr Peter Lole | Strongly agree | We should be resilient but are we? Coastal inundation is the threat, so why are we proposing a new expensive library on the side of a tidal estuary? Are we relocating the region's main sewerage treatment from an island in the Waimea estuary? What happens when the airport is inundated? |
| 31520 Andrew Stirling | Strongly agree | |
| 31549 Mr Ian McComb | Strongly agree | Support this objective but more tough choices are going to be needed in the years ahead to achieve this. |
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | Strongly agree | We are hugely underestimating the cost of sea-level rise on our existing infrastructure. Sufficient money will never be available to make a timely retreat for all the things that will need to move. For example, if we were serious about this statement we wouldn't spend any more money on keeping Port Nelson in place, we would be re-designing it to accommodate sea level rise. |
| 31560 Ms Steph Watts | Strongly agree | |

| 31579 Jane Tate | Strongly agree | |
|------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31580 Jenny Long | Strongly agree | I strongly support this, because the effects of climate change are already being felt. We should have been making changes decades ago to transport and infrastructure planning to reduce emissions and mitigate the effects of climate change. Instead we've continued to lock ourselves into a car-dependent framework that wastes green space by allowing urban sprawl. We must start making bigger changes now, helping individuals and businesses reduce emissions by making low-emissions behaviours easier and highemissions behaviours more difficult. |
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins | Strongly agree | I strongly support this outcome as the impacts of the climate crisis are already upon us, and are almost certain to escalate more extensively in both severity and breadth than the FDS seems to address. If Outcome 8 is taken seriously, large parts of the FDS are counterproductive, worsening the need for such resilience. |
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | Strongly agree | However - it is not just adapting to effects of CC that is necessary, but also working to MITIGATE AND REVERSE climate change in our region. NZ does not perform well on a global scale, and even we in Nelson Tasman need to be pulling our socks up. This outcome should include carbon reduction strategies, not just dealing with sea level rise etc. |
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | Strongly agree | We need to plan and protect our urban and rural areas. We need local food production and native restoration. Development of rural areas does not support this principle |
| 31617 Ms steph jewell | Strongly agree | Of course, I don't want anyone to suffer. But we need to address climate change extremely quickly. |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | Strongly agree | Yes, sadly we have to plan for the effects of climate change. Shouldn't we therefore protect our rural and natural land as areas to mitigate future flood risks, fire risks, provide security of local food production, etc.? It seems that the proposed strategy is reducing these areas even more. Wouldn't that do the opposite and increase the overall risk to our assets and population? |
| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | Strongly agree | Support this outcome, but there is no strong evidence of this as more and more trees are being cut down for development. |
| 31631 Mrs Joy Shackleton | Strongly agree | |
| 31632 Ms Jacquetta Bell QSM | Strongly agree | We strongly support this outcome, but our preference is for Nelson to play its part in reducing carbon emmissions and helping to halt or at least slow the impacts of climate change (which are already evident). The FDS needs to include likely future flood control measures (such as the Tonkin and Taylor proposal for a retention dam on the Maitai), so people (and developers) are aware of and can consider these within |

| | | the time frame of the strategy. We note flooding risk in the Maitai catchment is exacerbated by Council's failure to encourage a shift in landuse away from plantation pine forestry. |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31633 Ms Jacquetta Bell QSM | Strongly agree | It would appear the NCC while talking the talk on climate change is failing to walk the walk. Building a library on a tidal river and allowing developers to propose low cost housing on the Kaka Valley flood plain are just two examples. |
| 31636 Joanna Santa Barbara | Strongly agree | File uploaded. |
| 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin | Strongly agree | WE have lots of bush and forestry that help to offset climate change impact |
| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | Strongly agree | |
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | Strongly agree | |
| 31667 barbara nicholas | Strongly agree | |
| 31683 Richard Davies | Strongly agree | I sincerely hope so but the extent of climate change depends on a planetary response (not just a local NZ one). |
| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | Strongly agree | It is a requirement of the National Policy Statement on Urban development, 2020 to do this. We also need to ensure our rural infrastructure is resilient to climate climate change, so this does need to cover the whole region. Storm surges and flood risks also need to be part of the consideration, which should be considered under climate change impacts anyway, but I wanted to mention them as damaging storms are becoming more frequent. |
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | Strongly agree | It is my view that sea level rise, flooding and adverse weather events are going to be significantly worse that predicted by TDC and this strategy should clearly identify areas that will be protected and those from which we will gradually retreat and indicate how these will be achieved |
| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | Strongly agree | We certainly need to be! Whether intensification driven by commercial metrics will achieve this seems unlikely unless there is stringent and open regulatory oversight. |
| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | Strongly agree | As well as ensuring that we reduce our impact on the environment we should build resilience in our community. Protecting our natural environment (farmland, wetlands etc.) and helping to create resilience in our communities through flood and fire mitigation for example, and ensuring any new developments |
| | | |

| | | do not have a negative impact, should be a focus. |
|------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | Strongly agree | We are not resilient currently. Stop allowing houses to be built in flood prone, and low-lying areas, We see this all day long currently. Water resiliency is a huge potential problem - sufficient reserves need to be allowed for food security. |
| 31703 Ms Paula Holden | Strongly agree | Climate change will have an enormous impact on Nelson. Any new building in our region needs to be climate savvy in it's design to limit the impacts of flooding and drought. Building on raised foundations, ensuring generous stormwater solutions, putting in water-tanks (to backup supply) & solar panels on new housing should be required. |
| 31704 Mr Paul Bucknall | Strongly agree | I like some of the suggestions in the FDS to mitigate the impacts of SLR. It's good that there is a plan forming to cope with the expected impacts of inundation on Motueka - but isn't it counter-intuitive to suggest intensification in low lying parts of Nelson City? Of course, reducing emissions is a better approach, if we can lead the whole world to doing that, but we do need a mixed response. We need to recognise SLR will happen and plan for it as well as doing everything we can to reduce emissions. |
| 31705 Mr Lindsay Wood | Strongly agree | We strongly support this as the impacts of the climate crisis are already upon us, and are almost certain to escalate more extensively – in severity and breadth - than the FDS seems to address. If Outcome 8 is taken seriously, large parts of the FDS are counterproductive, worsening the need for such resilience. |
| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | Strongly agree | I am endorsing the Nelson Tasman Climate Forum's view . Forum response: Strongly agree. Climate change Regarding adaptation to the unavoidable impacts of climate change, our submission is based on the requirement of the National Policy Statement on Urban development, 2020, which stipulates that New Zealand's urban environments are resilient to the current and future effects of climate change, and that the needs of future generations be included in the planning. Development means building structures for people to live and work in. We think that to be "good ancestors" we need to make structures last at least 100 years, and to place them where they are likely to be safe from sea level rise, flood and fire for at least that period. Sea level rise The FDS map on page 8 titled Strategic Constraints has hatched areas of coastal inundation risk located along the coast from Motueka, Mapua, Appleby, Richmond, Stoke, and Nelson city, Atawhai and Nelson North. Motueka, Nelson and Stoke also have river flood risk marked. This Future Strategy should take heed of that predictable risk from rising sea level and storm surges as |

| | | both councils have mapped the SLR in 0.5m intervals up to 2m, including the current 1% AEP level which will occur more frequently over time. The IPCC AR6 predicts 1.5m is expected to occur in about 100 years and so no intensification or new infrastructure should be occurring in these areas. Even buildings with raised floors will eventually have to be removed or demolished and this is a serious waste of future resources, and landfill space. The decisions on what to do in these areas subjected to SLR should wait until after the DAPP (Dynamic Adaptive Pathway Planning) process has been undertaken with landowners and vulnerable communities. Social resilience is particularly relevant to those communities affected by insurance retreat, and those unable to move from flood prone or unstable areas for financial reasons. They will require affordable and social housing, preferably together in a location where they can keep their neighbourly friendships, schools, and other services. This doesn't appear to have been considered in this FDS. We need to consider a cascade or compounding of risks rather than each happening in isolation, and flooding, storms can happen as well as droughts and fires. This region has the second lowest average income in NZ (FDS page 55) and these households will need support. We can't rely on property developers to build |
|------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31716 Mr Alan hart | Strongly agree | Rising sea levels will be a major issue for low lying areas, quite possibly beyond the areas identified in the proposal as susceptible to coastal inundation if the latest ICPP report warning of impacts the consequences of 1.5-2 degrees of warming come to pass. Some of the areas slated for intensification, particularly in Tahuanuni/stoke, Mapua and Motueka are in coastal areas that may be heavily affected. A resilient planning process should prioritise infrastructure and intensive housing away from the risks posed by predicated sea level rise as a precautionary approach. |
| 31726 Mr John Jackson | Strongly agree | What is the policy for access to services in the event of a natural disaster not necessarily to do with climate change? |
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | Strongly agree | We need to do this but I'm not sure this FDS provides for that. |
| 31762 Mr Mark Hewetson | Strongly agree | consider the extremist views to be grossly overstated |
| 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | Strongly agree | |
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | Strongly agree | Yes, this would include going all out to become carbon neutral, including using arable, low lying land for food crops rather than suburban sprawl. |
| | | |

| 31769 Ms Jo Gould 31771 Colleen Shaw | Strongly agree | Future development needs to take into account the future effects of climate change, particularly increased flooding events. Natural buffers for flood water retention need to be integrated into development plans. |
|---|----------------------|---|
| 31771 Colleen Shaw | | |
| | Strongly agree | I strongly agree we SHOULD be but the FDP does not provide scope for this resilience considering climate change or climate breakdown is already upon us. |
| 31835 Mr Ian Wishart | Strongly agree | |
| 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | Strongly disagree | Rocks Rd, access to Glenduan, Tahunanui beach area, the airport areas are all at immediate risk. The sewage treatment plant on the Boulder Bank needs re-siting |
| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | Strongly disagree | I strongly disagree that Nelson/Tasman is resilient to and can adapt to the likely future effects of climate change. Motueka in low lying and at particular risk of the effects of climate change. |
| 31174 Ms Alison Westerby | Strongly disagree | |
| 31216 Ms Judith Holmes | Strongly disagree | No evidence of that to date! We are encouraging greater use of cars traveling further to and from work and services and paving huge %'s of our productive land while still allowing building too close to sea level and too close to flood plains! Short-sightedness personified! |
| 31219 Mrs kate windle | Strongly disagree | It will, but it will shut down businesses and make individuals pay the price in doing so, the red tape that people need to get through has gone too far. |
| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | Strongly disagree | Strongly disagree because current council is considering building more residential housing in central Nelson when they should instead be considering (and spending on) climate mitigation for current buildings and roads- e.g. flooding, high winds. |
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | Strongly disagree | No effort has been forthcoming to build up flood defences and money is being spent on less important projects such as a new library when existing car parks and land areas are even now flooded at king tides. Make the town safe and then build. |
| 31278 Wendy Ross | Strongly disagree | How can it adapt to a future that is so uncertain. And unknown at this point in time. There is a lot of land around Nelson and Tasman away from the inner city that could and would better serve the people - and wouldn't be as uncertain to have a future with flooding etc. |
| 31287 Ms Suzanne Bateup | Strongly disagree | This is a huge issue - we are not doing enough to address climate change. We need to act to prevents climate change a lot faster, including improving public and transport options |
| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | Strongly disagree | Resilient it ain't. Our society, health, mental health, economy, infrastructure, ecology and wellbeing are already collapsing. Only a very resilient consultant could come up with 'Nelson Tasman is resilient'. Have they met |

| | | any poor people lately? Cancer victims or suicide's loved ones? |
|----------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31298 Mr Duncan Macnab | Strongly disagree | our main arterial road goes around Rocks road and is subject to flooding, sea level rise and cliff erosion. This needs to be put onto the inland route over Bishopdale hill |
| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | Strongly disagree | I feel that nowhere is resilient to the ever increasing number and frequency of the adverse weather conditions. Our world locally, nationally and internationally has and is experiencing extreme weather events causing devastation to the land, people and wildlife. We as a community can be realistic and be prepared to react and to assist each other. |
| 31325 Dr Ann Briggs | Strongly disagree | No assertive planning for fossil fuel reduction by encouraging and enabling alternatives; no discernible planning to reduce / relocate properties at risk from tidal encroachment; poor regulation of forestry to reduce clear-felling (which accelerates soil erosion and down-slope flooding); no regulation on developers to address climate issues - eg in their choice of building materials and methods or the fuel needs of the building (heating / cooling / power source) and its occupiers; no apparent understanding of the effects of changes in land use - eg the effects of scrub clearance and tree felling, of building on greenfield sites, of water run-off replacing water retention etc. |
| 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | Strongly disagree | Nelson-Tasman has no idea what's going to be needed to adapt to the future effects of climate change. Education and a series of reality checks are required. If this policy is adopted, if we believe we're doing it, the policy will undo itself, by creating more need than ever for resilience. |
| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | Strongly disagree | Stupid question. You plan to build high rise in Tahunanui up to 6 stories and coastal sea rise is going to happen and you say you have consider it?? |
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | Strongly disagree | The FDS focus on increasing housing stocks of low density, high land use basis do not help to create a region able to deal with likely climate change effects. The current fossil fuels shortages / price impacts indicate the need to change a key part of our infrastructure plan regarding personal transport. |
| 31483 Debbie Hampson | Strongly disagree | Tahunanui has been identified as being subject to liquefaction in the case of an earthquake, & also to rising sea levels with climate change, so why would the council now deem it safe to build up to 6 storey high apartments!?. |
| 31484 Mr Gavin Brent Cook | Strongly disagree | |
| 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | Strongly | I think it is naive to think that we can handle the effects of future climate change. |
| | | |

| | disagree | |
|---------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | Strongly disagree | Outcome 8 does not provide for resilience to the future effects of climate change. Quite the opposite - this has been written to support the overall strategy which will add to global warming given its reliance of economic growth, urban sprawl and networks of roads with more and more vehicles. |
| 31554 Wendy Barker | Strongly disagree | What makes us different from the rest of the world? I don't see why we are more resilient than anywhere else. We already have a far too high rate of car ownership per family, far too many cars on the road, pollution from woodburners, very limited public transport, inadequate provision for safe cycling and more. All due to lack of appropriate Council action, big picture thinking, and future planning. |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | Strongly disagree | I believe we are slow to recognize what adaptions will be required. |
| 31570 Ms Annabel Norman | Strongly disagree | |
| 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham | Strongly disagree | Continued expansion using green field sites in contrary to the stated aims of Nelson Tasman |
| 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | Strongly disagree | the present plan has so much in it that will reduce resilience rather than enhance it. |
| 31717 Mr Frank Ryan | Strongly disagree | Is there confirmed science before putting ratepayers money into this or is it based on modelling like the covid 19 cases and deaths that didn't appear. You will always find consultants etc that will keep themselves in a job. |
| 31736 Ms Carol Curtis | Strongly disagree | this is still too vague as a Councils climate conscious awareness, but in regards to the proposed plans to open up more "greenfield" developments based on projected population growths, does not seem to be offering the first mechanism to help with climate change, ie: leave existing land alone, and put the resources into facilitating solutions to make existing areas " resilient to and able to adapt to" the likely future effects of climate change. |
| 31747 Mr (Tom) Neil BRETT | Strongly disagree | Nelson Tasman is not resilient as evidenced by the poor decision making in allowing developments to proceed in known areas of inundation. Eg. Beach Road high rise and development on the northern side of Lower queen Street. |
| 31763 Susan Rogers | Strongly disagree | Survey is flawed from the beginning. You need to redesign this entire line of questioning. It leads only to answers desired by the maker of the survey. |
| | | |

09 Please indicate whether you support or do not support Outcome 9: Nelson Tasman is resilient to the risk of natural hazards. Please explain your choice:

| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | Agree | |
|---------------------------|-------|---|
| 31227 Ms Lee Eliott | Agree | |
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | Agree | When you say "outcome" do you mean this is an outcome we should aim for? If so, who would disagree with such a statement? |
| 31261 Mr John Weston | Agree | As long as we have learned the lessons of Pigeon Valley, Gita, and the developing degrees of intensive weather globally. |
| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | Agree | But thought will need to be given to where it is better to retreat rather than protect. |
| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | Agree | |
| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | Agree | |
| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | Agree | |
| 31316 John Heslop | Agree | As long as it is a practical approach. |
| 31318 Mrs Isobel Mosley | Agree | |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | Agree | |
| 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman | Agree | |
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | Agree | |
| 31347 Ms Paula Baldwin | Agree | There's certainly been a heap of work over the last 5-10 years on the effects of natural hazards, community consultation, imagined restrictions applied to existing land, and work completed to protect areas. |
| 31350 Ms Janet Tavener | Agree | |
| 31356 Stephen Williams | Agree | As long as this involves mitigation through biological systems and not mechanical systems. Biological systems maintain themselves and improve over time. A mechanical system must be maintained at great expense and is constantly degrading. e.g. By storing water in the landscape with ponds and growing native bush around them we can provide habitat and slow surface runoff. Trees can be used to stabilise banks and simultaneously sequester carbon. |
| 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | Agree | Over development of forestry leaves us vulnerable to the impact of fire, as witnessed over the past 2-3 years. Sea level rise will impact on many coastal communities. |
| | | |

| 31384 Mr Jace Hobbs | Agree | This is a ridiculous question |
|-----------------------------|-------|---|
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin | Agree | Great goal. |
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | Agree | |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | Agree | |
| 31422 Mrs Marga Martens | Agree | |
| 31423 Mr Roger Frost | Agree | As with climate change we must be careful not to underestimate to suit our budgets. |
| 31431 Katerina Seligman | Agree | |
| 31449 Mr John Chisholm | Agree | |
| 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon | Agree | |
| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | Agree | It's not far from fault lines and close to the sea, so there will be trouble. A risk mitigation strategy makes sense. |
| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | Agree | I agree but feel that this is a difficult risk to avoid in terms of earthquakes as we have many fault lines with some being in areas that are already densely populated. Any new housing / commercial buildings must then be designed to withstand these natural hazards. |
| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | Agree | I agree with the outcome objective but I cannot see anything in the strategy to achieve this. |
| 31502 Ms Caroline Jones | Agree | |
| 31505 Cheryl Heten | Agree | |
| 31508 Mr Roger Barlow | Agree | Please keep housing and forestry separated. We have recently seen the result of not doing this. |
| 31516 Mr Peter Lole | Agree | As above. |
| 31529 Mr Steven King-Turner | Agree | |
| 31537 Mrs Juliana Trolove | Agree | |
| 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery | Agree | As above |
| 31551 Mrs Jo Kitchen | Agree | |
| 31560 Ms Steph Watts | Agree | |
| 31562 Grant palliser | Agree | BUT I have questions about recent developments that are clearly at risk if future flooding and have high ground water levelsie the light industrial area opposite Berryfields. |

| 31579 Jane Tate | Agree | |
|-------------------------------|-----------|--|
| 31580 Jenny Long | Agree | I support this, as natural hazards such as fires and flooding are likely to become more common as the effects of climate ramp up. |
| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | Agree | However I think it flooding down stream in Maitai river has had a few very close calls over the last few years and I do believe that urban development within the valley will increase the risk |
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | Agree | Absolutely. As on Q7, please reflect on what the strategy proposes for urban areas (not just use this for 'how to choose a subdivision location' strategy) |
| 31608 Robbie Thomson | Agree | So far, we have been lucky. No major earthquakes, some flooding events, fires. I suspect the larger events are yet to come and may be cumulative, ie one event predisposing us to others. |
| 31614 Mr mark Morris | Agree | |
| 31620 Mr Paul Baigent | Agree | |
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | Agree | |
| 31628 Mr Daniel Levy | Agree | It is of vital importance to recognize the potential of more frequent and more severe weather events resulting from the deteriorating Climate Change situation. Hence no developments that have the potential to aggravate the flood risk in existing urban areas should be permitted. This too should exclud the proposed Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats areas from being included as future potential greenfield development areas. |
| 31641 Mr Stephen (Steve) Hayd | den Agree | |
| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | Agree | |
| 31644 Murray Poulter | Agree | This means not allowing development in areas that are and will become hazard prone. Hazards occur when people get in the way of natural events. |
| 31656 Mr brad malcolm | Agree | |
| 31662 Joe Roberts | Agree | Support, with a risk-based assessment being used to balance against the conservative modelling of hazards. |
| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | Agree | |
| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | Agree | |
| 31695 Christine Horner | Agree | |
| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | Agree | |

| 31721 Ms Jill Cullen | Agree | |
|--|----------|--|
| 31722 Trevor Chang | Agree | NCC public meeting 3-4 years ago suggested that much of the city is subject to tidal inundation as is the western side of Tahunanui/Annesbrook from south of KFC to Nelson airport. Tasman is less at risk. |
| 31744 Mrs Lorna CRANE | Agree | We are all aware of the potential for disruption due to climatic events. In the case of flooding it makes sense not to allow development in areas known to have flooded in the past and to consider the potential for floods to be higher in the future. In terms of earthquakes, we consider that construction materials that withstand seismic activity be recommended and that masonry and brick buildings be discouraged in Murchison. |
| 31751 Hazel Pearson | Agree | Only if prevention of climate change is given equal or greater priority. |
| 31761 Karen Steadman | Agree | we will deal with whatever happens. |
| 31765 Mrs Lorna Ivy Cooper | Agree | I believe people can adapt to the conditions. |
| 31771 Colleen Shaw | Agree | I am not sure whether enough safeguards have been introduced to the FDP for natural hazards that have and will be occurring with more frequency. |
| 31774 Mrs Jane Sutherland | Agree | |
| 31777 Mr David Lucas | Agree | |
| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | Agree | See Q8, effects of natural hazards. |
| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | Agree | Please see attached - determined Agree from submission: A: Yes of course, who would be against this. However as with our ideas of using immediately and easily movable Tiny Houses on flood prone or liquefiable land, of floating townhouses, there are more ways than you suggest to do this. |
| 31809 Mr Andrew Spittal | Agree | Planning for natural hazards and climate change go hand in hand. The subject site not only provides for intensification of elevated land zoned for residential growth, but also provides for residential growth on the valley floor that would be developed above the flooding risks. |
| 31830 K.M. McDonald | Agree | More concrete, bitumen, roads, buildings make an area less resilient to natural hazards. |
| 31114 Ms Jill Rogers | Disagree | |
| 31122 Mr Johan Thomas Wahlgren | Disagree | We are not, just look at the flood zones and where new developments are suggested?! i.e Kaka Valley and Orchard flats. |

| Future Development Strategy 2022-2052 as this development would have a strong negative impact storm water management during the increasing number and intensification of major rain events. 31215 Mr Glen Parsons Disagree Takaka Hill falls with heavy rain and takes tears to fix. Airport suspect to possible liquifaction in ever earthquake. Disagree I'm not so sure. Personally, I'd rather take steps to reduce the risk of natural hazards than become resilient to their happening. People who take steps to reduce risk are often also resilient, but they a activists rather than waiting for the next natural hazard or climate change event to occur. Disagree Do natural hazards include earthqwuakes as well as tropical cyclones? If yes- then no we are not resilient. As an objective outcome, I would agree. However, as a statement, it is obviously untrue. Nelson is proposing to intensify development at the lower end of Trafalgar St in exactly the area inundated by tsunami in the early sixties which pushed seawater up the Maitai as far as the Nile St Bridge. There is long coastline on Lower Queen St with a school, residential, commercial area ridiculously exposed to tsunami. Resilience has not been a priority to date. The councils leave themselves open to paying compensation for allowing these developments. Councils still have no contract with developers that if there is a future problem with resilience the | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|----------|--|
| 31171 Ms Sallie Griffiths Disagree There will be more floods over time, we need more trees planted alongside rivers etc 31173 Mr Roderick Watson Disagree 31189 Ms Marlene Alach Disagree Plenty of people still buying coastal properties, sea walls still have to be paid for. 31195 Mr Serge Philippe Crottaz Disagree 1100 new houses in the Greenfield areas N-106 and N-032 should be removed from the draft of the Future Development Strategy 2022-2052 as this development would have a strong negative impact storm water management during the increasing number and intensification of major rain events. 31215 Mr Glen Parsons Disagree Takaka Hill falls with heavy rain and takes tears to fix. Airport suspect to possible liquifaction in even earthquake. 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows Disagree I'm not so sure. Personally, I'd rather take steps to reduce the risk of natural hazards than become resilient to their happening. People who take steps to reduce risk are often also resilient, but they a activists rather than waiting for the next natural hazard or climate change event to occur. 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan Disagree Disagree As an objective outcome, I would agree. However, as a statement, it is obviously untrue. Nelson is proposing to intensify development at the lower end of Trafalgar St in exactly the area inundated by tsunami in the early sixties which pushed seawater up the Maitai as far as the Nile St Bridge. There I long coastline on Lower Queen St with a school, residential, commercial area ridiculously exposed tsunami. Resilience has not been a priority to date. The councils leave themselves open to paying compensation for allowing these developments. Councils still have no contract with developers that if there is a future problem with resilience the developer must foot the bill. ChCh has found this the only answer to commercial pressure to development at the object of the problem with resilience the developer must foot the bill. ChCh has found this the only answer to commercial pressure to development at the object of | 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | Disagree | |
| 31173 Mr Roderick Watson Disagree Disagree Plenty of people still buying coastal properties, sea walls still have to be paid for. 31195 Mr Serge Philippe Crottaz Disagree Plenty of people still buying coastal properties, sea walls still have to be paid for. 31195 Mr Serge Philippe Crottaz Disagree 1100 new houses in the Greenfield areas N-106 and N-032 should be removed from the draft of the Future Development Strategy 2022-2052 as this development would have a strong negative impact storm water management during the increasing number and intensification of major rain events. 31215 Mr Glen Parsons Disagree Takaka Hill falls with heavy rain and takes tears to fix. Airport suspect to possible liquifaction in ever earthquake. 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows Disagree I'm not so sure. Personally, I'd rather take steps to reduce the risk of natural hazards than become resilient to their happening. People who take steps to reduce the risk of natural hazards than become resilient to their happening. People who take steps to reduce risk are often also resilient, but they a activists rather than waiting for the next natural hazard or climate change event to occur. 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards Disagree Do natural hazards include earthqwuakes as well as tropical cyclones? If yes- then no we are not resilient. Which was activists rather than waiting for the next natural hazard or climate change event to occur. 31262 Mr Martin John Shand Disagree As an objective outcome, I would agree. However, as a statement, it is obviously untrue. Nelson is proposing to intensify development at the lower end of Trafalgar St in exactly the area inundated by tsunami in the early sixties which pushed seawater up the Maital as far as the Nile St Bridge. There is one contract with developers that if there is a future problem with resilience the developer must foot the bill. ChCh has found this the only answer to commercial pressure to development succiously succiously succiously exposed to tsunami. Resilience have no contract with developers that if th | 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert | Disagree | We are coastal, with slip prone hills and a city built on a flood plan |
| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach Disagree | 31171 Ms Sallie Griffiths | Disagree | There will be more floods over time, we need more trees planted alongside rivers etc |
| 31192 Ms Rebecca Patchett Disagree Plenty of people still buying coastal properties, sea walls still have to be paid for. 1195 Mr Serge Philippe Crottaz Disagree 1100 new houses in the Greenfield areas N-106 and N-032 should be removed from the draft of the Future Development Strategy 2022-2052 as this development would have a strong negative impact storm water management during the increasing number and intensification of major rain events. 31215 Mr Glen Parsons Disagree Takaka Hill falls with heavy rain and takes tears to fix. Airport suspect to possible liquifaction in event earthquake. 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows Disagree I'm not so sure. Personally, I'd rather take steps to reduce the risk of natural hazards than become resilient to their happening. People who take steps to reduce risk are often also resilient, but they a activists rather than waiting for the next natural hazard or climate change event to occur. 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan Disagree Do natural hazards include earthqwakes as well as tropical cyclones? If yes- then no we are not resilient of the major that the lower end of Trafalgar St in exactly the area inundated by tsunami in the early sixties which pushed seawater up the Maitai as far as the Nile St Bridge. There is long coastline on Lower Queen St with a school, residential, commercial area ridiculously exposed to tsunami. Resilience has not been a priority to date. The councils leave themselves open to paying compensation for allowing these developments. Councils still have no contract with developers that if there is a future problem with resilience the developer must foot the bill. ChCh has found this the only answer to commercial pressure to development at the lower end of the problem with resilience the developers that if there is a future problem with resilience the developer must foot the bill. ChCh has found this the only answer to commercial pressure to development at the lower end of the problem with resilience the developer must foot the bill. ChCh has found this the only answer t | 31173 Mr Roderick Watson | Disagree | |
| 31195 Mr Serge Philippe Crottaz Disagree 1100 new houses in the Greenfield areas N-106 and N-032 should be removed from the draft of the Future Development Strategy 2022-2052 as this development would have a strong negative impact storm water management during the increasing number and intensification of major rain events. 31215 Mr Glen Parsons Disagree Takaka Hill falls with heavy rain and takes tears to fix. Airport suspect to possible liquifaction in ever earthquake. 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows Disagree I'm not so sure. Personally, I'd rather take steps to reduce the risk of natural hazards than become resilient to their happening. People who take steps to reduce risk are often also resilient, but they a activists rather than waiting for the next natural hazard or climate change event to occur. 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards Disagree Do natural hazards include earthqwuakes as well as tropical cyclones? If yes- then no we are not resilient. What is a stropical cyclones? If yes- then no we are not resilient of the resilient in the early sixties which pushed seawater up the Maitai as far as the Nile St Bridge. There is long coastline on Lower Queen St with a school, residential, commercial area ridiculously exposed to tsunami in the early sixties which pushed seawater up the Maitai as far as the Nile St Bridge. There is long coastline on Lower Queen St with a school, residential, commercial area ridiculously exposed to tsunami. Resilience has not been a priority to date. The councils leave themselves open to paying compensation for allowing these developments. Councils still have no contract with developers that if there is a future problem with resilience the developer must foot the bill. ChCh has found this the only answer to commercial pressure to developments. | 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | Disagree | |
| Future Development Strategy 2022-2052 as this development would have a strong negative impact storm water management during the increasing number and intensification of major rain events. 31215 Mr Glen Parsons Disagree Takaka Hill falls with heavy rain and takes tears to fix. Airport suspect to possible liquifaction in ever earthquake. 11230 Ms Jenny Meadows Disagree I'm not so sure. Personally, I'd rather take steps to reduce the risk of natural hazards than become resilient to their happening. People who take steps to reduce risk are often also resilient, but they a activists rather than waiting for the next natural hazard or climate change event to occur. 11231 Mrs Jean Edwards Disagree Do natural hazards include earthqwuakes as well as tropical cyclones? If yes- then no we are not resilient Martin John Shand Disagree As an objective outcome, I would agree. However, as a statement, it is obviously untrue. Nelson is proposing to intensify development at the lower end of Trafalgar St in exactly the area inundated by tsunami in the early sixties which pushed seawater up the Maitai as far as the Nile St Bridge. There is long coastline on Lower Queen St with a school, residential, commercial area ridiculously exposed tsunami. Resilience has not been a priority to date. The councils leave themselves open to paying compensation for allowing these developments. Councils still have no contract with developers that if there is a future problem with resilience the developer must foot the bill. ChCh has found this the only answer to commercial pressure to develounsuitable, but conveniently flat areas. | 31192 Ms Rebecca Patchett | Disagree | Plenty of people still buying coastal properties, sea walls still have to be paid for. |
| earthquake. 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows Disagree I'm not so sure. Personally, I'd rather take steps to reduce the risk of natural hazards than become resilient to their happening. People who take steps to reduce risk are often also resilient, but they a activists rather than waiting for the next natural hazard or climate change event to occur. 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards Disagree Do natural hazards include earthqwuakes as well as tropical cyclones? If yes- then no we are not resilient, but they a activists rather than waiting for the next natural hazard or climate change event to occur. 31262 Mr Martin John Shand Disagree As an objective outcome, I would agree. However, as a statement, it is obviously untrue. Nelson is proposing to intensify development at the lower end of Trafalgar St in exactly the area inundated by tsunami in the early sixties which pushed seawater up the Maitai as far as the Nile St Bridge. There is long coastline on Lower Queen St with a school, residential, commercial area ridiculously exposed to tsunami. Resilience has not been a priority to date. The councils leave themselves open to paying compensation for allowing these developments. Councils still have no contract with developers that if there is a future problem with resilience the developer must foot the bill. ChCh has found this the only answer to commercial pressure to developments. | 31195 Mr Serge Philippe Crottaz | Disagree | 1100 new houses in the Greenfield areas N-106 and N-032 should be removed from the draft of the Future Development Strategy 2022-2052 as this development would have a strong negative impact on storm water management during the increasing number and intensification of major rain events. |
| resilient to their happening. People who take steps to reduce risk are often also resilient, but they a activists rather than waiting for the next natural hazard or climate change event to occur. 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards Disagree Do natural hazards include earthqwuakes as well as tropical cyclones? If yes- then no we are not resultant and the standard of the next natural hazard or climate change event to occur. Disagree 31263 Mr Martin John Shand Disagree As an objective outcome, I would agree. However, as a statement, it is obviously untrue. Nelson is proposing to intensify development at the lower end of Trafalgar St in exactly the area inundated by tsunami in the early sixties which pushed seawater up the Maitai as far as the Nile St Bridge. There long coastline on Lower Queen St with a school, residential, commercial area ridiculously exposed to tsunami. Resilience has not been a priority to date. The councils leave themselves open to paying compensation for allowing these developments. Councils still have no contract with developers that if there is a future problem with resilience the developer must foot the bill. ChCh has found this the only answer to commercial pressure to developments. Disagree Disag | 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | Disagree | Takaka Hill falls with heavy rain and takes tears to fix. Airport suspect to possible liquifaction in event of earthquake. |
| 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman Disagree As an objective outcome, I would agree. However, as a statement, it is obviously untrue. Nelson is proposing to intensify development at the lower end of Trafalgar St in exactly the area inundated by tsunami in the early sixties which pushed seawater up the Maitai as far as the Nile St Bridge. There is long coastline on Lower Queen St with a school, residential, commercial area ridiculously exposed to tsunami. Resilience has not been a priority to date. The councils leave themselves open to paying compensation for allowing these developments. Councils still have no contract with developers that if there is a future problem with resilience the developer must foot the bill. ChCh has found this the only answer to commercial pressure to developments. Disagree Disagree | 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | Disagree | resilient to their happening. People who take steps to reduce risk are often also resilient, but they are |
| 31262 Mr Martin John Shand Disagree As an objective outcome, I would agree. However, as a statement, it is obviously untrue. Nelson is proposing to intensify development at the lower end of Trafalgar St in exactly the area inundated by tsunami in the early sixties which pushed seawater up the Maitai as far as the Nile St Bridge. There is long coastline on Lower Queen St with a school, residential, commercial area ridiculously exposed to tsunami. Resilience has not been a priority to date. The councils leave themselves open to paying compensation for allowing these developments. Councils still have no contract with developers that if there is a future problem with resilience the developer must foot the bill. ChCh has found this the only answer to commercial pressure to developments. Bisagree Disagree Disagree | 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | Disagree | Do natural hazards include earthqwuakes as well as tropical cyclones? If yes- then no we are not resilient |
| As an objective outcome, I would agree. However, as a statement, it is obviously untrue. Nelson is proposing to intensify development at the lower end of Trafalgar St in exactly the area inundated by tsunami in the early sixties which pushed seawater up the Maitai as far as the Nile St Bridge. There is long coastline on Lower Queen St with a school, residential, commercial area ridiculously exposed to tsunami. Resilience has not been a priority to date. The councils leave themselves open to paying compensation for allowing these developments. Councils still have no contract with developers that if there is a future problem with resilience the developer must foot the bill. ChCh has found this the only answer to commercial pressure to developments. Bisagree Disagree | 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan | Disagree | |
| proposing to intensify development at the lower end of Trafalgar St in exactly the area inundated by tsunami in the early sixties which pushed seawater up the Maitai as far as the Nile St Bridge. There is long coastline on Lower Queen St with a school, residential, commercial area ridiculously exposed to tsunami. Resilience has not been a priority to date. The councils leave themselves open to paying compensation for allowing these developments. Councils still have no contract with developers that if there is a future problem with resilience the developer must foot the bill. ChCh has found this the only answer to commercial pressure to developments. 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley Disagree | 31262 Mr Martin John Shand | Disagree | |
| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley Disagree | 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman | Disagree | proposing to intensify development at the lower end of Trafalgar St in exactly the area inundated by two tsunami in the early sixties which pushed seawater up the Maitai as far as the Nile St Bridge. There is a long coastline on Lower Queen St with a school, residential, commercial area ridiculously exposed to tsunami. Resilience has not been a priority to date. The councils leave themselves open to paying compensation for allowing these developments. Councils still have no contract with developers that if there is a future problem with resilience the developer must foot the bill. ChCh has found this the only answer to commercial pressure to develop |
| • | 31273 Ms Flizaheth Dooley | Disagree | unsultable, but conveniently hat areas. |
| 5.545. Communication of the state of the sta | · | | Several cyclones and droughts have proven our area is not as resilient as some would like to believe |
| 31286 Mr David Short Disagree Similarly I do not think that Nelson Tasman is resilient to the risk of natural hazards at a Council leve | | | Similarly I do not think that Nelson Tasman is resilient to the risk of natural hazards at a Council level. |

| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | Disagree | Much of the district is coastal and therefor at rick of cyclones, tidal surges etc. |
|---------------------------------------|----------|--|
| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | Disagree | Well I spend time in my partner's house by Ruby Bay beach. So, no, we take the risk, big risk. What's stopping another rain storm on Takaka Hill, bigger next time? The big earthquake, is your dam resilient? What's stopping weather events far outside our experience? No, and with such a long and glorious coastline, Nelson Tasman is right in the firing line. And over-indebted to boot. Resilience is a misnomer too, but this applies everywhere. Our world has had enough of our burning everything for energy, and travelling long distances on a whim. Really, we should close the petrol stations, ports and airports to the public, except for essential services, this is what we SHOULD do. |
| 31358 George Harrison | Disagree | |
| 31360 Ms Thuy Tran | Disagree | See above comment |
| 31364 Mrs Christine Tuffnell | Disagree | Nelson is on a fault line - which has resulted in significant earthquakes previously. Areas of CBC in Nelson are subject to flooding, low lying - and this will get worse with sea rising Erosion and unstable land are features of Nelson hills - with already significant housing State Highway 6 around Rocks Road is high risk for significant destruction from hillside collapse and globa warming. |
| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | Disagree | eg Takaka Hill |
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | Disagree | Nelson Tasman is not resilient to natural hazards. When there is heavy rainfalls, areas flood. When there is a spring tide, part of the downtown floods. There are many steep hillsides in the Nelson area which can be subject to landslides. We need to plan to be more resilient to natural hazards. |
| 31403 Mr Richard Deck | Disagree | Pretty clear this area is not. Takaka Hill slips is an example. Infrastructure is not as well maintained as it should be. Take a look at the drains beside our roading network, they are not cleaned on a regular basis. |
| 31415 Mrs Zanahe Ruth Galloway | Disagree | Nelson Tasman will be resilient with the right decisions considering Climate change Emergency measures instead of business as usual, too much money into population growth with the hope of tourism, agriculture, fisheries, forestry intensifying instead of being done in a ecological environmental respect! |
| 31430 Muriel Moran | Disagree | River stop banks failing, sea level rise, climate change are all risks we are facing. The intensified weather events being experienced now are not something we can guarantee to be resilient from. They will continue to intensify unless we stop the rise of global warming. |
| 31434 Mrs cushla Moorhead | Disagree | |
| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn Ball | Disagree | |
| 31441 Mr Chris Head | Disagree | Given that large areas of housing currently exists in areas known to be at risk of coastal inundation and |
| | | |

| | | slope instability (including new development west of Richmond), I'm not sure about the level of resilience here. |
|-------------------------------|----------|--|
| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | Disagree | AS above. |
| 31481 Mrs Lucy Harrhy | Disagree | Please see above. |
| 31484 Mr Gavin Brent Cook | Disagree | |
| 31488 Annette Starink | Disagree | Too many areas exposed to sea levels rising Hill side slips within housing areas |
| 31533 Wendy Trevett | Disagree | Natural hazards are increasing all the time. |
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | Disagree | We have built our most expensive infrastructure along fault lines and instable coastline. We continue to build houses in low-lying areas where a moderate sea-level rise of 0.5M will ruin such developments. We continue to spend money for a failed water damn that will likely not last a serious earthquake, leaving tens of thousands of homes and irrigators without water. How can we as ratepayers take such a statement seriously? Of COURSE it is an ideal to which we should aspire. We just lack credibility at the moment. |
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | Disagree | inundation and liquifaction have already been identified - Wakatu Sq and lower areas around Trafalgar street are subject to tidal events |
| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | Disagree | As above. Nobody cananother pipe dream |
| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | Disagree | We have hardly been tested on this |
| 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz | Disagree | |
| 31622 Peter Butler | Disagree | Nelson is on the contrary vulnerable to natural hazards as has been experienced on the Tahuna slump |
| 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | Disagree | |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | Disagree | |
| 31637 Ms Frances Kemble Welch | Disagree | |
| 31643 Inge Koevoet | Disagree | |
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | Disagree | Please see other fields |
| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | Disagree | As mentioned above, flooding, slips, wild fires (droughts causing this), storm surges, etc are a major threa to our city. |
| | | |

| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | Disagree | No where is completely safe. The dangers lie in places near the ocean that are tsunami prone, and where housing has been built on swampy land. Housing continues to be build around the low coastal areas like Richmond which is worrying, and other unstable places in Nelson. In terms of other natural hazards, it would be similar to other locations in New Zealand as alot of them are our of our control, and hard to have protection against. |
|---------------------------|---------------|---|
| 31657 Mrs Andrea Hay | Disagree | The NCC is not adequately implementing the recommendations of Climate Change experts to inform decision making around development. |
| 31673 Mike Drake | Disagree | Every significant rain event is causing slips. The roads take many weeks to be fixed, many are just bandaid. Some of the temporary fixes will blow apart with the next major weather event. |
| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | Disagree | The Region lacks resiliency to extreme weather events (floods, storms) with both communities and road infrastructure vunerable. |
| | | No detailed has been made information is available relating to earthquake or tsunami risk. |
| 31688 Gerard McDonnell | Disagree | The region is surrounded by risk - more extreme weather (slips on hills), sea level rise, fault lines. Infrastructure generally needs to be upgraded across the board |
| 31747 Mr (Tom) Neil BRETT | Disagree | Similar to Q8. |
| 31759 Mr Damian Campbell | Disagree | |
| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | Don't know | |
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | Don't know | |
| 31248 Mr Will Bosnich | Don't know | |
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | Don't know | New builds and renovations in areas close to known fault lines and tsunami zones are still being approved so I'm unsure if the ideal above reflects the current reality. |
| 31355 Mr Barney Hoskins | Don't know | |
| 31410 Mr Scott Smithline | Don't know | We'll see. I feel we should be far more pro-active |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas | Don't | |

| 31473 Mr Andrew Downs | Don't | |
|----------------------------|-------|--|
| | know | |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31598 Mrs Nicola Worsfold | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31606 Mr Trent Shepard | Don't | |
| · | know | |
| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | Don't | |
| · | know | |
| 31717 Mr Frank Ryan | Don't | |
| • | know | |
| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | Don't | Not answering any of these leading questions |
| | know | |
| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | Don't | We (the planet) is experiencing larger and more common natural hazards so difficult to know the future. |
| | know | |
| 31784 Ms Teresa James | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | N/A | Nelson-Tasman is not risilient to the risk of natural hazards. The newspaper puts people on the front page complaining that the tide is eroding their properties, and demanding that something, somebody fix the |
| | | problem. We are not resilient. We rebuilt the Boatshed after the last storm. It will be find, until the next one blows in. |
| 24262 Mar Charrer C | N1/2 | |
| 31363 Mr Steve Cross | N/A | I reject the premise of this question |

| 31460 Kris Woods | N/A | Left to be determined. Thinking it is possible, and it actually occurring in a way that is positive and sustainable are 2 very different things |
|---|--------------------|---|
| 31487 Ms Heather Spence | N/A | How can you ask that question when TDC allowed housing development in that flat area near Waimea Inlet? If your response is (as I have heard) 'it was a developer's decision', why was that so??? |
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | N/A | I have noticed that most proposed new greenfield areas have stayed away from areas at risk of flooding (including inundation due to sea level rise), fault lines and slip prone areas. However I'm missing a strategy for how our future urban areas will be resilient and future proof. GNS identified a few years ago that Aporo Road approx. halfway between Williams and Horton Roads would be subject to evacuation if a 3m high tsunami was to occur. As sea level rises this risk, moves the point closer to Horton Road and beyond. So why does the Council even consider building a large new settlement in an area that quite possibly would be subject to a tsunami inundation? |
| 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | N/A | I don't think any place in the world today is resilient to the risk of (human caused) natural hazards. |
| 31572 Mr David Todd | N/A | Is it? |
| 31623 Ms Lucy Charlesworth | N/A | I am wary of answering this question as I cannot be sure of how my answer will be interpreted. So I will state - I do not agree with developing green spaces. These spaces need to be reserved and protected to allow for sustainable biodiversity and for future generations. Intensification within Nelson CBD needs to be a priority. I do not agrees with building on Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. I do not agree with housing development on green fields. There is a climate emergency. Remove these areas from the FDS. |
| 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | Neutral | Same as above for number 8. Add in Coastal hazards of inundation from storms and future frequency of these |
| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | Neutral | |
| 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS | Neutral | WE DO NOT KNOW THE EXTENT OF CLIMATE CHALLENGES THAT ARE COMING SO IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO ANSWER THE QUESTION . SAFE TO SAY WE HAVE HAD A FEW TASTES OF WHAT COULD COME ON AN EVER INCREASING BASIS AND GIVEN THE MORPHOLOGY OF THE REGION ESPECIALLY COASTAL AREAS WE ARE IN A HIGH RISK AREA. |
| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | Neutral | |
| 31129 Mrs Gaynor Brooks | Neutral | |
| | | |
| 31186 Mr Gary Scott | Neutral | As I said, you can't fight nature. But you can plan for any event like a flood, or earthquake. |
| 31186 Mr Gary Scott 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | Neutral Neutral | |

| | | sufficiently mitigated through the RMA & BC Processes. |
|---|---------|--|
| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | Neutral | |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | Neutral | |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | Neutral | unrealistic pipe dream. Let market forces do the adaption. Note on titles of potentially flooded houses. Price will be low but some people happy t accept risk. |
| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | Neutral | |
| 31285 Dr Hamish Holland | Neutral | Natural hazards can occur anywhere. Urban developments are high risk areas, and rural land provides a buffer function and a level of resilience. Part of the reason to protect rural 1 land is to maintain this protective function. I do not think Nelson Tasman is necessarily resilient to natural hazards. It can be with considered development. |
| 31309 Mr & Mrs Rose & Phillip Windle | Neutral | |
| 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | Neutral | We are situated as good or better than many other areas. |
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | Neutral | |
| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | Neutral | Less fussed about this as it should be obvious. Don't build on marshland or flood zones, or if you do, make sure your building code is up to it. |
| 31365 michael monti | Neutral | |
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | Neutral | As above |
| 31373 Ms Jenny Daniell | Neutral | |
| 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer | Neutral | |
| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling | Neutral | Thi is not evident in the FDS. There are known hazards such as earthquake and sea level risks which the Council's will not be able to handle alone. |
| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling | Neutral | TDC will not be able to cope with climate change or earthquake. |
| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors | Neutral | |
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | Neutral | |
| 31438 Aleisha Hosie | Neutral | |
| 31457 Mr J Santa Barbara | Neutral | We need to clarify what natural hazards we need to adapt to and which we should avoid. |
| | | |

| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | Neutral | |
|------------------------------|---------|--|
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | Neutral | |
| 31480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | Neutral | |
| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless | Neutral | |
| 31521 Mrs Marie Waterhouse | Neutral | |
| 31523 Ms karen steadman | Neutral | |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | Neutral | Fault lines; draught?; temperature rise on production? cyclones? - really is this a valid question |
| 31558 Mr Steve Jordan | Neutral | |
| 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett | Neutral | I am unsure how this plan sets to achieve increased resilience. Of course, I support increased resilience to natural hazards and especially as they intensify. |
| 31574 Mr David Bolton | Neutral | |
| 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | Neutral | Tasman Village is totally unsuitable for a small town - more extreme weather events in the future are creating a major risk of flooding, especially since the streams along Aporo Road already flood at times. In addition the Tsunami 3m flood zone mark is approx. half way between Tasman Village and Horton Road and this is before taking into account rising sea levels. |
| 31588 pene Greet | Neutral | i have personally chosen to live somewhere that minimizes risks from known hazards. There are always unknown hazards. If somewhere is flooded regularly it shouldn't be built on. |
| 31595 Gary Clark | Neutral | |
| 31604 Mr Peter Moot | Neutral | |
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | Neutral | I know a lot of work has been done to increase storm water resilience, but don't really know how resilient Nelson Tasman would be if we had eg a major shake or another big forest fire. |
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | Neutral | That is dependant on what the council chooses to do with future development. Creating more density in Tahunanui's housing stock will not help, in an inundation zone. |
| 31617 Ms steph jewell | Neutral | Natural hazards/disasters are frequently doing the wrong thing in the wrong place, it has to be addressed but not as seriously as climate change. |
| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | Neutral | |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | Neutral | |
| 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin | Neutral | |

| 31647 Mrs Rebecca Parish | Neutral | |
|---|----------------|--|
| 31651 Dr Patrick Conway | Neutral | There is no uniform answer to this question. There are areas of the City, such as the Tahunanui Hills where land is unstable and has a long history of slips and major shifts. The Plan's designation of this area for "residential infill," ignores the risks and potentially will have disastrous consequences. SEE ATTACHED |
| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | Neutral | |
| 31681 Seev Oren | Neutral | Tasman Village provides resilience for rising sea levels. |
| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | Neutral | |
| 31692 Mr Alasdair Gardiner | Neutral | |
| 31697 Robert King-Tenison | Neutral | We want to be resilient, but not over the top anticipating something that no timeline in terms of a working life can make sense. |
| 31709 Ofer Ronen | Neutral | New Tasman Village Provided Resilience. |
| 31711 Sara Flintoff | Neutral | |
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | Neutral | See attached submission. Summarised - no key points related to this outcome. |
| 31718 Kathryn & Keith Quigley | Neutral | |
| 31739 Philippa Hellyer | Neutral | This is not something that can be measured in a meaningful way. Stop wasting so much energy on this topic. |
| 31741 Mr Robert Stevenson | Neutral | Risks are exaggerated to drive political agendas |
| 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert- Watene | Neutral | I am concerned of erosion |
| 31752 Jill Pearson | Neutral | |
| 31756 Ronald Alfred & Phylis Kinzett | Neutral | |
| 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | Neutral | |
| 31775 Dr Thomas Carl | Neutral | |
| 31787 Lilac Meir | Neutral | Tasman Village will provide support in case of rising sea levels. |
| 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren | Strongly agree | To not built or develop on areas that is already effected by natural hazards like floodings, slips etc. |
| | | |

| 31130 Trevor James | Strongly agree | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson | Strongly agree | This means that resources and infrastructure are not overstretched, that reserve capacity is maintained. |
| 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward | Strongly agree | |
| 31185 Myfanway James | Strongly agree | |
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | Strongly agree | |
| 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | Strongly agree | |
| 31250 Mr Richard Wyles | Strongly agree | |
| 31306 Mr Jaye Barr | Strongly agree | |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | Strongly agree | |
| 31322 Mrs BARBARA AND TIM ROBSON | Strongly agree | |
| 31328 Ms Karen du Fresne | Strongly agree | As above |
| 31334 Diane Sutherland | Strongly agree | |
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | Strongly agree | Should be, but isn't currently or with your proposed draft plan, see the one above. (by the way, I support the Waimea dam for this reason. But not the funding model maybe, but hey, needs to be built) |
| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | Strongly agree | |
| 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | Strongly agree | |
| | | |

| 31346 Martin Hartman | Strongly agree | |
|------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31349 Laurien Heijs | Strongly agree | Endorse NelsonTasman2050 submission. |
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | Strongly agree | Strongly agree with the objective. I have noticed that most proposed new greenfield areas have stayed away from areas at risk of flooding (including inundation due to sea level rise), fault lines and slip prone areas. However I'm missing a strategy for how our future urban areas will be resilient and future proof. |
| 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann | Strongly agree | |
| 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett | Strongly agree | Makes sense to map hazardous areas and not make developments in them. |
| 31400 Miss Heather Wallace | Strongly agree | Disappointing to note development around Richmond in such low lying areas. away from coasts and sensitive wetlands especially. |
| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | Strongly agree | history |
| 31406 Ms Floortje van Lierop | Strongly agree | Significant changes are required to better protect our region from the effects of climate change and natural hazards. I'm especially worried about the huge areas of land in our region used to grow pine and the erosion caused by the growing and harvesting of pine. |
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle | Strongly agree | I have noticed that most proposed new greenfield areas have stayed away from areas at risk of flooding (including inundation due to sea level rise), fault lines and slip prone areas. However I'm missing a strategy for how our future urban areas will be resilient and future proof. |
| 31416 Tim Leyland | Strongly agree | Proposed new greenfield areas have stayed away from areas at risk of flooding in Tapawera. This limits possibilities and suggests more intensification in "safe' areas is needed. |
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | Strongly agree | It seems that most of the new green field developments are located away from natural hazards |
| 31443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | Strongly agree | That is a no brainer. Again, more creativity than shown in the draft is needed. |
| 31447 Dr David Jackson | Strongly agree | |

| 31452 Mr David Bartle | Strongly agree | This is also a key strategic outcome |
|---|-------------------|--|
| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | Strongly agree | I strongly support outcome 9 as a prudent approach to planning in any natural environment context. But have some questions: For Example: The construction of the new housing project "The Meadows" around lower Queen street is, to me, a form of very bad planning. I am originally from the Netherlands and it is very disturbing to see a new housing project within a short distance of the ocean without any dunes or dykes to protect the area against rising sea levels Any increase in sea level and those houses are under water. |
| 31472 Dr David Briggs | Strongly agree | Of course. That needs to include tsunamis, storms, earthquakes and future pandemics. |
| 31485 Ms Robin Schiff | Strongly agree | The alpine fault is "scheduled" to blow anytime between now and the next couple of hundred years. Planning redundancy into electrical supply and water supply would reduce the suffering of the population once the quake happens - during the time necessary for rebuilding. |
| 31492 Anton, Benni, Shalom, AJ Bank, Bonnin, Shalom Davis | Strongly agree | |
| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | Strongly agree | I have noticed that most proposed new greenfield sites have stayed away from areas at risk of flooding, however it is missing a strategy for how our future urban areas will be resilient and future proof. |
| 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | Strongly agree | Where is the strategy for how our future urban areas will be resilient and future proof? |
| 31496 Mrs Petra Dekker | Strongly agree | I have noticed that most proposed new greenfield areas have stayed away from areas at risk of flooding (including inundation due to sea level rise), fault lines and slip prone areas. However, I'm missing a strategy for how our future urban areas will be resilient and future proof. |
| 31499 Ms Jane Fisher | Strongly agree | |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne | Strongly agree | Sea level rise may cause flooding |
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | Strongly agree | |
| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | Strongly agree | The impacts of the climate crisis are already upon us, and are almost certain to escalate both in severity and breadth. |

| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | Strongly agree | Strongly agree. Flooding can cause significant damage to property and people. Storm surges in coastal environments and heavy and prolonged rainfall can lead to flooding of low-lying areas. It is important for Councils to avoid development in high risk areas and prioritise investment in effective storm water management solutions including storm water detention basins and diversions from low-lying areas. Intensive residential development may increase site coverage of impervious surfaces requiring effective storm water management to reduce the risk of flooding. In addition, development on land that is susceptible to liquefaction and/or landslides should be avoided. NMH notes in the Technical Report (page 20) that broad assessments on flooding, potential liquefaction areas and slope instability have not been undertaken for Tasman District. Extreme weather events exacerbated by climate change can cause flooding and slips. Therefore NMH stresses the importance for Tasman District Council to undertake assessments in relation to the FDS planning to ensure that development does not occur on hazard prone land. |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31515 Geoffrey Vause | Strongly agree | lbid. |
| 31520 Andrew Stirling | Strongly agree | |
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | Strongly agree | I strongly agree with the objective but there needs to be more information on how our future urban area will be resilient and future proof. |
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | Strongly agree | We're not resilient to tsunami risk or sea level rise that may be faster & more extreme than currently estimated. Better planning for such possibilities is definitely needed. |
| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard | Strongly agree | |
| 31549 Mr Ian McComb | Strongly agree | |
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | Strongly agree | I have noticed that most proposed new greenfield areas have stayed away from areas at risk of flooding (including inundation due to sea level rise), fault lines and slip prone areas. However I'm missing a strategy for how our future urban areas will be resilient and future proof. |
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | Strongly agree | I have noticed that most proposed new greenfield areas have stayed away from areas at risk of flooding (including inundation due to sea level rise), fault lines and |
| | | |

| | | slip prone areas. However I'm missing a strategy for how our future urban areas will be resilient and future proof. |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins | Strongly agree | I strongly support Nelson Tasman to increase resiliency to natural hazards. The most likely of which, and most severe are fire due to increased temperatures and flooding due to rising sea levels. The former will reverse any gains we can make in sequestering carbon and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The latter will displace many in the region, and increase the cost of insurance, making our region less affordable to live in. |
| 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | Strongly agree | It looks like most proposed new greenfield areas have stayed away from areas at risk of flooding (including inundation due to sea-level rise), fault lines and slip prone areas. But how else our future urban areas will be resilient and future proof. |
| 31593 Mr William Samuels | Strongly agree | I have noticed that most proposed new greenfield areas have stayed away from areas at risk of flooding (including inundation due to sea level rise), fault lines and slip prone areas. However I'm missing a strategy for how our future urban areas will be resilient and future proof. |
| 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner | Strongly agree | Most new proposed greenfield areas have stayed away from areas at risk of flooding (including inundation due to sea level rise), fault lines and slip prone areas. Great. Where is that for the future urban areas? How will they be resilient and future proof? The FDS does not indicate these, but definitely should to make this outcome throughly achieved. |
| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | Strongly agree | I have noticed that most proposed new greenfield areas have stayed away from areas at risk of flooding (including inundation due to sea level rise), fault lines and slip prone areas. However I'm missing a strategy for how our future urban areas will be resilient and future proof. |
| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | Strongly agree | I have noticed that most proposed new greenfield areas have stayed away from areas at risk of flooding (including inundation due to sea level rise), fault lines and slip prone areas. However I'm missing a strategy for how our future urban areas will be resilient and future proof. |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | Strongly agree | I have noticed that most proposed new greenfield areas have stayed away from areas at risk of flooding (including inundation due to sea-level rise), fault lines and slip prone areas. However, I'm missing a strategy for how our future urban areas will be resilient and future proof. |
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | Strongly agree | This is extremely important. It is outside my area of expertise to comment further |
| | | |

| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | Strongly agree | I have noticed that most proposed new greenfield areas have stayed away from areas at risk of flooding (including inundation due to sea level rise), fault lines and slip prone areas. However I'm missing a strategy for how our future urban areas will be resilient and future proof. |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | Strongly agree | |
| 31631 Mrs Joy Shackleton | Strongly agree | |
| 31633 Ms Jacquetta Bell QSM | Strongly agree | |
| 31636 Joanna Santa Barbara | Strongly agree | Strongly agree. It is not clear from this FDS that councils have planned for resilience from natural hazards and climate change. Just keeping buildings away from the fault line doesn't mean that the predicted magnitude 8 Alpine Fault rupture won't cause serious damage in this region, and reduced or very limited access to roads south and east and rupture of main trunkline electricity. The predicted Alpine Fault rupture means that planning for local energy generation is important and needs to be considered in the FDS |
| | | Slope instability areas may need recalculation and extension to protect from the effect on slope erosion and slumping of predicted future droughts followed by heavy rainfall . |
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | Strongly agree | I have noticed that most proposed new greenfield areas have stayed away from areas at risk of flooding (including inundation due to sea-level rise), fault lines and slip prone areas. However, I'm missing a strategy for how our future urban areas will be resilient and future proof. |
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | Strongly agree | This also applies to the infrastructure to support growth e.g. transportation routes |
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | Strongly agree | Strongly agree I have noticed that most proposed new greenfield areas have stayed away from areas at risk of flooding (including inundation due to sea-level rise), fault lines and slip prone areas. However, I'm missing a strategy for how our future urban areas will be resilient and future proof. |
| 31667 barbara nicholas | Strongly | |
| | | |

| | agree | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | Strongly agree | Agree and suggest new developments could be engineered to fit into some existing areas that are hazard prone to low levels, particularly flood prone. Eg this seems to be the plan for the new Nelson library. |
| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | Strongly agree | Strongly agree I have noticed that most proposed new greenfield areas have stayed away from areas at risk of flooding (including inundation due to sea-level rise), fault lines and slip prone areas. However, I'm missing a strategy for how our future urban areas will be resilient and future proof. |
| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | Strongly agree | I have noticed that most proposed new greenfield areas have stayed away from areas at risk of flooding (including inundation due to sea-level rise), fault lines and slip prone areas. However, I'm missing a strategy for how our future urban areas will be resilient and future proof. The notion of green sponge cities can be adopted to manage inner city development to be resilient to climate change based hazards while delivering a more green and healthy environment that will allow for more resident to live in our cities. |
| 31683 Richard Davies | Strongly agree | Local councils would be failing in their duty of care if they did not attempt to anticipate natural hazards. |
| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | Strongly agree | Councils also need to plan for the effects of natural hazards and climate change. Even if housing and commercial building and our infrastructure is developed to consider the risk of natural hazards and climate change, we need to plan for when these events happen and ensure horizontal and vertical infrastructure is constructed to be carbon negative and non polluting when an event occurs. How will the infrastructure need to be dismantled at end of life or after an event, to minimise the impact on the environment. |
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | Strongly agree | As above (question 8) |
| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | Strongly agree | Absolutely! Who would disagree? You will see by my address I have a personal interest (as well as a large group of residents on the Tahunanui slump who have been meeting about unconsented work on four properties being 'developed' in Moncrieff Ave, Grenville Tce and The Cliffs). The proposed infill on the Tahunanui slump will make it even less resilient. Reference the BECA Report Nov 2020 outlining geotechnical requirements in areas of slope instability and run out zones. |
| 31698 Mrs Kelly Atkinson | Strongly agree | Our family is part of a Tahunanui Hills community collective that is deeply concerned about unconsented earthworks happening in Grenville Terrace, Moncrieff Avenue and The Cliffs. The proposed infill on the Tahunanui Slump would make the area even less resilient. Reference the BECA report Nov 202 outlining geotechnical requirements in areas of sloe instability and run out zones. |

| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | Strongly agree | As per answer for 9. |
|---------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | Strongly agree | Richmond and Nelson are built on a fault line, as well as the whole of the Brightwater/Hope/Wakefield proposed intensification - abysmal planning. Build on stable higher ground, and away from all productive agriculturally fertile land. |
| 31703 Ms Paula Holden | Strongly agree | Building housing on the floodplains of the Maitai Valley is just plain crazy! |
| 31704 Mr Paul Bucknall | Strongly agree | |
| 31710 Ms Angela Fitchett | Strongly agree | |
| 31716 Mr Alan hart | Strongly agree | see previous: A resilient planning process should prioritise infrastructure and intensive housing away from the risks posed by predicated sea level rise as a precautionary approach. This includes relying on critical roads that cross coastal or low lying land |
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | Strongly agree | |
| 31726 Mr John Jackson | Strongly agree | |
| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | Strongly agree | However I'm missing a strategy for how our future urban areas will be resilient and future proof. |
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | Strongly agree | I have noticed that most proposed new greenfield areas have stayed away from areas at risk of flooding (including inundation due to sea level rise), fault lines and slip prone areas. However I'm missing a strategy for how our future urban areas will be resilient and future proof. |
| 31734 Eric Thomas | Strongly agree | Yes we will as always address whatever as and where it happens. You cannot plan for what we do not know. Prevention is better than cure. |
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | Strongly agree | |
| 31762 Mr Mark Hewetson | Strongly agree | demonstrated by history |
| 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | Strongly agree | |

| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | Strongly agree | Because there will be increasing natural disasters due to climate change, this is very important, every development needs to take into consideration how it will mitigate risks. |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31769 Ms Jo Gould | Strongly agree | As above, the potential effect of natural hazards needs to be integrated in development planning. |
| 31801 Joan Skurr | Strongly agree | I have been involved with the Nelson/Tasman Climate Forum who are working hard to encourage resilience, but this strategy covers the next 30 years and some council decisions do not seem to fully recognise the possible changes ahead. |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | Strongly agree | Resilience will decrease if growth continues to increase. |
| 31835 Mr Ian Wishart | Strongly agree | |
| 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | Strongly disagree | Rocks Rd, access to Glenduan, Tahunanui beach area, the airport areas are all at immediate risk. The sewage treatment plant on the Boulder Bank needs re-siting |
| 31174 Ms Alison Westerby | Strongly disagree | |
| B1196 Ms Alli Jackson | Strongly disagree | |
| 31216 Ms Judith Holmes | Strongly disagree | 1)Forestry slash and clear-felling reign down on us i)a constant supply of sedimentation of the Waimea Estuary causing huge loss of marine environment species and ii)degradation and flooding of land by logs in heavy rains and floods |
| | | 2) Fire danger is obvious e.g. Pigeon Valley and Rabbit Island.3) Sea invasioncoastal erosion. |
| 1219 Mrs kate windle | Strongly disagree | T143 is flood prone |
| 1274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | Strongly disagree | Other than pointing out where faulkt lines are thought to occur, there does not seem to be any plannin consideration on the effects of earthquake, land slippage or even storm water. |
| 1278 Wendy Ross | Strongly disagree | |
| 1293 Mr Richard Osmaston | Strongly disagree | Resilient it ain't. Our society, health, mental health, economy, infrastructure, ecology and wellbeing are already collapsing. Only a very resilient |
| | | |

| | | consultant could come up with 'Nelson Tasman is resilient'. Have they met any poor people lately? Cancer victims or suicide's loved ones? |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | Strongly disagree | I feel that nowhere is resilient to natural hazards. We as a community can be prepared to react and to assist each other |
| 31325 Dr Ann Briggs | Strongly disagree | See my response to Item 9 |
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | Strongly disagree | There is no long term strategy to deal with this, only reactive action. |
| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | Strongly disagree | We are on the fault line and coastal sea rising. Tahunanui is a walking time bomb and you want to build up to 6 stories there with no plan? |
| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | Strongly disagree | I see little that resembles either smart or hardline decision making on behalf of the council. Look at all that coastal development. |
| 31483 Debbie Hampson | Strongly disagree | Tahunanui has been identified as being subject to liquefaction in the case of an earthquake, & also to rising sea levels with climate change, so why would the council now deem it safe to build up to 6 storey high apartments!?. |
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers | Strongly disagree | no our infrastructure isn't resilient, we area at risk of failures during a extreme event. then society isn't equipped to deal with no water / no food / |
| 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | Strongly disagree | I support Nelson Tasman being resilent to Natural hazards but the Future Strategy will not so this. It will add to the risk and frequency of natural hazards. |
| 31554 Wendy Barker | Strongly disagree | We have been badly affected by floods and landslips, particularly because of the high amount of forestry that goes on in the region with land being stripped of trees with no adequate restoration work, leading to pollution also of the seabed and destruction of the scallop industry in Tasman Bay. Flooding is only going to get worse due to global warming. We are very at risk of earthquakes and tsunamis. Also of fires as was shown two summers ago (again due to forestry). Also now at risk of flooding from sea levels rising. |
| 31563 Mrs Loretta Anne Hogg | Strongly disagree | How would you think this? |
| 31570 Ms Annabel Norman | Strongly disagree | |
| 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham | Strongly | Ruby Bay and Mapua are not resilient to climate change |

| 31706 Paul Donald Galloway | Strongly disagree | How can we be resilient if we have too many houses in the line of fires drought and flooding with land slides pine forest all around us? |
|----------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31736 Ms Carol Curtis | Strongly disagree | the current strategy does not meet this Outcome, refer answer to question 09. |
| 31763 Susan Rogers | Strongly disagree | Absolutely! Who would disagree? You will see by my address that I have a personal interest (as well as a large group of residents on the Tahunanui slump who have been meeting about unconsented work on four properties being 'developed' in Moncrieff Ave, Grenville Tce and The Cliffs). The proposed infill on the Tahunanui slump will make it even less resilient. Reference the BECA Report Nov 2020 outlining geotechnical requirements in areas of slope instability and run out zones. |
| 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | Strongly disagree | |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Strongly disagree | Please see attached: Development of the proposed greenfield development areas seems indifferent to runoff and slip hazards and the effects on existing properties. |
| | | |

10 Please indicate whether you support or do not support Outcome 10: Nelson Tasman's highly productive land is prioritised for primary production. Please explain your choice: Wish this land was more protected and there was a strong emphasis on increasing density instead. The 31098 Ms Ella Mowat Agree

| S1050 MS Elia Mowat | , igree | further out we push food production, the more expensive it becomes to produce and transport it to markets. |
|---|---------|---|
| | | Of coarse enabling this to occur is the role of resource management plans |
| 31173 Mr Roderick Watson | Agree | |
| 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | Agree | Craetes jobs that the region leans on. |
| 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | Agree | With a caveat educate the public about regenerative grazing, crop and stock rotation, plant planning, and carbon sequestration. |
| 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | Agree | |
| 31247 Mr yuri aristarco | Agree | We need to keep producing in the land surrounding our city to minimise the cost (both economical and in GHG) for the community. |
| 31248 Mr Will Bosnich | Agree | |
| 31250 Mr Richard Wyles | Agree | Agreed but shouldn't be categorised as Rural 1 = Highly productive land. That's simply untrue. There is a lot of Rural 1 land that has very low productivity and would be better resoned for lifestyle small holdings or high density residential. 89 Abel Tasman Drive is such a location. |
| 31257 Mr Kent Inglis | Agree | There is sufficient expansion capacity for housing via intensification and greenfield development of marginal land, to allow highly productive land to continue to be used for primary production. |
| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | Agree | |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | Agree | But its too late Berryfields ghetto |
| 31309 Mr & Mrs Rose & Phillip Windle | Agree | Very important we are able to feed people. |
| 31316 John Heslop | Agree | As long as the land is clustered. No point in having fragmented small parcels of land surrounding 1 or 2 12 hectare rural land parcels. |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | Agree | It is not a good idea to use productive land for housing. |
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | Agree | There has already been too much good land lost |
| 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman | Agree | |
| | | |

| 1360 Ms Thuy Tran 1364 Mrs Christine Tuffnell | Agree | Agree only with the caveat that it should not be only the council's own categorization of the 'highest productive land' only to be protected |
|--|-------|---|
| | | |
| | Agree | Providing that it is going to be used for primary production |
| 1373 Ms Jenny Daniell | Agree | |
| 1374 Dr Inge Bolt | Agree | In general yes- we all need to eat. Primary production should not be equated with land exploitation / abuse, but that needs to be balanced with excellent use of the land, including protecting waterways, abandoning use of very steep land for forestry / farming etc. |
| 1385 Mr Gordon Hampson | Agree | |
| 1403 Mr Richard Deck | Agree | While I do agree, Tasman's method of deciding what is "high producing" land is fundamentally flawed. When the council can allow subdivision at Richmond West, all the time stating that "Highly Productive (land) Values" are as follows: means land which has a combination of at least two of the following features, one of which must be (a): (a) a climate with sufficient sunshine that supports sufficient soil temperature; (b) a slope of up to 15 degrees; (c) imperfectly-drained to well-drained soils; (d) soil with a potential rooting depth of more than 0.8 metres and adequate available moisture; (e) soil with no major fertility requirements that could not be practicably remedied; (f) water available for irrigation; where that combination is to such a degree that it makes the land capable of producing crops at a high rate or across a wide range. NOTE: This meaning is adapted from "Classification System for Productive Land in the Tasman District", Agriculture New Zealand, December 1994 and is equivalent to land under classes A, B, and C |
| 1411 Mrs Moira Tilling | Agree | It is essential that all A1 class agricultural land be protected from development. As our polupulation grows, we will need even more land to grow food on! I am very concerned that the strategy has earmarked a lot of A1 class soils for greenfield development!!!!!!! |
| 1443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | Agree | Yes - but also to be extended to land that is not highly productive in food terms, but highly productive i social and recreational terms (eg Maitai, Mahitahi, Kaka) |
| 1449 Mr John Chisholm | Agree | |
| 1457 Mr J Santa Barbara | Agree | This outcome is a necessity if we are to thrive into the future. |
| | | |

| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | Agree | |
|------------------------------------|-------|--|
| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | Agree | Once it's gone it's likely gone for a very long time. |
| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | Agree | Absolutely!! As a region we are privileged to have so much land that is productive and provides jobs in the region along with the export opportunities that local orchards and primary producers have been able to profit from. This injects money back into our communities supporting many different businesses and individuals. |
| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | Agree | I agree with the outcome but paving over productive land will surely not help resilience in food production. |
| 31502 Ms Caroline Jones | Agree | |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne | Agree | Food is vital |
| 31520 Andrew Stirling | Agree | |
| 31521 Mrs Marie Waterhouse | Agree | |
| 31529 Mr Steven King-Turner | Agree | |
| 31533 Wendy Trevett | Agree | |
| 31537 Mrs Juliana Trolove | Agree | |
| 31563 Mrs Loretta Anne Hogg | Agree | Yes Nelson Tasman's productive land should be be productive - yes not houses!! |
| 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett | Agree | I support that our productive land is prioritised and protected. We are one of the horticultural capitals of NZ and we need to sustain that feel. |
| 31572 Mr David Todd | Agree | |
| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | Agree | |
| 31580 Jenny Long | Agree | I agree that already-cultivated productive land should be prioritised for production, and not used for housing. Land that is currently in native forest cover or regenerating forest cover should not be used for production, as healthy native ecosystems underpin our society and economy. |
| 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner | Agree | We need our land for food production, but it also needs protecting to preserve the wonderful landscape character that makes our region so special. I can't really see how the FDS is going to achieve this. The strategy proposes many greenfield expansions that eat into our productive countryside. Shouldn't we better limit development to our existing urban areas and where transport options are at proximity? |
| 31595 Gary Clark | Agree | |

| 31612 Mr Paul Davey | Agree | We need food |
|---------------------------------|---------|--|
| 31620 Mr Paul Baigent | Agree | |
| 31622 Peter Butler | Agree | |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | Agree | |
| 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin | Agree | |
| 31641 Mr Stephen (Steve) Hayder | n Agree | Land can be improved. The Braeburn submission will utilise productive land used by primary industry |
| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | Agree | |
| 31644 Murray Poulter | Agree | Provided the impacts of things like impacts of intensification and on (water) resources are considered prior to implementation. |
| 31651 Dr Patrick Conway | Agree | |
| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | Agree | |
| 31662 Joe Roberts | Agree | Support, so long as there is scope of value judgements being made on a case-by-case basis. |
| 31679 T R Carmichael | Agree | |
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | Agree | Existing productive land should be prioritised for primary production but existing natural areas should not be converted for this |
| 31692 Mr Alasdair Gardiner | Agree | |
| 31695 Christine Horner | Agree | |
| 31697 Robert King-Tenison | Agree | Build on more marginal land and it that means greater transport infrastructure costs then so be it. |
| 31721 Ms Jill Cullen | Agree | |
| 31722 Trevor Chang | Agree | The sprawling residential areas in Tasman would be better served with multi-storied buildings to preserve productive land. |
| 31736 Ms Carol Curtis | Agree | agree with the outcome BUT with the proviso that this existing highly productive land is assessed for sustainable/ ethical / carbon neutral, practices that enhances the environment surrounding it, and is also tested for resilience and adaption options. |
| 31741 Mr Robert Stevenson | Agree | |
| 31742 Mr tim manning | Agree | The proposed development at Tasman Village appears to fly in the teeth of this suggestion |
| 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert- | Agree | This is important but not its only concern |
| | | |

| Watene | | |
|---|----------|---|
| 31756 Ronald Alfred & Phylis Kinzett | Agree | |
| 31762 Mr Mark Hewetson | Agree | yes, but sometimes the definition of productive appears misapplied |
| 31765 Mrs Lorna Ivy Cooper | Agree | |
| 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | Agree | |
| 31774 Mrs Jane Sutherland | Agree | |
| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | Agree | Please see attached - determined Agree from submission: A: Yes but this does not go far enough. Expanding existing urban areas onto land that is currently not very productive is bad as well in that it has high Climate Change impacts in building the infrastructure, maintaining the infrastructure into the future and high climate change impacts from people living in far flung suburbs rather than close-in. Additionally so-called unproductive land often allows for wildlife corridors and areas of peaceful recreation. |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | Agree | Within the suite of upper loc land capability, a network of ecosystems must link and underpin the use of productive land. |
| 31815 Peter Wilks | Agree | Mostly should be protected but some boundary rationalization. |
| 31820 Debbie Bidlake | Agree | Federated Farmers generally supports the FDS outcomes, in particular the prioritisation of highly productive land for primary production. It makes sense to focus greenfield development on land with limited productive potential near existing urban areas that have access to public transport, infrastructure, and services. |
| 31830 K.M. McDonald | Agree | Larger sections can be highly productive, unrestrained, large scale development must not be allowed on land which is used for food production in a sustainable way. |
| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | Disagree | The waimea plains are the productive lands of this region, and these must not be extended into. |
| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | Disagree | Whilst you indicate that only certain land is highly productive, the disregard for other, productive land is evident in the Tasman Bay Village site. |
| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | Disagree | While particular land may be productive for agriculture, it may also be important - perhaps even more important - for achieving other objectives. Therefore it would be best to let decisions on land be made or a case-by-case basis, with no pre-ordained priority established. |
| 31284 Mr Jarmo Saloranta | Disagree | It should not be only the 'highly productive' greenfields that need to be protected. There should be |
| | | |

| | | careful protection of ANY productive land, regardless of various low to high categorizations. |
|-----------------------------|----------|---|
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | Disagree | The 'good' you can get out of building your housing/workspace and industry in the right place, is worth sacrificing some highly productive land over, if needed. You have done so yourself recently in Motueka west, anyway, against all your pretended need to protect highly productive land. |
| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | Disagree | Commercial makes money. You will make a huge change in zones over riding residential areas so you don't effect money making commercial activities. I have seen commercial sell land for residential because it makes a lot of money for them example is Richmond. |
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | Disagree | The greenfield developments are taking over the productive land. The FDS does not protect the productive land. Much more needs to be done to save the productive land. |
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | Disagree | further change of use from rural / market garden land use to housing on the Waimea Plains (T-038, T-120 T-121) after the huge "Berryfield" development shows the FDS is not considering the value of local primary food production. Results in: more food miles to bring food product into the region |
| 31431 Katerina Seligman | Disagree | I think the land can be used very productively in small allotments and several dwellings on farms does not necessarily significantly impact on primary production. |
| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | Disagree | the definition used is to narrow and only talks about highly productive land. we have many more land areas that fall out of this definition and are productive. |
| 31496 Mrs Petra Dekker | Disagree | Refer attachment: I disagree because the definition of "highly productive" land is used here, which is too narrow. W |
| 31570 Ms Annabel Norman | Disagree | I don't believe this is shown as an intention with development that has already taken place on fertile soils |
| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | Disagree | This plan is actively encouraging landowners to move away from using highly productive land for growing into converting to housing so they, and the Council profit. Greed driven. The attitude that a plan of rural development such as what is proposed can be driven by acquisitive individuals potentially seeing huge profits by selling their land for development is fundamentally wrong. |
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | Disagree | The plan for greenfield sites seems to go against this statement. |
| 31643 Inge Koevoet | Disagree | |
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | Disagree | Please see other fields |
| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | Disagree | The sprawling subdivision on the Waimea Plains are proof of this. |
| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | Disagree | It shouldn't be so simple. We need to optimise our land use not simply prioritise primary production. We need to incentivise productive activities and disincentivse non productive uses on productive land but prioritise urban development close to existing areas. E.g. do we need a huge dairy farm between the |
| | | |

| | | Coastal Highway and Lower Queen street in Richmond/Appleby? There are too many non productive lifestyle properties in the Rural 1 zone. |
|------------------------------------|---------------|---|
| 31716 Mr Alan hart | Disagree | Self sufficiency in food production is a political decision not necessary in a global system where ample food may be imported from areas that do not have urban growth issues. |
| 31754 Ms Joanna Hopkinson | Disagree | it depends upon the definition of prioritised. So far it has been deprioritised around Richmond and Prioritised around Murchison, Debilitating Murchison growth. |
| 31779 Mrs Julie Sherratt | Disagree | Sometimes land is zoned for primary production but over the years has been cut into titles which are too small for this purpose, and are not currently being used for farming any more. An example is Dodson Roa where I live. Land here which is being used to graze a few sheep to keep the grass down would be better rezoned as residential. This land is above the flood plain, within walking and cycling and mobility scooter distance (under 2 flat kilometres along sealed bike and walking path) of the Supermarket and main street shops in Takaka, the Recreation Park, Central Takaka and Takaka Primary Schools and Golden Bay High School, and Golden Bay Community Health. The owners of this land should have the option of subdividing and adding very much wanted housing to the pool of residences close to Takaka. |
| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | Don't know | |
| 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | Don't know | |
| 31240 Michael Markert | Don't know | |
| 31355 Mr Barney Hoskins | Don't know | |
| 31406 Ms Floortje van Lierop | Don't know | Too many definitions of primary production so I don't know what it refers to. If it refers to growing foods (sustainably) I am in favor of it being a priority to increase our resilience and reduce our carbon footprint. We need to significantly reduce the number of cows though (if this is part of primary production). |
| 31410 Mr Scott Smithline | Don't know | Carbon capture, organic agriculture fit my definition of 'primary production' so if this is prioritised, great. |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas Hollyman | Don't know | |
| 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart | Don't know | |
| | | |

| 31598 Mrs Nicola Worsfold | Don't | |
|----------------------------|---------|--|
| | know | |
| 31717 Mr Frank Ryan | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | Don't | Not answering any of these leading questions |
| | know | |
| 31784 Ms Teresa James | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31129 Mrs Gaynor Brooks | N/A | See No. 40 below. |
| 31363 Mr Steve Cross | N/A | I reject the premise of this question |
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | N/A | This is imperative, however the strategy proposes many greenfield expansions that eat into our productive countryside. |
| 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | Neutral | |
| 31174 Ms Alison Westerby | Neutral | |
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | Neutral | |
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | Neutral | |
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | Neutral | By primary production, I assume this includes food production and much of the existing land of this type is being taken for building. |
| 31278 Wendy Ross | Neutral | Already Nelson and Tasman's highly productive land is compromised with single height subdivisions already in place - this is a stupid question when all that land is already compromised. |
| 31286 Mr David Short | Neutral | I am uncertain if there is sufficient prioritisation of productive land for primary production especially with the pressure on productive land near main centres to be subdivided for housing. |
| 31318 Mrs Isobel Mosley | Neutral | The needs for easily accessible housing is higher priority than preserving agricultural land. However the spread of lifestyle blocks should be limited. |
| 31347 Ms Paula Baldwin | Neutral | Market gardeners in the family and also the development of large flat areas into residential ??? We need both, and think, once the current Tasman developments are completed, that's enough 'taking' of productive land. |
| 31365 michael monti | Neutral | |
| | | |

| 31423 Mr Roger Frost | Neutral | I support prioritising the use of ALL productive land for primary production (except that which should be prioritised for Conservation), not just highly productive land. Restricting the priority to class 1 and 2 land is too coarse a filter. Plenty of worthwhile production can occur on so called "less productive land" it all depends on what is being produced, how the climate is changing and how land is sustainably managed |
|------------------------------|---------|--|
| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | Neutral | |
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | Neutral | |
| 31480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | Neutral | |
| 31483 Debbie Hampson | Neutral | |
| 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | Neutral | |
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers | Neutral | Farming as a business need more than location / proximity to its market, maybe a better option out further, with cheaper land, and better profit margins for the farmer. they are in the game for money, |
| 31523 Ms karen steadman | Neutral | The way we grow food in the future will probably be very different from how we do it today, but where possible smaller towns where there is very little horticulture should be encouraged to grow. |
| 31551 Mrs Jo Kitchen | Neutral | |
| 31558 Mr Steve Jordan | Neutral | |
| 31574 Mr David Bolton | Neutral | |
| 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz | Neutral | |
| 31604 Mr Peter Moot | Neutral | |
| 31614 Mr mark Morris | Neutral | |
| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | Neutral | |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | Neutral | |
| 31647 Mrs Rebecca Parish | Neutral | |
| 31656 Mr brad malcolm | Neutral | |
| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | Neutral | |
| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | Neutral | |
| 31711 Sara Flintoff | Neutral | |
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | Neutral | See attached submission. Summarised - no key points related to this outcome. |

| 31752 Jill Pearson Neutral But who decides which is which? | |
|--|--|
| 31761 Karen Steadman Neutral I think the production of the ford will work very different in 31809 Mr Andrew Spittal Neutral The land at 49 Stafford Drive is not highly productive land at 0utcome 10. 31114 Ms Jill Rogers Strongly agree 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS Strongly agree BE DEVELOPED INTO RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT. WHATA YOUR FUTURE PLANS RISK REPEATING THAT BASIC AND OB AND ASK YOURSELVES WHAT MAKES TASMAN SUCH AN AT YOURSELVES WHAT MAKES TASMAN SUCH AN AT YOURSELVES WHY ON EARTH DO YOU WANT TO ALTER THAT AGRICULTURAL LAND OR RECREATIONAL AREASHOPE AS AGRICULTURAL LAND OR RECREATIONAL AREASHOPE AS Should remain productive land. 31118 Ms Sarah Varey Strongly agree 31122 Mr Johan Thomas Strongly agree 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren Strongly agree 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren Strongly agree Focus on keeping these areas for agriculture purposes. | |
| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh 31118 Ms Sarah Varey 31122 Mr Johan Thomas Wahlgren 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren Strongly agree Strongly agree Strongly agree Strongly agree Strongly agree But you are not doing this agree hat New OR WHY WAS THE PRIME PRO But you ASK HOW OR WHY WAS THE PRIME PRO But you agree that New OR WHY WAS THE PRIME PRO But you and you and you and you agree that Nelson Tasman's productive land is proposed by a agree agree agree agree 31112 Mr Johan Thomas Strongly agree that Nelson Tasman's productive land is proposed by agree that Nelson Tasman's productive land is proposed by agree by agree that Nelson Tasman's productive land is proposed by agree that Nelson Tasman's productive land is proposed by agree by agree that Nelson Tasman's productive land is proposed by agree by agree that Nelson Tasman's productive land is proposed by agree by agree that Nelson Tasman's productive land is proposed by agree by agree by agree that Nelson Tasman's productive land is proposed by agree by agree that Nelson Tasman's productive land is proposed by agree by agree that Nelson Tasman's productive land is proposed by agree that Nelson Tasman's productive land is proposed by agree that Nelson Tasman's productive land is proposed by agree that Nelson Tasman's productive land is proposed by agree that Nelson Tasman's productive land is proposed by agree that Nelson Tasman's productive land is proposed by agree that Nelso | |
| Outcome 10. 31114 Ms Jill Rogers Strongly agree I WOULD HAVE TO ASK HOW OR WHY WAS THE PRIME PROBE DEVELOPED INTO RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT. WHATA YOUR FUTURE PLANS RISK REPEATING THAT BASIC AND OB AND ASK YOURSELVES WHAT MAKES TASMAN SUCH AN AT YOURSELVES WHY ON EARTH DO YOU WANT TO ALTER THATA AGRICULTURAL LAND OR RECREATIONAL AREASHOPE AS A GRICULTURAL LAND OR RECREATIO | the future. |
| agree Strongly agree BE DEVELOPED INTO RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT. WHAT A YOUR FUTURE PLANS RISK REPEATING THAT BASIC AND OB AND ASK YOURSELVES WHAT MAKES TASMAN SUCH AN AT YOURSELVES WHY ON EARTH DO YOU WANT TO ALTER THAT AGRICULTURAL LAND OR RECREATIONAL AREASHOPE AGRICULTURAL LAND OR RECREATIONAL AREAS | nd so this residential growth option achieves |
| agree BE DEVELOPED INTO RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT. WHATA YOUR FUTURE PLANS RISK REPEATING THAT BASIC AND OB AND ASK YOURSELVES WHAT MAKES TASMAN SUCH AN AT YOURSELVES WHY ON EARTH DO YOU WANT TO ALTER THAT AGRICULTURAL LAND OR RECREATIONAL AREASHOPE AS TO BE AVAILABLE OF THE AGRICULTURAL LAND OR RECREATIONAL AREASHOPE AS TO BE AVAILABLE OF THE AGRICULTURAL LAND OR RECREATIONAL AREASHOPE AS TO BE AVAILABLE OF THE AGRICULTURAL LAND OR RECREATIONAL AREASHOPE AS TO BE AVAILABLE OF THE AGRICULTURAL LAND OR RECREATIONAL AREASHOPE AS TO BE AVAILABLE OF THE AGRICULTURAL LAND OR RECREATIONAL AREASHOPE AS TO BE AVAILABLE OF THE AGRICULTURAL LAND OR RECREATIONAL AREASHOPE AS TO BE AVAILABLE OF THE AGRICULTURAL LAND OR RECREATIONAL AREASHOPE AS TO BE AVAILABLE OF THE AGRICULTURAL LAND OR RECREATIONAL AREASHOPE AS TO BE AVAILABLE OF THE AGRICULTURAL LAND OR RECREATIONAL AREASHOPE AS TO BE AVAILABLE OF THE AGRICULTURAL LAND OR RECREATIONAL AREASHOPE AS TO BE AVAILABLE OF THE AGRICULTURAL LAND OR RECREATIONAL AREASHOPE AS TO BE AVAILABLE OF THE AGRICULTURAL LAND OR RECREATIONAL AREASHOPE AS TO BE AVAILABLE OF THE AGRICULTURAL LAND OR RECREATIONAL AREASHOPE AS TO BE AVAILABLE OF THE AGRICULTURAL LAND OR RECREATIONAL AREASHOPE AS TO BE AVAILABLE OF THE AGRICULTURAL LAND OR RECREATIONAL AREASHOPE AS TO BE AVAILABLE OF THE AGRICULTURAL LAND OR RECREATIONAL AREASHOPE AS TO BE AVAILABLE OF THE AGRICULTURAL LAND OR RECREATIONAL AREASHOPE AS TO BE AVAILABLE OF THE AGRICULTURAL AREAS | |
| agree be available for development. In particular, I refer to T136 should remain productive land. 31118 Ms Sarah Varey Strongly agree 31122 Mr Johan Thomas Strongly wahlgren Strongly agree 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren Strongly agree Focus on keeping these areas for agriculture purposes. 31130 Trevor James Strongly | WASTE OF A WONDERFUL RESOURCE AND VIOUS MISTAKE. EQUALLY TAKE A STEP BACK TRACTIVE PLACE TO LIVE AND THEN ASK AT BY LARGE SCALE DEVELOPMENT IN PRIME |
| agree 31122 Mr Johan Thomas Wahlgren Strongly agree Strongly agree We are already facing high food costs, do not develop on p agree Focus on keeping these areas for agriculture purposes. Strongly | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| Wahlgren agree 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren Strongly agree Focus on keeping these areas for agriculture purposes. 31130 Trevor James Strongly | |
| agree Focus on keeping these areas for agriculture purposes. 31130 Trevor James Strongly | |
| 3 / | roductive land areas for any development. |
| | |
| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson Strongly There is already too much high quality land under housing agree | and concrete. |
| 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward Strongly This is a no-brainer. It's madness to continue building on pragree | oductive land. |
| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley Strongly agree | |

| 31145 Ms Maggie Sweetman | Strongly agree | We must not built on rich soil it's already happening in hope it's got to stop it's insanity to choose housing over food |
|----------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31171 Ms Sallie Griffiths | Strongly agree | Stop building on arable land |
| 31185 Myfanway James | Strongly agree | Protect our good soils - avoid housing on these good soils. |
| 31186 Mr Gary Scott | Strongly agree | Once you build on it, it has gone forever. The production of food would need to be done further away from the city, thus putting up the cost. |
| 31192 Ms Rebecca Patchett | Strongly agree | Food security should be factored in at the local and national level always. |
| 31216 Ms Judith Holmes | Strongly agree | Highly productive land should be retained for food production and ecological balance. |
| 31227 Ms Lee Eliott | Strongly agree | |
| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | Strongly agree | No building or housing to be built on farm land or productive land. |
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | Strongly agree | We have lost so much productive land to urban sprawl. No more! |
| 31251 Ms Jacqui Tyrrell | Strongly agree | There is so little land in the world that is suitable for growing crops, and what remains is subject to numerous threats. Every time I come to Nelson, I'm aware that more fine agricultural land has disappeared under subdivisions. It needs to stop now. |
| 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan | Strongly agree | We need to keep it this way and not senselessly chop up farmland for housing for monetary gain by a few people, if land is already zoned rural then it should stay that way if it's not actually needed to meet housing needs. Keep the subdivisions tight to the main centres |
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | Strongly agree | See previous answer |
| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | Strongly agree | |
| 31261 Mr John Weston | Strongly agree | Yes yes yes this is my main comment and argument along with climate change. |
| | | |

| 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman | Strongly agree | It would be a great outcome. However, there is a lot of productive land disappearing under the present proposals. Consolidated growth and Greenfield development should not occur on the highly productive land in Hope along SH6 south of Richmond especially not from Bob's Bank (just north of the Wairoa Bridge, Brightwater) to Bateup Rd. This area enjoys an excellent soil and microclimate which is good for early vegetables and other crops. Development close to SH6 south of Richmond would cover this excellent soil and waste the microclimate with housing. The Council has soil maps. The soil is less suitable for cropping nearer the hills along the back road. This road (Paton's Line) could be developed for housing and dedicated to bikes and scooters for town access. The vegetable farm at 185 Hope Main Rd is used by a huge number of locals. It provides zero-miles food for many, and is the model preferred in Europe for carbon-zero urban food provision. It and businesses like it should be encouraged under the FDS. |
|---------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | Strongly agree | In other words agricultural land should not be given up for development. |
| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | Strongly agree | This is a major issue. We cannot continue to allow urban sprawl onto our productive flat lands around Richmond and on the Waimea plains. Once it is developed for urban use it is gone forever, and that is clearly not sustainable. The current rules appear to allow sprawl bit by bit which is like a death by a thousand cuts. |
| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley | Strongly agree | |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | Strongly agree | Productive land is our Toanga. Food is life and our future depends on our ability to continue to grow crops. Productive land must be protected as well as the ability to farm it. You can only crop houses once then the land is unavailable for production |
| 31285 Dr Hamish Holland | Strongly agree | Continued capacity for primary production is vital. It is well recognised that a mixed agricultural landscape is more productive, less prone to disease, and has less need for chemical fertilizer and pest control than large agribusiness monocultures. The rural 1 designation is designed to protect productive farmland - not just cash crops, not just horticulture, but also a range of food and fibre production. Local production of both food and fibre is required to reduce our dependence on petrochemicals, and so reduce GHGs. |
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | Strongly agree | Productive land is an essential need and needs to be preserved as taonga even if it is not currently being used in that way. |

| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | Strongly agree | Seems sensible. As does the food produced being distributed equitably to society, rather than being flown overseas to grace the tables of the rich. Whose preferences we have cultivated in our marketing. |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | Strongly agree | Much of this land has already been lost to development. |
| 31298 Mr Duncan Macnab | Strongly agree | If we keep on putting houses where we grow food we will have to import food and that is a green miles disaster |
| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | Strongly agree | Yes I strongly agree I feel all the productive land with all the farming diversities we have in this region is the sight and flavour of our region. The reference to "Highly" productive land should be thought through carefully. The Nelson and Tasman diverse landscape has a "Highly" productive rate of happiness, pleasure and enjoyment for the locals and visitors alike as they travel or explore our region. This is HIGH rate is providing a healthy state for mental health and physical well being. These "feel good" factors cannot have a price on them but will be the health and happiness of those who live here or pass by in the future. If the land is lost to housing / business developments and the landscape changes to subdivisions, corridors of houses or ribbon development then the sight and flavour of our region will be lost. All our green land we still have is so very precious, please look carefully before categorising and protecting only the prioritised HIGHLY productive land |
| 31306 Mr Jaye Barr | Strongly agree | |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | Strongly agree | |
| 31322 Mrs BARBARA AND TIM ROBSON | Strongly agree | We should not contemplate further building on productive land - Food Security! |
| 31325 Dr Ann Briggs | Strongly agree | |
| 31328 Ms Karen du Fresne | Strongly agree | This is not what I see now. Productive land on the Waimea Plains is being swallowed up by poorly planned, sprawling housing development, much of it in areas which will be subject to sea level rise in the near future. |

| 31334 Diane Sutherland | Strongly agree | Yes definitely for primary production but also for protection of our unique and awesome landscape. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this with so many greenfield expansions eating into our countryside. |
|----------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | Strongly agree | It is the source of the region's economic prosperity and good land should not be wasted in expansive, soulless residential neighbourhoods filled with single-story dwellings. These soils should be protected. |
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | Strongly agree | It should not be built on because it is finite. |
| 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | Strongly agree | The strategy therefore needs to focus on urban intensification and prevent any sprawling of suburbs and the development of new housing areas. |
| 31346 Martin Hartman | Strongly agree | The strategy therefore needs to focus on urban intensification and prevent any sprawling of suburbs and the development of new housing areas. |
| 31349 Laurien Heijs | Strongly agree | It's interesting you have this an an objective but there are no similar objectives for other matters the community might like to see prioritised. For example: land of high ecological value and restoration potential is protected and restored. Or land with high amenity value is protected for existing and future residents to enjoy. Or, outstanding landscapes with high natural character and protected. I understand these matters need to be considered in resource management planning and therefore should be communicated here. We need to know and understand the range of values that exist across the landscape before we can make an informed decision about where new or intensified housing is appropriate. |
| 31350 Ms Janet Tavener | Strongly agree | |
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | Strongly agree | |
| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | Strongly agree | Primary production happens on fertile land only. So why build houses roads and factories on this land? This really is dumb. We need this land for food growing while we still can. Growth must be controlled properly, and it now means UP only. By 2100 much of our primary land in Appleby will be salted by seawater ingression - look at the vast volumes of land ice in both poles melting every day - current growth projections just speed this up! Surely this is dumb too isn't it? Resilient? We are in so much trouble! |
| 31356 Stephen Williams | Strongly agree | Consuming locally produced food is a large part of reducing our carbon footprint and increasing health. |
| 31358 George Harrison | Strongly agree | |

| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | Strongly agree | Best fresh food in the country. The district doesn't do enough to build its brand in this space. |
|------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | Strongly agree | Too much has been lost already. |
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | Strongly agree | Highly productive land should not be used for housing |
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | Strongly agree | Strongly agree with the objective. For me this question goes beyond productivity. Of course we need our land for food production, but it also needs protecting to preserve the wonderful landscape character that makes our region so special. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The strategy proposes many greenfield expansions that eat into our productive countryside. Shouldn't we better limit development to our existing urban areas? |
| 31384 Mr Jace Hobbs | Strongly agree | I can see this is being ignored, even as you consider the plans |
| 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann | Strongly agree | |
| 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett | Strongly agree | Not only prioritised but perpetually reserved for it. |
| 31400 Miss Heather Wallace | Strongly agree | Of course!! |
| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | Strongly agree | VERY VERY strong support |

Very strong support given current planning attitude that is ignoring Council priority policy to protect highly productive land and NPS authority, and especially given a planning response at a webinar that there had to be give and take when it is continually taking control of this limited resource of Heritage Soils, ranking them of lower priority for protection than water which is a nonsense when water can be stored, but soil is finite resource

| 31405 Mr Doug Hattersley | Strongly agree | Yes, but the definition of highly productive can be misinterpreted. Medium productive land must also be retained |
|--------------------------|----------------|---|
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle | Strongly agree | For me this question goes beyond productivity. Of course we need our land for food production, but it also needs protecting to preserve the wonderful landscape character that makes our region so special. |

| | | However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The strategy proposes many greenfield expansions that eat into our productive countryside. Shouldn't we better limit development to our existing urban areas? |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling | Strongly agree | This should go without saying as the Waimea Plains is one of the few areas in the country with high class soils for food production |
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin | Strongly agree | Yes. Please don't allow major development on productive greenfield land. |
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | Strongly agree | |
| 31415 Mrs Zanahe Ruth Galloway | Strongly agree | Keep prioritizing land for food for an uncertain future and not covering the land with unproductive housing developments. Time to be rational about endless population and economic growth. |
| 31416 Tim Leyland | Strongly agree | However the FDS appears to propose many greenfield expansions in productive countryside. We should limit development to our existing urban areas? |
| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors | Strongly agree | |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | Strongly agree | we have a finite amount of highly productive soils , and there is only one crop of houses. we must intensify housing on marginal land close to or in existing town centres . Urban sprawl is the past, smart intensification is the furure. |
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | Strongly agree | The proposal includes huge areas of development on productive land and beautiful natural areas that make this region so unique and special. |
| 31422 Mrs Marga Martens | Strongly agree | Strongly agree but it is not only about protecting productive land, it is also about protecting our landscape, coastline and natural environment. The green field developments, infill and subdivisions (coastal) happening in Tasman destroy all of that. |
| 31430 Muriel Moran | Strongly agree | That land should never be made unusable by having housing and infrastructure imposed on it. |
| 31434 Mrs cushla Moorhead | Strongly agree | If it isn't we will not be able to grow food. Food is just as important as housing . We need to be as self sufficient as possible. |
| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn Ball | Strongly agree | Lower Queen St residential development is on usable land! Horticulture is being squeezed out as land values increase due to re-zoning. |
| 31438 Aleisha Hosie | Strongly agree | |
| | | |

| 31441 Mr Chris Head | Strongly agree | It would be a grave mistake to allow highly productive land to give way to residential/commercial property expansion. |
|---------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31447 Dr David Jackson | Strongly agree | The continued sprawl of Richmond onto productive land is very sad. |
| 31452 Mr David Bartle | Strongly agree | Communities throughout NZ look to our to contribute food and this is a national security responsibility. The housing development suggestions in the plan are inconsistent with this outcome, and this inconsistence will be highly divisive across our communities |
| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | Strongly agree | Given the pressures of climate change and other geopolitical factors I believe that primary production should be retained on good productive land. This area has the capacity to be self sufficient for most essential items. |
| 31460 Kris Woods | Strongly agree | Productive land is a priority. I do not agree with ruining this resource by paving over |
| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | Strongly agree | I give strong but qualified support to outcome 9. I am certainly in favor of prioritising the protection of productive land, but I am opposed to it automatically being flagged for "primary production". Not only does this have a range of meanings (e.g. the online Oxford dictionary says "the production of raw materials for industry") but "primary production" has often been harmful in the past and may need to take very different forms in the future. E.g. there may be a better case for developing carbon-storing wetlands in some areas We also need to be able to grow our own food |
| 31472 Dr David Briggs | Strongly agree | One of the more unforgiveable aspects of recent development has been the way good, productive land jac been sacrificed to development, often via the morally doubtful process of reducing agricultural intensity for several years (e.g. converting orchards to rough grassland) before development takes place. This needs to be stopped both to protect productive land for farming, and to help minimise GHG emissions (and other environmental pressures) from agriculture - e.g. through the use of regenerative farming. MOre generally, of course, conversions of land to residential uses also needsto be minimised to protect environmental quality. |
| 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon | Strongly agree | Absolutely paramount. Once productive rural land is built on by houses, we can never get it back. |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | Strongly agree | |
| 31481 Mrs Lucy Harrhy | Strongly agree | I'm sorry, I have seen no actual evidence of high productive land being prioritised for primary production. This would be amazing if this could be a priority, although I think it's a bit late in the day. |
| | | |

| 31484 Mr Gavin Brent Cook | Strongly agree | |
|---|-------------------|--|
| 31485 Ms Robin Schiff | Strongly agree | once subdivisions are built on land it is lost for food production. |
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | Strongly agree | |
| 31487 Ms Heather Spence | Strongly agree | Only an idiot would disagree with this outcome. Or a housing developer. I hope TDC councillors are neither idiots nor housing developers, nor in the pockets of the latter. |
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | Strongly agree | I think this question goes beyond productivity. Yes we need our land for food production, but it also needs protecting to preserve the wonderful landscape character that makes our region so special. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The strategy proposes many greenfield expansions that eat into our productive countryside as well as destroy the outlook that attracts tourists to the area. Shouldn't we better limit development to our existing urban areas? |
| 31491 Ms Annette Milligan | Strongly agree | In a world in which food production is vital, my view is that the superbly productive land of this region must be kept for food production, not for housing development |
| 31492 Anton, Benni, Shalom, AJ Bank, Bonnin, Shalom Davis | Strongly agree | Surely we should not be considering building on productive land that may be needed for food security in the future |
| 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | Strongly agree | Allowing further subdivision of prime rural land destroys it for it's best productive use. Soils are the skin of our planet, and must be preserved and cared for. We need our land for food production, but it also needs protecting to preserve the wonderful landscape character that makes our region so special. The strategy proposes many greenfield expansions that eat into our productive countryside. Shouldn't we better limit development to our existing urban areas? |
| 31497 Mrs Uta Purcell | Strongly agree | We could not survive without it. To destroy it with housing increases transport costs for primary produce from distant and probably less suitable places. |
| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless | Strongly agree | |
| 31505 Cheryl Heten | Strongly agree | Food production areas to remain and restrictions put in place regarding change existing Orchards/ St B/ Dairy etc., into residential housing. |
| 31508 Mr Roger Barlow | Strongly agree | Stop wasting good productive land, the Tasman area has sufficient low productive foothills land to use. |

| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | Strongly agree | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | Strongly agree | Too much such land has already been lost to housing and business developments. |
| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | Strongly agree | Strongly agree. Consideration also needs to be given to protecting the productive soils in Nelson and Tasman. The Ministry for the Environment's Our Land 2018 report states that urban expansion is reducing the availability of some of our most versatile productive land. Nationally, between 1990-2008, 29% of new urban areas were on some of the most versatile land. Creating new developments on greenfield land will have an impact on the productivity of the land around the townships. Protecting land for food production and avoiding urban encroachment were matters of national importance in the RMA's predecessor, the Town and Country Planning Act 1977. It is important that arable land is retained and enhanced rather than being converted into housing. Highly productive land grows better food more cheaply and with fewer environmental consequences. It is vital to protect horticultural land that surrounds towns and cities so that cheaper locally grown produce can get to local communities thus supporting the local economy. Access to cheaper fruit and vegetables is vital for people to maintain good health. Therefore NMH recommends that productive soils is protected. |
| 31515 Geoffrey Vause | Strongly agree | While taking productive agricultural/horticultural land for greenfield development has been a modus operandi for our region, this must stop for the health and wealth of our nation is heavily dependent upon primary production |
| 31516 Mr Peter Lole | Strongly agree | Intensification not sprawl. We're blessed with wonderfully productive land - we'll need as much as we car keep. |
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | Strongly agree | I strongly agree with the objective but much of the land need protection as well. The strategy proposes many greenfield expansions that eat into our productive countryside when we should limit development to our existing urban areas. |
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | Strongly agree | Too much highly productive land has already been lost & scheduled for further housing development. Productive land must be preserved to bolster supply & help reduce food cost. |
| 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | Strongly agree | I strongly support the protection of food producing and highly productive land - but this strategy will not support that objective. Quite the opposite - it is enabling the TDC to continue to release productive land for housing subdivisions! |
| 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery | Strongly agree | It is really concerning to see good fertile land becoming small (ineffective) blocks. We need farmland to produce local food. Farmers also need to be able to carry out their jobs in an appropriate environment and reverse sensitivity is a real issue in Tasman. |
| 31549 Mr Ian McComb | Strongly | Agree, however, the facilitation of clustered housing for workers living on-site, supporting a primary |
| | | |

| | agree | production operation should be prioritised to minimise transport issues between urban areas and high-labour-input farms. |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31554 Wendy Barker | Strongly agree | See above. |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | Strongly agree | TDC is talking of increased growth let alone Nelson - we MUST preserve our 'food basket' land - it can never be returned and the alternative is more trucks on roads/ increased emissions/ less employment opportunities. |
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | Strongly agree | |
| 31560 Ms Steph Watts | Strongly agree | |
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | Strongly agree | World needs food! Locally and internationally this great effort supports the economy of NZ - do the sums on our CPI & GDP without all that the Nelson/Tasman region produces across so many categories. Dispute ratings based on soil types. Highly productive land is deemed to be "flexible" - Many of the sites on the plans are capable of supporting the highest rating of crops/ha as well as feeding large populations via agricultural practises as available production figures / records can attest |
| 31562 Grant palliser | Strongly agree | Agree with sentiment but not going to happen unless LA limits future development to existing urban areas. |
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | Strongly agree | For me this question goes beyond productivity. Of course we need our land for food production, but it also needs protection to preserve the wonderful landscape character that makes our region so special. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The strategy proposes many greenfield expansions that eat into our productive countryside. Shouldn't we better limit development to our existing urban areas? |
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | Strongly agree | For me this question goes beyond productivity. Of course we need our land for food production, but it also needs protecting to preserve the wonderful landscape character that makes our region so special. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The strategy proposes many greenfield expansions that eat into our productive countryside. Shouldn't we better limit development to our existing urban areas? |
| 31571 Ms Susan Drew | Strongly agree | |

| 31573 Mrs Susan Lea | Strongly agree | Yes mst keep as much primary land as possible - too much already used for cheap subdivions / retirement villages . we must expect to be able to feed our population |
|----------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham | Strongly agree | We need all the productive land in an expanding population. |
| 31579 Jane Tate | Strongly agree | |
| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | Strongly agree | We have plenty of low productive land to use first |
| 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | Strongly agree | Yes, we need our land for food production, but we also need to protect and preserve the wonderful landscape that makes our region a gem. However, I'm not sure that the FDS is actually achieving this. The FDS proposes too many greenfield expansions. |
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins | Strongly agree | I support this outcome as food resiliency needs to be given a higher consideration given the climate crisis. We need to use our productive land to ensure a good economic outlook, by using "primary production" in the ethos of a planetary diet (which means a diet that is good for both people and the planet). We need to provide our population good nutrition as a foundation for well-being. Dr Rucklidge has done extensive research to show that nutrition is an important intervention in mental health. By using our productive land we can provide affordable access to nutrition for our population and this can lower instances of mental ill health, which in turn leads to a more desirable region to live in. |
| 31588 pene Greet | Strongly agree | |
| 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | Strongly agree | This question goes beyond productivity. Of course, we need our land for food production, but it also needs protection to preserve the wonderful landscape character that makes our region so special. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The strategy proposes many greenfield expansions that eat into our productive countryside. Shouldn't we better limit development to our existing urban areas? |
| 31593 Mr William Samuels | Strongly agree | For me this question goes beyond productivity. Of course we need our land for food production, but it also needs protecting to preserve the wonderful landscape character that makes our region so special. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The strategy proposes many greenfield expansions that eat into our productive countryside. Shouldn't we better limit development to our existing urban areas? |
| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | Strongly | For me this question goes beyond productivity. Of course we need our land for food production, but it |
| | | |

| | agree | also needs protecting to preserve the wonderful landscape character that makes our region so special. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The strategy proposes many greenfield expansions that eat into our productive countryside. Shouldn't we better limit development to our existing urban areas? |
|---------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | Strongly agree | We should be doing creative infill and development within the boundaries rather than using high-quality farming and cop land |
| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | Strongly agree | For me this question goes beyond productivity. Of course we need our land for food production, but it also needs protecting to preserve the wonderful landscape character that makes our region so special. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The strategy proposes many greenfield expansions that eat into our productive countryside. Shouldn't we better limit development to our existing urban areas? |
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | Strongly agree | Of course. And in terms of the statement on your intro page about being 'careful to avoid unfragmented highly productive land' it is not only 'unfragmented' land which should be left alone, but also the fragmented bits. There are many small orchards (such as our own) which are maintained on a consolidated basis, small-time farmers whose sheep graze the various local vineyards, etc, etc. This is quite charming and should be encouraged. Otherwise you end up with a highly industrialised primary production sector which doesn't benefit anyone locally. |
| 31606 Mr Trent Shepard | Strongly agree | Berryfields and the next new development on prime food production land are bad ideas. Put these developments in hilly areas instead. |
| 31608 Robbie Thomson | Strongly agree | Possibly 29,000 houses added by 2052. 4 people per house? approximately 100,000 more mouths to feed Recent pandemics and wars have shown how we can't rely on reliable access to the wider world for food or fuel or other essentials. We are building on productive food growing land at a dangerous rate. Once built on, its gone forever. Productive land tends to be flat and easily accessed, but we must protect it from development by every possible means, legal, zoning, funding, anything! While large areas of highly land productive land are built on every year, large areas will be lost to salination with sea level rise, or erosion in weather events. Food and Shelter are the two basics for life. Do you want a new house but no food? Or food, but no house? |
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | Strongly agree | I agree that productive land should be prioritised for primary production so am puzzled that horticultural or orchards are turned into greenfield housing developments. |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | Strongly | This question goes beyond productivity. Of course, we need our land for food production, but it also |
| | 3, | - · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |

| | agree | needs protection to preserve the wonderful landscape character that makes our region so special. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The strategy proposes many greenfield expansions that eat into our productive countryside. Shouldn't we better limit development to our existing urban areas? |
|------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | Strongly agree | I agree strongly with the objective but am concerced that the proposed stragey supports greenfield expansions. We need to focus on the development of our existing urban centres and villages. |
| 31617 Ms steph jewell | Strongly agree | Yes butGHGs, where do they come from? Largely, transport farming and food waste, I think. So ag and hort need to change the way they do things, and preferably in a way that doesn't pollute our groundwaters. |
| 31621 Dr Kath Walker | Strongly agree | |
| 31623 Ms Lucy Charlesworth | Strongly agree | I am wary of answering this question as I cannot be sure of how my answer will be interpreted. So I will state - I do not agree with developing green spaces. These spaces need to be reserved and protected to allow for sustainable biodiversity and for future generations. Intensification within Nelson CBD needs to be a priority. I do not agrees with building on Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. I do not agree with housing development on green fields. There is a climate emergency. Remove these areas from the FDS. |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | Strongly agree | C/o-NT2050 For me this question goes beyond productivity. Of course we need our land for food production, but it also needs protecting to preserve the wonderful landscape character that makes our region so special. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The strategy proposes many greenfield expansions that eat into our productive countryside. Shouldn't we better limit development to our existing urban areas? |
| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | Strongly agree | |
| 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | Strongly agree | with increasing population highly productive land is essential for primary production and should not be used for housing |
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | Strongly agree | Because productive land is not being made any more. And putting concrete on it doesn't do anyone any favours. |
| 31628 Mr Daniel Levy | Strongly agree | |
| | | |

| 31631 Mrs Joy Shackleton | Strongly agree | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31633 Ms Jacquetta Bell QSM | Strongly agree | If the situation in the Ukraine, which, with Russia, produces 30% of the world's wheat, does not wake us up to food security - what will? |
| 31636 Joanna Santa Barbara | Strongly agree | Strongly agree. We appreciate that TDC has made a considerable effort to identify the most productive land, and to minimise its use for development. We applaud this, and urge that no productive land at all is further built on. The areas of the region with productive land also have ecological values - very little lowland forest remains, for example (Snowdon's Bush being one small remnant). The focus on productive land should not allow any further degradation of these remnants, whether protected or not, and ecological restoration should still be encouraged herefor example, riparian plantings that have benefits for biodiversity e.g. allowing climate related migrations inland (corridors along river margins) as well as contributing to carbon sequestration at farm and landscape levels. |
| 31637 Ms Frances Kemble Welch | Strongly agree | |
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | Strongly agree | This question goes beyond productivity. Of course, we need our land for food production, but it also needs protection to preserve the wonderful landscape character that makes our region so special. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The strategy proposes many greenfield expansions that eat into our productive countryside. Shouldn't we better limit development to our existing urban areas? |
| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | Strongly agree | We need to maintain nutritious land for primary agriculture as they can refuel and keep the system going It also provides the basic necessities of vegetables which is overpriced and lacking in New Zealand as a whole. It's a waste for such land to go to other use. We should develop with the land and environment ware in, by integrating it and not overpowering it. |
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | Strongly agree | |
| 31657 Mrs Andrea Hay | Strongly agree | |
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | Strongly agree | Strongly agree This question goes beyond productivity. Of course, we need our land for food production, but it also needs protection to preserve the wonderful landscape character that makes our region so special. |

| | | However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The strategy proposes many greenfield expansions that eat into our productive countryside. Shouldn't we better limit development to our existing urban areas? |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31667 barbara nicholas | Strongly agree | we need to protect land best suited for food and fibre production |
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | Strongly agree | Secure local food supply is absolutely necessary. Highly productive land should no longer be given over to low density housing |
| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | Strongly agree | Strongly agree This question goes beyond productivity. Of course, we need our land for food production, but it also needs protection to preserve the wonderful landscape character that makes our region so special. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The strategy proposes many greenfield expansions that eat into our productive countryside. Shouldn't we better limit development to our existing urban areas? |
| 31673 Mike Drake | Strongly agree | Once land is taken away from primary production, it is gone for good. We all need to eat. The rise in water levels will, over time reduce food producing land worldwide. |
| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | Strongly agree | Again the green field development needs to be reduced and more green density delivered to the the existing built environment. I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The strategy proposes many greenfield expansions that eat into our productive countryside. Shouldn't we better limit development to our existing urban areas? |
| 31683 Richard Davies | Strongly agree | Absolutely onboard. Food (along with fresh air and water) is as important as shelter and more important than most concerns of local residents. |
| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | Strongly agree | |
| 31688 Gerard McDonnell | Strongly agree | We need to preserve this land for intensive food production |
| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | Strongly agree | |
| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | Strongly agree | Presuming primary production means food? |
| | | |

| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | Strongly agree | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | Strongly agree | I support the outcome but with so much green field development still proposed I'm not sure it will achieve this. |
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | Strongly agree | ABSOLUTELY. Lower Queen St. development is an embarrassment, for example. |
| 31703 Ms Paula Holden | Strongly agree | We need food security! We can't eat sprawling concrete subdivisions. The Berryfield area in Richmond is a great example of what not to do - covering productive land close Nelson/Richmond with SINGLE dwellings. More multi-storey apartments here would've been a better use of land. |
| 31704 Mr Paul Bucknall | Strongly agree | Primary production is crucial for our economy, both to keep prices low and provide employment. We have invested in the dam - it would be nonsensical to then build more homes on the land we had intended to irrigate. |
| 31706 Paul Donald Galloway | Strongly agree | We must protect this precious primary commodity especially in the reality of Planetary Climate Change with conservation of water, encouraging regenerative farming. |
| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | Strongly agree | I am endorsing the Nelson Tasman Climate Forum's view. We appreciate that TDC has made a considerable effort to identify the most productive land, and to minimise its use. We applaud this and urge that no productive land at all is further built on. The areas of the region with productive land also have ecological values - very little lowland forest remains, for example (Snowdon's Bush being one small remnant). The focus on productive land should not allow any further degradation of these remnants, whether protected or not, and ecological restoration should still be encouraged herefor example, riparian plantings that have benefits for biodiversity e.g. allowing climate related migrations inland (corridors along river margins) as well as contributing to carbon sequestration at farm and landscape levels. |
| 31710 Ms Angela Fitchett | Strongly agree | Highly desirable to limit development to already existing urban areas. Preserving productive land is also about community resilience. |
| 31713 Mrs Debora Scholl Dos Santos | Strongly agree | I believe it is such a great waste when highly productive land is taken over by houses, buildings, and even lifestyle blocks that don't produce anything. |
| 31718 Kathryn & Keith Quigley | Strongly agree | |
| 31726 Mr John Jackson | Strongly agree | All productive land must be preserved. Development must take place on unproductive land. |

| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | Strongly agree | Of course we need our land for food production and for mitigating the effects of climate change by storing carbon in our soils and plantings. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The strategy proposes many greenfield expansions that eat into our productive countryside. Shouldn't we better limit development to our existing urban areas? The proposed NPS-HPL is to promote the sustainable management of New Zealand's productive land. The government is proposing new policy to better safeguard highly productive land that could be used for food production from being subdivided or used for urban expansion. How come the TDC is not following this policy. Is it rushing this project through to avoid the new protections coming through? |
|---------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | Strongly agree | For me this question goes beyond productivity. Of course we need our land for food production, but it also needs protecting to preserve the wonderful landscape character that makes our region so special. However, I'm not sure that the proposed strategy is really going to achieve this. The strategy proposes many greenfield expansions that eat into our productive countryside. Shouldn't we better limit development to our existing urban areas? |
| 31734 Eric Thomas | Strongly agree | It must take 1st priority we have to feed our folk employment. Build on/in non productive. To much top land has been lost to concrete forever. Stop it now. You look after land it will look after us. |
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | Strongly agree | The proposed FDS does not do this as it allows further greenfield development of good soils. |
| 31739 Philippa Hellyer | Strongly agree | This was consulted about many years ago and it was very clear then that our rural productive land should NOT be used for housing or industry. Yet you have proceeded to ignore the wishes of the ratepayers and highly productive land has been put into that revolting urban sprawl near Richmond! STOP STOP STOP following the instructions of the United Nations. The destruction of our beautiful country must not be allowed to happen. |
| 31744 Mrs Lorna CRANE | Strongly agree | We have seen other areas where urban spread has eaten into some of the best arable land. Designating "Green Belt" zones makes good sense. |
| 31747 Mr (Tom) Neil BRETT | Strongly agree | This aim does not seem to be a priority on the South side of Lower Queen Street |
| 31748 Jo Brooks | Strongly agree | Perfect horticultural land providing jobs + Food. Don't want to see it turned in to property development. |
| 31751 Hazel Pearson | Strongly agree | |
| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | Strongly agree | Please see attached for further detail (summarised): Do not use land/greenfield land for housing. |
| | | |

| 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | Strongly agree | This should be the TDC number one proirty!! Richmond South should not proceded |
|--|----------------------|--|
| 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | Strongly agree | Food resiliency needs to be given a higher consideration given the climate crisis. |
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | Strongly agree | Yes, preserving fertile land for food production is vital, but this strategy is going to use lots of productive farming land for housing! |
| 31769 Ms Jo Gould | Strongly agree | This totally makes sense. It's a finite resource and highly productive land shouldn't be used for housing o lifestyle blocks. |
| 31771 Colleen Shaw | Strongly agree | I support this outcome. I feel any incursion on highly productive land for 'growth' housing or commercial activity should be very circumspect as we need to protect our food security and minimize the cost of food transport as it becomes more expensive. We are seeing right now the inflationary effects of this and the suffering that is occurring because of it. Food banks are stretched to provide supplies for hungry families who are finding it hard to afford food and accommodation. |
| 31775 Dr Thomas Carl | Strongly agree | |
| 31777 Mr David Lucas | Strongly agree | |
| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | Strongly agree | See Q7 and Q8 |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Strongly agree | Nelson Tasman is vitally important as NZ's horticultural and primary production region. NZ (and Nelson Tasman) need to be more self sufficient to cut down on transport. |
| 31801 Joan Skurr | Strongly agree | We will need as much productive farm land close to urban areas as we can get to reduce the needs for transporting food. Building on green field productive land seems to be the opposite objective. Less productive slopes could be a consideration. |
| 31835 Mr Ian Wishart | Strongly agree | |
| 31836 Paula M Wilks | Strongly agree | We must produce food to feed the nation ourselves, reduce dairy, increase vegetable production. |
| 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | Strongly disagree | N-106 & N-032, T-038 and T-039 turn rural into residential. |
| 31219 Mrs kate windle | Strongly | T145 situated in the centre of highly productive dairy farm |
| | | |

| | disagree | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31225 Mrs Beverley Diane Trengrove | Strongly disagree | |
| 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | Strongly disagree | Berryfields at Richmond is an example of prime fertile land lost from production for ever |
| 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | Strongly disagree | Berryfields in Richmond is spawning all over highly productive land that was used for primary production. |
| 31488 Annette Starink | Strongly disagree | HighlynProductive fruit and vegetable growing land SHOULD NOT be used for subdeviding and building on. |
| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard | Strongly disagree | The land should be restored to its pre-human state (i.e., wetlands, indigenous forest etc), only keeping enough farmed land to provide for a healthy plant-based diet for the region. |
| 31763 Susan Rogers | Strongly disagree | Survey is flawed from the beginning. You need to redesign this entire line of questioning. It leads only to answers desired by the maker of the survey. |

11 Please indicate whether you support or do not support Outcome 11: All change helps to revive and enhance the mauri of Te Taiao. Please explain your choice:

| 31118 Ms Sarah Varey | Agree | |
|-----------------------------|-------|--|
| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | Agree | |
| 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | Agree | Again, a caveat: Not all change is good for the environment, the community, and the planet. More education is needed about regenerative grazing, crop and stock rotation, plant planning, carbon sequestration, and especially about which changes will go toward reducing climate change, and which changes will increase harm. |
| 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | Agree | |
| 31261 Mr John Weston | Agree | In NZ this is a fundamental requirement |
| 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman | Agree | |
| 31285 Dr Hamish Holland | Agree | Regarding T136, I do not see how an urban development on Rural 1 land enhances the mauri of Te Taiao when these factors are considered - the development is surplus to projected needs; there is no local concentration of work opportunities; development of work opportunities would encroach further on Rural 1 land; Nelson Tasman has poor provision of public transport and none in the projected area; other infrastructure is completely lacking; There is also a large greenfield expanse of Rural 3 land close to Tasman Village and on the coastal side of Tasman View Drive. |
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | Agree | |
| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | Agree | I'm not entirely sure what this means, if it means something like take care of this special place, its people, the land, the water, then I'm all for it |
| 31384 Mr Jace Hobbs | Agree | |
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | Agree | |
| 31422 Mrs Marga Martens | Agree | Agree |
| 31435 Mr Alan Eggers | Agree | Housing and settlements are the lifeblood of communities. Providing extra housing will enhance that "mauri, |

| asman Village proposal in particular seems to be at odds with this and doesn't appear to have iwint. how the TDC can even preserve te mauri o Te Taioa when there are such significant proposals for |
|---|
| how the TDC can even preserve te mauri o Te Taioa when there are such significant proposals for |
| |
| |
| h particularly in green fields development, in the FDS is truly puzzling. We cannot see this outcome thing other than paying lip service to te Ao Maori. |
| |
| correct in thinking that the mauri of Te Taiao is the life force of nature, then yes I support this. ny nature underpins our society and economy, so it is essential. |
| evelopment of T-125 and the Seaton Valley Flats area provides a great opportunity to provide for h while respecting and enhancing mauri. The development of sustainable wetlands and green ors around development provides an equitable solution for all. |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| a bicultural nation, the treaty partner should be integral in the future of the Motu |
| with the protection and revival of Te Taiao, "the natural world" but this is not reflected in the sal, and at times the current strategy negates the opportunity's this could offer. For example the ack on the recent Tasman Village Proposal. |
| it is important to make positive changes where possible |
| ation would be useful. |
| |
| |

| | | enhance the mauri of te taiao, which necessarily includes te tangata. |
|---------------------------------------|----------|---|
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | Disagree | |
| 31219 Mrs kate windle | Disagree | Unsure what this means as I dont speak maori |
| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | Disagree | |
| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley | Disagree | |
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | Disagree | We do not want this city to become like New York with skyscraper buildings all of which are vulnerable to natural disasters. |
| 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | Disagree | Not all change is good or enhances, the subdivision of T136 certainly would not enhance anything. |
| 31349 Laurien Heijs | Disagree | This objective is vague. It's unclear what is aimed for and how this will be achieved. Is there a partnership with iwi in place to ensure this outcome? |
| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | Disagree | The mauri of Te Taiao keeps changing |
| 31423 Mr Roger Frost | Disagree | I doubt this is true. Change for change's sake sounds like a recipe for more exploitation of the environment. |
| 31430 Muriel Moran | Disagree | Change can be destructive when it doesn't consider outcomes for all the life and land forms that will be effected by that change. Change should respect all life forms and the indigenous rights of them. Change should respect that whenua is the core of our environment and is entrusted to our care not our dominance and requires considered attention in the use of it. |
| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn Ball | Disagree | |
| 31488 Annette Starink | Disagree | Not all changedepends if it contributes to a healthy and car independent community where people thrive out doors and connect with eachother in their daily life |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | Disagree | Not all change revives and enhances - how have we done on preserving mauri of Te Taiao to date?' If the natural world is healthy - so too are the people. |
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | Disagree | While some change can enhance the Mauri of an area, it is not a blanket given, areas previously occupied by Tangata whenua |
| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | Disagree | As above; this plan is actively encouraging landowners and to move away from using highly productive land for growing into converting to housing so they, and the Council profit. Greed driven. Will never improve the mauri of Te Taiao because you're destroying natural environment and introducing lots of people and things like cats |
| | | |

| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | Disagree | If its not broken why try and mend it? The area has many great aspects don't ruin them by a false perceived need for change. Please also - in future surveys include an English translation of Maori words used - we don't all speak Te Reo - nor want to. |
|---------------------------------|---------------|--|
| 31608 Robbie Thomson | Disagree | Not necessarily. Depending on how the change is arrived at. Understanding and respecting those who have occupied and used the land before is important, and good change means thorough discussion and agreement with previous occupants. Or the work will come undone later. |
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | Disagree | This isn't true at all, unless there is true partnership and engagement with Iwi. Where is this indicated in the plan, in specific terms? |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | Disagree | Only good changes will help |
| 31641 Mr Stephen (Steve) Hayden | Disagree | |
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | Disagree | Please see other fields |
| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | Disagree | Depends on what change. |
| 31697 Robert King-Tenison | Disagree | It has little relevance. |
| 31734 Eric Thomas | Disagree | Any change should help here but focus on the total big picture of why and the needs of the communities and balance out from there. |
| 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | Disagree | Changes need to be balanced with both old and new ideas of the land. |
| 31771 Colleen Shaw | Disagree | All change is not necessarily beneficial change. There is no place for change for the sake of change or change for a few isolated goals such as unsubstantiated growth. |
| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | Disagree | Please see attached - determined Disagree from submission: A: We do not feel qualified to answer this well, but it appears to suggest that all change is good, which we don't agree with. |
| 31815 Peter Wilks | Disagree | Doesn't sound right. |
| 31114 Ms Jill Rogers | Don't know | Ask the Mauri of Te Taiao - that is their decision |
| 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS | Don't know | ONLY THE MAURI ARE QUALIFIED TO ANSWER THIS |
| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson | Don't know | |

| 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward | Don't know | |
|---------------------------|---------------|---|
| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | Don't know | |
| 31186 Mr Gary Scott | Don't know | ???? I don't understand the question. |
| 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | Don't know | no idea what this is |
| 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | Don't know | |
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | Don't know | |
| 31248 Mr Will Bosnich | Don't know | |
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | Don't know | |
| 31278 Wendy Ross | Don't know | OK, as I am not a speaker of Maori I have no idea what that question means. A translation would have made me think that my opinion was valued but I can see it is not. Most New Zealanders are not going to understand a Maori word or ideal unless it is first realized that we need a translation. |
| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | Don't know | |
| 31286 Mr David Short | Don't know | |
| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | Don't know | |
| 31298 Mr Duncan Macnab | Don't know | |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | Don't know | I do not know what this is. |
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | Don't | |
| | | |

| | know | |
|-----------------------------|-------|--|
| 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31347 Ms Paula Baldwin | Don't | • |
| | know | |
| 31355 Mr Barney Hoskins | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31403 Mr Richard Deck | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas | Don't | |
| Hollyman | know | |
| 31434 Mrs cushla Moorhead | Don't | As I have no idea what the Maori words mean and there is no translation I can't comment. |
| | know | |
| 31443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31452 Mr David Bartle | Don't | I am unqualified to comment |
| | know | |
| 31472 Dr David Briggs | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31473 Mr Andrew Downs | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31502 Ms Caroline Jones | Don't | |
| | | |

| | know | |
|---------------------------|---------------|--|
| 31508 Mr Roger Barlow | Don't know | What does that mean?? |
| 31516 Mr Peter Lole | Don't know | I don't te reo. |
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers | Don't know | |
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | Don't know | |
| 31558 Mr Steve Jordan | Don't know | |
| 31572 Mr David Todd | Don't know | What does this mean in plain English. If you are going to use Maori references at least explain to what you are referring. |
| 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart | Don't know | |
| 31598 Mrs Nicola Worsfold | Don't know | |
| 31622 Peter Butler | Don't know | |
| 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin | Don't know | |
| 31643 Inge Koevoet | Don't know | |
| 31651 Dr Patrick Conway | Don't know | |
| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | Don't know | This need to be done in a useful way, not just throwing money or random responsibilities. If done well, I support it. |
| 31656 Mr brad malcolm | Don't know | |
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | Don't | Please see attached: Did not answer multi-choice. Not qualified to answer this obscure outcome. Would |
| | | |

| | know | be good to provide a plain english translation |
|-----------------------------|---------------|--|
| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | Don't know | |
| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | Don't know | |
| 31717 Mr Frank Ryan | Don't know | |
| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | Don't know | Not answering any of these leading questions |
| 31748 Jo Brooks | Don't know | |
| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | Don't know | Didn't answer multi choice question - Please see submission for further detail - stated question is unclear. |
| 31759 Mr Damian Campbell | Don't know | |
| 31761 Karen Steadman | Don't know | have no idea what Mauri of tetaiao means. |
| 31774 Mrs Jane Sutherland | Don't know | |
| 31784 Ms Teresa James | Don't know | |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Don't know | In plain English what does it mean to the ratepayer? |
| 31363 Mr Steve Cross | N/A | I reject the premise of this question |
| 31563 Mrs Loretta Anne Hogg | N/A | Have no idea what you mean !!! seriously !! |
| 31623 Ms Lucy Charlesworth | N/A | Yet another ambiguous question. In principle the values are sound, yet the interpretation of these values would need to be taken on individual merits. For this reason, I am wary of answering this question as I cannot be sure of how my answer will be interpreted. So I will state - I do not agree with developing green spaces. These spaces need to be reserved and protected to allow for sustainable biodiversity and for future generations. Intensification within Nelson CBD needs to be a priority. I do not agrees with building on Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. I do not agree with housing development on green fields. There is a |

| | | climate emergency. Remove these areas from the FDS. |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---|
| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | Neutral | I dont think there is particularly clear evidence of this in this plan. |
| | | With many of the waterways in a degraded state, intensification has the potential to push these beyond the tipping point. Water sensitive urban design is critical to development. The constructed wetlands practice note should be extensively implemented across the region in conjunction with new developments and intensification. |
| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | Neutral | |
| 31122 Mr Johan Thomas Wahlgren | Neutral | Don't know what this means. |
| 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | Neutral | |
| 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren | Neutral | |
| 31129 Mrs Gaynor Brooks | Neutral | |
| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | Neutral | |
| 31227 Ms Lee Eliott | Neutral | |
| 31250 Mr Richard Wyles | Neutral | |
| 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan | Neutral | |
| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | Neutral | |
| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | Neutral | |
| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | Neutral | |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | Neutral | As long as its not change for the sake of change. |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | Neutral | |
| 31318 Mrs Isobel Mosley | Neutral | |
| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | Neutral | I am a global citizen, choosing to live in this area, very happily thank you for 30 years. I respect the indigenous values of this land as an immigrant - it doesn't mean I agree with it all. The change coming no must be a change in direction from 20th century habits and values, and I believe some of this reversal does line up with Maori world-view. Monstrous weather events don't, and are caused by inappropriate growth. We have arrived at the decision to change course with this submission. |

| 31364 Mrs Christine Tuffnell | Neutral | My ancestors arrived in Nelson in 1842 |
|------------------------------|---------|---|
| 31365 michael monti | Neutral | |
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | Neutral | |
| 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer | Neutral | |
| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling | Neutral | Not all change has been beneficial as we have seen in the past with deforestation, pollution of terrestrial sites (Mapua) and estuaries for example |
| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling | Neutral | Not all change has been beneficoal. |
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | Neutral | |
| 31441 Mr Chris Head | Neutral | This outcome is directly related to all the others. |
| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | Neutral | |
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | Neutral | |
| 31480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | Neutral | |
| 31483 Debbie Hampson | Neutral | |
| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | Neutral | Change can be good or bad |
| 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | Neutral | |
| 31505 Cheryl Heten | Neutral | |
| 31520 Andrew Stirling | Neutral | |
| 31521 Mrs Marie Waterhouse | Neutral | |
| 31529 Mr Steven King-Turner | Neutral | |
| 31551 Mrs Jo Kitchen | Neutral | |
| 31570 Ms Annabel Norman | Neutral | |
| 31573 Mrs Susan Lea | Neutral | Te Taiao is a great comcept but ALL change can not possibly live up to the ideals of Te Taiao - nice if it did |
| 31574 Mr David Bolton | Neutral | |
| 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz | Neutral | |
| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | Neutral | |

| 31604 Mr Peter Moot | Neutral | |
|--------------------------------|---------|--|
| 31606 Mr Trent Shepard | Neutral | |
| 31614 Mr mark Morris | Neutral | |
| 31620 Mr Paul Baigent | Neutral | |
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | Neutral | I suspect it is a bit of window dressing by Council and not wholehearted. |
| 31628 Mr Daniel Levy | Neutral | I agree with this statement as a matter of principle. However I do not believe that the proposals in the draft FDS 2022 with regards to the Maitai Valley adhere to the principle or the intention to revive and enhance the mauri of Te Taiao. One stated advantage of this FDS proposal is that it, 'excludes the need to develop greenfield sites subject to natural hazard risks or which may have significant impacts on freshwater bodies'. If Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats are included then this statement is blatantly false. The river flats in the lower part of Kaka Valley are prone to flooding and the proposed urbanization of Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats will both have a significant negative impact on the Maitai River - the most significant freshwater body in the Nelson City region. Hence in order to adhere to te Mana o te Wai and to enhance the mauri of Te Taiao, the proposed greenfield Maitai valley development areas should not be included in the FDS 2022. |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | Neutral | |
| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | Neutral | |
| 31644 Murray Poulter | Neutral | |
| 31647 Mrs Rebecca Parish | Neutral | |
| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | Neutral | |
| 31673 Mike Drake | Neutral | |
| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | Neutral | |
| 31679 T R Carmichael | Neutral | |
| 31683 Richard Davies | Neutral | The knowledge of Te Reo tells me what Maori is (spirit) but I am not sure about Te Taiao. Sorry. |
| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | Neutral | |
| 31688 Gerard McDonnell | Neutral | This is important but secondary to basic survival! |
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | Neutral | |
| | | |

| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | Neutral | |
|---|-------------------|--|
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | Neutral | See attached submission. Summarised - no key points related to this outcome. |
| 31718 Kathryn & Keith Quigley | Neutral | |
| 31721 Ms Jill Cullen | Neutral | |
| 31722 Trevor Chang | Neutral | |
| 31756 Ronald Alfred & Phylis Kinzett | Neutral | |
| 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | Neutral | All change should assist all people |
| 31765 Mrs Lorna Ivy Cooper | Neutral | |
| 31775 Dr Thomas Carl | Neutral | |
| 31777 Mr David Lucas | Neutral | |
| 31809 Mr Andrew Spittal | Neutral | The concept masterplan has been designed with an intention to generate positive outcomes to freshwater and terrestrial environments. These intentions have been shared with iwi who have signalled their broad support for this proposal. |
| 31835 Mr Ian Wishart | Neutral | |
| 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | Strongly agree | |
| 31130 Trevor James | Strongly agree | |
| 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert | Strongly agree | |
| 31185 Myfanway James | Strongly agree | |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | Strongly agree | Every opportunity to restore Mauri and bring forward the concept of Kaitiakitanga to land must be taken in any development strategy. Te Tau Ihu au te Waka au Maui is a very special place and it is our hei mahi is to give it more life and not diminish it. |
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | Strongly agree | The Whenua is vital to our overall wellbeing, as it is the foundation of life that sustains us physically, mentally, spiritually and socially. |
| | | |

| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | Strongly agree | our people and our land are our future, we need to plan together and carefully so we can strive to ensure we do more good than harm to our land |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31306 Mr Jaye Barr | Strongly agree | |
| 31322 Mrs BARBARA AND TIM ROBSON | Strongly agree | |
| 31328 Ms Karen du Fresne | Strongly agree | Environmental protection has to be at the heart of all planning, and respecting the perspective of Tangata Whenua is a key part of this. |
| 31334 Diane Sutherland | Strongly agree | |
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | Strongly agree | Of course. And assuming this aligns with future proofing our society, and the environment, even more so. |
| 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | Strongly agree | The mauri of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and knowledge of Tangata Whenua. I don't see in the current strategy enough holistic partnership with iwi to ensure this outcome. |
| 31346 Martin Hartman | Strongly agree | The mauri of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and knowledge of Tangata Whenua. I don't see in the current strategy enough holistic partnership. |
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | Strongly agree | |
| 31356 Stephen Williams | Strongly agree | We should be using natural systems to solve our problems. For example, wastewater should be able to be treated in native bush. This would reduce power consumption associated with the cost of septic systems and encourages people to plan natives. These pockets of bush could eventually create corridors for wildlife. |
| 31360 Ms Thuy Tran | Strongly agree | |
| 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | Strongly agree | It suggests and requires a broader understanding of the wider environments and our relationship to it as stewardsnot owners. |
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | Strongly agree | Strongly agree with the objective. Tangata Whenua Te Pae Tawhiti (Vision) and Te Kaupapa (mission), especially with regard to the protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world is not clearly reflected in the proposal. The mauri of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and knowledge of Tangata Whenua. I don't |
| | | |

| | | see in the current strategy enough holistic partnership with iwi to ensure this outcome. The Tasman Village proposal in particular seems to be at odds with this and doesn't appear to have iwi |
|------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| | | support. |
| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | Strongly agree | We'd all be better off. |
| 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann | Strongly agree | |
| 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett | Strongly agree | See 7 above. |
| 31400 Miss Heather Wallace | Strongly agree | |
| 31406 Ms Floortje van Lierop | Strongly agree | Yes the natural world (and restoration of it) needs to be our priority. |
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle | Strongly agree | Tangata Whenua Te Pae Tawhiti (Vision) and Te Kaupapa (mission), especially with regard to the protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world is not clearly reflected in the proposal. The mauri of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and knowledge of Tangata Whenua. I don't see in the current strategy enough holistic partnership with iwi to ensure this outcome. The Tasman Village proposa in particular seems to be at odds with this and doesn't appear to have iwi support. |
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin | Strongly agree | |
| 31416 Tim Leyland | Strongly agree | Tangata Whenua Te Pae Tawhiti (Vision) and Te Kaupapa (mission), especially with regard to the protection and revival of the natural world is not clearly reflected in the FDS. |
| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors | Strongly agree | |
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | Strongly agree | Tasman Village does not seem to have iwi support and does not appear to support this outcome. |
| 31438 Aleisha Hosie | Strongly agree | |
| 31457 Mr J Santa Barbara | Strongly agree | |
| | | |

| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | Strongly agree | One of the attractions of this area, and one which supports both national and international tourism is the natural environment. It is a duty/responsibility to protect this and to enhance it. |
|---|-------------------|---|
| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | Strongly agree | I am not qualified to speak on the mauri of Te Taiao but am supportive of measures to enhance it. However I have major doubts that "All change" will necessarily help such revival. I am supportive of the broad outcome but opposed to that implied licence to achieve it. So I would word it differently: All changes must be made in such a way that they help to revive and enhance the mauri of Te Taiao |
| 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon | Strongly agree | |
| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | Strongly agree | If we disrespect the fundamentals of life we are lost. |
| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | Strongly agree | Yes, definitely. This aligns with the need to maintain and restore important habitats within our region such as wetlands and estuaries and keep our biodiversity at its peak. |
| 31481 Mrs Lucy Harrhy | Strongly agree | I understand mauri to mean essence and Te Taiao to mean earth and all natural things interconnected. That only happens when all living organisms are respected and treated fairly. That also includes the non-native species that are now living in Aotearoa and have been since Maori and Pakeha arrived. I have seen blackbirds and Bellbirds/Korimako work together in the bush to sound alarm bells. If native birds can work with those birds who are non native, then why can't we? I hope that outcome 11 does not mean a wildlife cleanse of species that are non-native. |
| 31484 Mr Gavin Brent Cook | Strongly agree | |
| 31485 Ms Robin Schiff | Strongly agree | All plans made should support this outcome. We need to protect and enhance biodiversity |
| 31487 Ms Heather Spence | Strongly agree | Need a good working relationship with Maori to achieve this. |
| 31492 Anton, Benni, Shalom, AJ Bank, Bonnin, Shalom Davis | Strongly agree | Absolutely! |
| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | Strongly agree | Tangata Whenua Te Pae Tawhiti (Vision) and Te Kaupapa (mission), especially with regard to the protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world is not clearly reflected in the proposal. |

| | | The mauri of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and knowledge of Tangata Whenua. I don't see in the current strategy enough holistic partnership with iwi to ensure this outcome. The Tasman Village proposal in particular seems to be at odds with this and doesn't appear to have iwi support |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | Strongly agree | Tangata Whenua Te Pae Tawhiti (Vision) and Te Kaupapa (mission), especially with regard to the protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world is not clearly reflected in the proposal. The mauri of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and knowledge of Tangata Whenua. I don't see in the current strategy enough holistic partnership with iwi to ensure this outcome. The Tasman Village proposal in particular seems to be at odds with this and doesn't appear to have iwi support. |
| 31496 Mrs Petra Dekker | Strongly agree | Tangata Whenua Te Pae Tawhiti (Vision) and Te Kaupapa (mission), especially regarding the protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world is not clearly reflected in the proposal. |
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | Strongly agree | |
| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | Strongly agree | |
| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | Strongly agree | Strongly agree. NMH strongly endorses the mission statement in relation to iwi and hapū aspirations: Toitū te marae a Tane-Mahuta, Toitū te marae a Tangaroa, Toitū te tangata: If the land is well and the sea is well, the people will thrive. This mission statement aligns with public health outcomes. |
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | Strongly agree | Tangata Whenua Te Pae Tawhiti (Vision) and Te Kaupapa (mission), especially with regard to the protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world is not clearly reflected in the proposal. The mauri of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and knowledge of Tangata Whenua. I believe the current strategy does not demonstrate enough holistic partnership with iwi to ensure this outcome. The Tasman Village proposal in particular does not appear to have iwi support. |
| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard | Strongly agree | |
| 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | Strongly agree | Refer to full submission. Summarised below (similar to NT2050 submission): singluar focus on growth, challenges underlying growth projections, insufficient consultation, misleading submission form (outcome questions), community feedback ignored, biased process, non-compliance with government directives. Recommends re-think of the draft. |

| 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery | Strongly agree | A lot has been compromised in past developments. Te Taiao calls for a balance between land, air, water, and all living beings (not just humans). The rapid residential development is heavily weighted towards human outcomes, let's see a bit more thought go into developing communities with good spaces for the other aspects of nature and less traffic/ road pressure roaring through their surrounds. The self sustaining community model, where people take care of and draw from their shared environment and can find the majority of their work and services locally seems to be disappearing. |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31549 Mr Ian McComb | Strongly agree | |
| 31554 Wendy Barker | Strongly agree | About time this was given the importance it deserves. |
| 31560 Ms Steph Watts | Strongly agree | |
| 31562 Grant palliser | Strongly agree | strongly agree with sentiment but only empty words at present. Objectives use the reo, but little evidence of partnership to enhance understanding and outcomes. Suggestions of reclamation of drained wetlands on outskirts of Mapua village ignores iwi as well as other strategies in this document. |
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | Strongly agree | Tangata Whenua Te Pae Tawhiti (Vision) and Te Kaupapa (mission), especially with regard to the protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world is not clearly reflected in the proposal. The mauri of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and knowledge of Tangata Whenua. I don't see in the current strategy enough holistic partnership with iwi to ensure this outcome. The Tasman Village proposal in particular seems to be at odds with this and doesn't appear to have iwi support. |
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | Strongly agree | Tangata Whenua Te Pae Tawhiti (Vision) and Te Kaupapa (mission), especially with regard to the protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world is not clearly reflected in the proposal. The mauri of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and knowledge of Tangata Whenua. I don't see in the current strategy enough holistic partnership with iwi to ensure this outcome. |
| | | The Tasman Village proposal in particular seems to be at odds with this and doesn't appear to have iwi support. |

| 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett | Strongly agree | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham | Strongly agree | |
| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | Strongly agree | |
| 31579 Jane Tate | Strongly agree | |
| 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | Strongly agree | The Tasman Village proposal in particular seems to be at odds with this and doesn't appear to have iwi support. Protection of our natural land is extremely important but is not reflected in the FDS |
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins | Strongly agree | Te Taiao is the environment that contains and surrounds us. It has four major components: Whenua (soil and land) Wai (all freshwater bodies and their connections) Āhuarangi (climate across time). |
| | | This is paramount given the climate crisis. Shame on you for disguising this important concept in something I had to google! (or shame on me!) |
| 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | Strongly agree | The Tasman Village proposal in particular seems to be at odds with this and doesn't appear to have iwi support. Tangata Whenua Te Pae Tawhiti (Vision) and Te Kaupapa (mission), especially with regard to the protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world are not clearly reflected in the proposal. The mauri of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and knowledge of Tangata Whenua. I don't see in the current strategy enough holistic partnership with iwi to ensure this outcome. |
| 31593 Mr William Samuels | Strongly agree | Tangata Whenua Te Pae Tawhiti (Vision) and Te Kaupapa (mission), especially with regard to the protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world is not clearly reflected in the proposal. |
| | | The mauri of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and knowledge of Tangata Whenua. I don't see in the current strategy enough holistic partnership with iwi to ensure this outcome. |
| | | The Tasman Village proposal in particular seems to be at odds with this and doesn't appear to have iwi support. |
| 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner | Strongly agree | This is a must! Tangata Whenua Te Pae Tawhiti (Vision) and Te Kaupapa (mission), especially with regard to the protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world is not clearly reflected in the proposed FDS. The mauri of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and knowledge of Tangata Whenua. I don't |
| | | |

| | | see in the current strategy enough holistic partnership with iwi to ensure this outcome. The Tasman Village proposal in particular seems to be at odds with this and doesn't appear to have iwi support. |
|------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | Strongly agree | Tangata Whenua Te Pae Tawhiti (Vision) and Te Kaupapa (mission), especially with regard to the protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world is not clearly reflected in the proposal. The mauri of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and knowledge of Tangata Whenua. I don't see in the current strategy enough holistic partnership with iwi to ensure this outcome. The Tasman Village proposal in particular seems to be at odds with this and doesn't appear to have iwi support. |
| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | Strongly agree | Tangata Whenua Te Pae Tawhiti (Vision) and Te Kaupapa (mission), especially with regard to the protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world is not clearly reflected in the proposal. The mauri of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and knowledge of Tangata Whenua. I don't see in the current strategy enough holistic partnership with iwi to ensure this outcome. The Tasman Village proposal in particular seems to be at odds with this and doesn't appear to have iwi support. |
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | Strongly agree | Absolutely. How does this link to the proposed strategy though? |
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | Strongly agree | I don't have enough inside knowledge to comment |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | Strongly agree | Tangata Whenua Te Pae Tawhiti (Vision) and Te Kaupapa (mission), especially with regard to the protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world are not clearly reflected in the proposal. The mauri of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and knowledge of Tangata Whenua. I don't see in the current strategy enough holistic partnership with iwi to ensure this outcome. The Tasman Village proposa in particular seems to be at odds with this and doesn't appear to have iwi support. |
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | Strongly agree | I strongly agree but I do not have the expertise to comment further |
| 31617 Ms steph jewell | Strongly agree | But I think your wording could be improved, sorry. "All changes must help revive and enhance" etc etc. And if not, change should not go ahead. Simple! |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | Strongly agree | C/o-NT2050 Tangata Whenua Te Pae Tawhiti (Vision) and Te Kaupapa (mission), especially |

| | | with regard to the protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world is not clearly reflected in the proposal. The mauri of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and knowledge of Tangata Whenua. I don't see in the current strategy enough holistic partnership with iwi to ensure this outcome. The Tasman Village proposal in particular seems to be at odds with this and doesn't appear to have iwi support. |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | Strongly agree | |
| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | Strongly agree | |
| 31633 Ms Jacquetta Bell QSM | Strongly agree | Let's not make this empty words. Recognising and protecting the spiritual and restorative value of the Maitai river to the city would be a good place to start. |
| 31636 Joanna Santa Barbara | Strongly agree | Our iwi partners would best comment on this outcome. "An example of the mauri focus is what is being proposed in Te Mana o te Wai. The first water should go to the river, then to the other taonga — the biodiversity — and only at that point, once we've taken care of those responsibilities, can humans exert what we call in a Māori view our 'user privilege' and use the water".(Dan Hikuroa, E-Tangata April 18, 2021). The more our region can protect its (relatively) untouched areas, restore damaged ecosystems, resist further encroachment on wild habitat, the more its mauri will be enhanced. But that's not all. We need a human population in our region who have felt connected to Nature from infancy, and who are happy to work alongside and be guided by tangata whenua in kaitiakitanga. |
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | Strongly agree | Tangata Whenua Te Pae Tawhiti (Vision) and Te Kaupapa (mission), especially with regard to the protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world are not clearly reflected in the proposal. The mauri of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and knowledge of Tangata Whenua. I don't see in the current strategy enough holistic partnership with iwi to ensure this outcome. The Tasman Village proposa in particular seems to be at odds with this and doesn't appear to have iwi support. |
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | Strongly agree | Waka Kotahi support Te Tau Ihu iwi feedback in this space, summarised in the FDS |
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | Strongly agree | Strongly agree Tangata Whenua Te Pae Tawhiti (Vision) and Te Kaupapa (mission), especially with regard to the protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world are not clearly reflected in the proposal. The mauri of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and knowledge of Tangata Whenua. I don't see in the |

| in particular seems to be at odds with this and doesn't appear to have iwi support. We all rely, directly or indirectly, on Te taiao. We must protect, revive and restore the whenua in every way we can, Strongly agree 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille Strongly Strongly agree Tangata Whenua Te Pae Tawhiti (Vision) and Te Kaupapa (mission), especially with regard to the protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world are not clearly reflected in the proposal. The maur of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and knowledge of Tangata Whenua. I don't see in the current strategy enough holistic partnership with iwi to ensure this outcome. The Tasman Village proposin particular seems to be at odds with this and doesn't appear to have liw support. Tangata Whenua Te Pae Tawhiti (Vision) and Te Kaupapa (mission), especially with regard to the protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world are not clearly reflected in the proposal. The maur of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and knowledge of Tangata Whenua. I don't see in the current strategy enough holistic partnership with iwi to ensure this outcome. The Tasman Village proposin particular seems to be at odds with this and doesn't appear to have liw support. Strongly agree There needs to be co-governance with liw for our local government and this plan. The region must adhere to Te Tiritt in all matters. It saddens me that this question needs to be asked. The mauri will onlibe enhanced if we have co-governance. It agree with the Outcome, but does the strategy do that? This feels a bit like cultural appropriation here to throw a few Maori words in without any real substance to back it up. An obvious outcome required and highly desirable to meet and acknowledge Te Tiriti. Tangata Whenua Te Pae Tawhiti (Vision) and Te Kaupapa (mission), especially with regard to the protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world is not clearly reflected in the proposal. The mauri of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and kno | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|----------|--|
| Strongly agree agree way we can, Strongly agree Tangata Whenua Te Pae Tawhiti (Vision) and Te Kaupapa (mission), especially with regard to the protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world are not clearly reflected in the proposal. The maur of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and knowledge of Tangata Whenua. I don't see in the current strategy enough holistic partnership with iwi to ensure this outcome. The Tasman Village proportion particular seems to be at odds with this and doesn't appear to have iwi support. Strongly agree protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world are not clearly reflected in the proposal. The maur of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and knowledge of Tangata Whenua. I don't see in the current strategy enough holistic partnership with iwi to ensure this outcome. The Tasman Village proportion particular seems to be at odds with this and doesn't appear to have iwi support. Strongly agree after to Te Tiriti nall matters. It saddens me that this question needs to be asked. The mauri will onlibe enhanced if we have co-governance. I agree with the Outcome, but does the strategy do that? This feels a bit like cultural appropriation here to throw a few Maori words in without any real substance to back it up. An obvious outcome required and highly desirable to meet and acknowledge Te Tiriti. An obvious outcome required and highly desirable to meet and acknowledge Te Tiriti. Tangata Whenua. I don't see in the current strategy enough holistic partnership with iwi to ensure this outcome. Strongly agree Tangata Whenua Te Pae Tawhiti (Vision) and Te Kaupapa (mission), especially with regard to the protection and revised and highly desirable to meet and acknowledge Te Tiriti. Tangata Whenua Te Pae Tawhiti (Vision) and Te Kaupapa (mission), especially with regard to the protection and revised and highly desirable to meet and acknowledge Te Tiriti. Tangata Whenua Te Pae Tawhiti (Vision) and Te Kaupapa (mission), especially with regard to the protect | | | current strategy enough holistic partnership with iwi to ensure this outcome. The Tasman Village proposa in particular seems to be at odds with this and doesn't appear to have iwi support. |
| Tangata Whenua Te Pae Tawhiti (Vision) and Te Kaupapa (mission), especially with regard to the protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world are not clearly reflected in the proposal. The maur of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and knowledge of Tangata Whenua. I don't see in the current strategy enough holistic partnership with iwi to ensure this outcome. The Tasman Village proposin particular seems to be at odds with this and doesn't appear to have iwi support. Tangata Whenua Te Pae Tawhiti (Vision) and Te Kaupapa (mission), especially with regard to the protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world are not clearly reflected in the proposal. The maur of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and knowledge of Tangata Whenua. I don't see in the current strategy enough holistic partnership with iwi to ensure this outcome. The Tasman Village proposin particular seems to be at odds with this and doesn't appear to have iwi support. There needs to be co-governance with lwi for our local government and this plan. The region must adhere to Te Tiriti in all matters. It saddens me that this question needs to be asked. The mauri will onlibe enhanced if we have co-governance. The region must adhere to Te Tiriti in all matters. It saddens me that this question needs to be asked. The mauri will onlibe enhanced if we have co-governance. The region must adhere to Te Tiriti in all matters. It saddens me that this question needs to be asked. The mauri will onlibe enhanced if we have co-governance. The region must adhere to Te Tiriti in all matters. It saddens me that this question needs to be asked. The mauri will only be enhanced if we have co-governance. The region must adhere to Te Tiriti in all matters. It saddens me that this question needs to be asked. The mauri will only be enhanced if we have co-governance. The region of Te Taiao to the natural world is not clearly reflected in the protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world is not clearly reflected in the propos | 31667 barbara nicholas | | |
| protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world are not clearly reflected in the proposal. The maur of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and knowledge of Tangata Whenua. I don't see in the current strategy enough holistic partnership with iwi to ensure this outcome. The Taman Village proposition particular seems to be at odds with this and doesn't appear to have iwi support. There needs to be co-governance with Iwi for our local government and this plan. The region must adhere to Te Tiriti in all matters. It saddens me that this question needs to be asked. The mauri will onlibe enhanced if we have co-governance. Strongly agree to throw a few Maori words in without any real substance to back it up. An obvious outcome required and highly desirable to meet and acknowledge Te Tiriti. Tangata Whenua Te Pae Tawhiti (Vision) and Te Kaupapa (mission), especially with regard to the protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world is not clearly reflected in the proposal. The mauri of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and knowledge of Tangata Whenua. I don't see in the current strategy enough holistic partnership with iwi to ensure this outcome. | 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | | Tangata Whenua Te Pae Tawhiti (Vision) and Te Kaupapa (mission), especially with regard to the protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world are not clearly reflected in the proposal. The mauri of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and knowledge of Tangata Whenua. I don't see in the current strategy enough holistic partnership with iwi to ensure this outcome. The Tasman Village proposal |
| adhere to Te Tiriti in all matters. It saddens me that this question needs to be asked. The mauri will onl be enhanced if we have co-governance. Strongly agree to throw a few Maori words in without any real substance to back it up. Strongly agree An obvious outcome required and highly desirable to meet and acknowledge Te Tiriti. Tangata Whenua Te Pae Tawhiti (Vision) and Te Kaupapa (mission), especially with regard to the protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world is not clearly reflected in the proposal. The mauri of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and knowledge of Tangata Whenua. I don't see in the current strategy enough holistic partnership with iwi to ensure this outcome. Strongly agree | 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | | protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world are not clearly reflected in the proposal. The mauri of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and knowledge of Tangata Whenua. I don't see in the current strategy enough holistic partnership with iwi to ensure this outcome. The Tasman Village proposal |
| agree to throw a few Maori words in without any real substance to back it up. Strongly agree Strongly agree Strongly agree Strongly agree Tangata Whenua Te Pae Tawhiti (Vision) and Te Kaupapa (mission), especially with regard to the protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world is not clearly reflected in the proposal. The mauri of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and knowledge of Tangata Whenua. I don't see in the current strategy enough holistic partnership with iwi to ensure this outcome. Strongly agree | 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | | adhere to Te Tiriti in all matters. It saddens me that this question needs to be asked. The mauri will only |
| agree Strongly agree | 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | | I agree with the Outcome, but does the strategy do that? This feels a bit like cultural appropriation here, to throw a few Maori words in without any real substance to back it up. |
| agree with regard to the protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world is not clearly reflected in the proposal. The mauri of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and knowledge of Tangata Whenua. I don't see in the current strategy enough holistic partnership with iwi to ensure this outcome. Strongly agree | 31710 Ms Angela Fitchett | | An obvious outcome required and highly desirable to meet and acknowledge Te Tiriti. |
| agree | 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | • . | with regard to the protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world is not clearly reflected in the proposal. The mauri of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and knowledge of Tangata Whenua. I don't see in the current strategy enough holistic partnership |
| 31727 Mr Philip Jones Strongly Tangata Whenua Te Pae Tawhiti (Vision) and Te Kaupapa (mission), especially with regard to the | 31726 Mr John Jackson | | |
| | 31727 Mr Philip Jones | Strongly | Tangata Whenua Te Pae Tawhiti (Vision) and Te Kaupapa (mission), especially with regard to the |

| | agree | protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world is not clearly reflected in the proposal. The mauri of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and knowledge of Tangata Whenua. I don't see in the current strategy enough holistic partnership with iwi to ensure this outcome. The Tasman Village proposal in particular seems to be at odds with this and doesn't appear to have iwi support. |
|--|-------------------|---|
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | Strongly agree | Tangata Whenua Te Pae Tawhiti (Vision) and Te Kaupapa (mission), especially with regard to the protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world is not clearly reflected in the proposal. The mauri of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and knowledge of Tangata Whenua. I don't see in the current strategy enough holistic partnership with iwi to ensure this outcome. The Tasman Village proposal in particular seems to be at odds with this and doesn't appear to have iwi support. |
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | Strongly agree | I can't see how the FDS does this. |
| 31744 Mrs Lorna CRANE | Strongly agree | When considering changes to the District Plan we would emphasize that living in harmony with Nature is paramount for a healthy society. |
| 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | Strongly agree | We are wholly supported by the environment. With our plans, ideas, and designs, we may account for some ways we interact with the environment. But we need to be humble. Until we have a deeper understanding of our relationship with the natural world, a very good shortcut is respect. Acting with reverence. Because more likely than not, the science will wash out in decades to come that actions motivated by reviving the mauri of Te Taiao were in our own interests after all. |
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | Strongly agree | Tangata Whenua Te Pae Tawhiti (Vision) and Te Kaupapa (mission), especially with regard to the protection and revival of Te Taiao / the natural world is not clearly reflected in the proposal. The mauri of Te Taiao can only be regenerated with the help and knowledge of Tangata Whenua. I don't see in the current strategy enough holistic partnership with iwi to ensure this outcome. |
| 31769 Ms Jo Gould | Strongly agree | If all development or change revived and enhanced the mauri of Te Taiao that would be a great thing! |
| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | Strongly agree | We support a holistic partnership with iwi to ensure this outcome. |
| 31801 Joan Skurr | Strongly agree | It is important to include the protection and restoration of the natural world in the strategy. Not all change would help with this unless the change carefully considers its long term effects. |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | Strongly | Develop implementation with Iwi. Refer directly to the ATTACHED submission, which seek all change |
| | | |

| | agree | results in Net Enduring Restorative Outcomes. |
|---------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | Strongly Disagree | The proposed developments create a bland and characterless spread of residential zones with no mana. |
| 31173 Mr Roderick Watson | Strongly Disagree | |
| 31174 Ms Alison Westerby | Strongly Disagree | |
| 31192 Ms Rebecca Patchett | Strongly Disagree | too much change too fast reduces the mauri of Te Taioa. Plan to facilitate and foster population growth in our area puts resources under pressure. |
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | Strongly Disagree | nelson must consult, and then include, the recommendations of local iwi to ensure all voices are appropriately represented |
| 31211 Mrs Alison Pickford | Strongly Disagree | See attached. Summarised - Will Tasman District actually have sufficient water to service the proposed 30,000 new homes??? I am Against the Tasman Village Proposal - Due to emissions and loss of productive land. |
| 31216 Ms Judith Holmes | Strongly Disagree | The mauri of Te Taiao will best be protected by adhering to environmental principles of good stewardship not necessarily "change" |
| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | Strongly Disagree | Don't understand what this question means. Mauri? Te Taiao? We need BOTH languages to be used. |
| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | Strongly Disagree | 1200 new homes in Tasman Bay would increase the dog population by around 330 given 28% of households have a dog and its estimated that 44% of homes in NZ have a cat so around 500 extra cats. In addition to the loss of rural landscape through building a new estate the addition of all these pets will have a significant impact on local wildlife, especially native birds. |
| 31284 Mr Jarmo Saloranta | Strongly Disagree | |
| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | Strongly Disagree | If I understand the question correctly, thus far change has been catastrophic for Te Taiao. 'All change helps' seems a bit disingenuous. |
| 31325 Dr Ann Briggs | Strongly Disagree | 'If the natural world is healthy, so are the people'. An interrelationship with the environment based on respect. Sadly, I don't see any of that in the current developments, or in the presented planning. We have so much in this region, and we are trashing it in the name of 'development'. |
| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | Strongly Disagree | This is a religious viewpoint. I don't believe in Mauri, while some people do, the council shouldn't base its environmental decision- |
| | | |

| | | making principles on a religious viewpoint. Otherwise, they should also consider other religious ideas and belief systems. Council should put its faith in science and city planning |
|----------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | Strongly Disagree | Change is sometimes good, sometimes bad. "All change" is sometimes good, sometimes bad. Change needs consideration, and should not be implemented for its own sake. We need a powerful, arbiting "Ministry of Change"where ideas for change are measured in terms of their environmental impact. |
| 31358 George Harrison | Strongly Disagree | |
| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | Strongly Disagree | Equality and not based on race or colour or creed. Please change question to read in english as this is our first language. If you cant tell me in english I wont agree. |
| 31410 Mr Scott Smithline | Strongly Disagree | Re-phrase. 'all change helps' to 'all respect helps'. Time to stop exploiting the earth in the guise of 'change' |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | Strongly Disagree | |
| 31431 Katerina Seligman | Strongly Disagree | Some change is harmful. |
| 31460 Kris Woods | Strongly Disagree | All change is not positive. • New infrastructure and services are needed to support growth – public transport, active transport, three waters, roads, schools, open space, local shops, cafes, community facilities. • Highly productive land should be protected from development. • The natural environment, water quality and landscape are important. • New development should not be to the detriment of existing open spaces and recreation areas |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne | Strongly Disagree | Some change is bad for the world |
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | Strongly Disagree | "All change" is indecipherable as having a positive or negative value. |
| 31612 Mr Paul Davey | Strongly Disagree | That is a silly statement as all change could mean some really stupid idea that might make a few people richer but deny alot of people a fair quality of life |
| 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | Strongly Disagree | Only good changes will have a good outcome |
| | | |

| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | Strongly Depends what you mean by 'all change'! Disagree |
|------------------------|---|
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | Strongly We are all equal. Disagree |
| 31720 Ms Rainna Pretty | Strongly Disagree |
| 31752 Jill Pearson | Strongly I don't know what this is talking about. Disagree |
| 31763 Susan Rogers | Strongly Survey is flawed from the beginning. You need to redesign this entire line of questioning. It leads only to Disagree answers desired by the maker of the survey. |
| 31836 Paula M Wilks | Strongly This embraces caring & supporting our environment only some change revives and enhances this must Disagree not do change with NEG environmental outcomes. |

| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | N/A | Change is needed in north nelson in the zoning from rural to another category that makes subdivision |
|---------------------------|-----|--|
| | | more attainable. This area has largely been excluded from this plan but has big potential to support a large community. However, the formation of a one key hub of north nelson (Glenduan, Wakapuaka, Hira, Delaware Bay, Cable Bay) is paramount to allow transport network into the city, and guide where intensification and development can be focused. |
| 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS | N/A | NO |
| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | N/A | Yes, I am very concerned about the proposed development of T136. I strongly oppose the development of that block of land. |
| 31129 Mrs Gaynor Brooks | N/A | See No. 40 below |
| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson | N/A | Serious consideration needs to be given to limiting growth and development of the region. What makes Tasman such a great place to live is the open spaces and lack of overcrowding. This is already sadly changing with the rapid population rise. |
| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | N/A | Port Nelson is situated on valuable reclaimed land. The return on assets is weak (Negative). There needs to be a review of the Ports Performance having regard to the Cost of Capital. Look to Australian examples of what could be done here. Read Charles Heaphy's view on where the Port Should be located. Could be done progressively. |
| 31186 Mr Gary Scott | N/A | Spend our rates contributions wisely. Not on vanity projects like a new library which we won't need in 20 years time due to technology, and better types of access to information. It will be a dinosaur which will cost more like \$60mill, not the budgeted \$44mill. |
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | N/A | Yes, this will be a disaster for neighbourhoods like the Wood. I cannot believe that such poor planning is proposed and it truly shows that New Zealand is 40 years behind other countries. |
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | N/A | I do not support, or encourage any councillor to support, the development of the Mahitahi / Bayview development in the Kaka Valley, Maitai Valley area. it beggars belief that the current councillors would consider they have the authority to make any vote on this local treasure. The subterfuge regarding the development has been nothing short of Russian, this is not your decision to make. Do not rezone the Kaka Valley. |
| 31211 Mrs Alison Pickford | N/A | See attached. Summarised - More work opportunities provided close to housing hubs, new schools need to be planned for Disappointed by 'Likely to require further investment in public transport frequency' This has to happen as soon as possible not as a weak aspiration as a vague future date. Motueka is low lying, should we look at the inland road not the valley floor either to begin future developments. |

| 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | N/A | whats FDS ? Unclear question |
|-----------------------------|-----|---|
| 31216 Ms Judith Holmes | N/A | We should NOT encourage population growth. Just because we've expanded recently, doesn't mean we want to or should expect/plan to grow at the rate TDC seems to want/predict. As a country and region we should be taking a far more environmentally sound approach to the future. |
| 31219 Mrs kate windle | N/A | It woulve been good if youd spoken with the landowners, to see if they supported these areas being developed. |
| 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | N/A | I encourage Nelson and specifically our area, Tahunanui to consolidate and intensify housing and commercial to create a destination hub and stay ahead of the ever changing world. |
| 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | N/A | How do you plan to educate the community about how each one of us can contribute to climate change OR can help reduce its effects? |
| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | N/A | Yes, I think you have clearly missed taking into account what the population is telling you on most of these issues. You are not listening, instead barging ahead with your own ideas and plans; you are not representing us fairly. |
| 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | N/A | Focus on the betterment of all society. Not just the well off. Perhaps I feel that more is not always better to have bigger and more, but economic and less. Do we need to encourage an ever increasing size in our community? I would rather see an ever increasing quality of life in our community. Good spirit, community strength and diversity. Healthy modest homes which will last, over and above mass produced characterless structures which may well not hold a good history or character. Dont leave our great and diverse history to the museum and suchlikebuild it into our everyday lives and people. |
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | N/A | I want to submit my support for the intensification of housing in Nelson. We need as many apartments and townhouses as possible, especially in central Nelson. We need to look at areas of wasted land, particularly carparks that could be turned into housing. I want to particularly mention New Street which has a considerable area devoted to car parking. All of these would be very suitable for apartments. We have an increasing number of people with small families or older people whose children have left home and they are looking for smaller properties. The councils need to incentivise the owners of these carparks to turn them into housing. |
| | | We should also be looking at intensifying existing suburbs such as Tahunanui and Stoke and making sure that new developments in Marsden Valley are as intensive as possible. I support development in Kaka Valley if it is done in a way that protects the Maitai River and is intensive. We do not need more urban sprawl. We do not need more houses with large sections around them. |
| | | I am strongly opposed to increasing the use of land for housing in Brightwater Wakefield and Mapua. |
| | | |

| 31261 Mr John Weston | N/A | To me, this appears to be a thoroughly planned event with plenty of deep research well-done. |
|----------------------------|-----|--|
| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | N/A | In conclusion the Draft FDS 2022 -Fails to give enough weight to the list of Community Values and Stakeholder Views. -Fails to meaningfully address climate change and the avoidance of greenfield sites, especially flood plains. -Fails to create a league table of potential greenfield sites e.g. site A would be the first on the list, site Z would be the last based on the potential environmental risks etc. etc. -Fails to meaningfully address concerns that have been raised with regard to questionable demographic modelling. -Fails to define what "affordable" means. Affordability should also include the cost of new infrastructure, not just house prices. But affordable houses built on the cheapest land must also take into account that lower-paid homeowners forced to live in potentially dangerous circumstances with rising insurance costs and depreciating house values. If affordability is important it needs to be defined. -Adds a further controversial greenfield site at Orchard Flats which will further exacerbate the already documented safety, noise, air pollution and climate impacts from construction traffic and new resident's vehicles, plus through traffic if this becomes a temporary or long-term alternative to SH6. Traffic assessments of potential development sites are completely absent from the FDS. |
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | N/A | Please append my earlier submission on the 2022 FDS to this submission, thanks. Please see attached for more detail (conclusion copied below) |
| 31240 Michael Markert | N/A | Growth in the past does not mean it will continue on that rate. Lots of green field developments had beer for the wealthy and retirees. Future housing demand is not more lifestyle blocks but affordable living close to jobs, so living and working in or close by town centers. Extrapolating past figures does not reflect what will or should happen. |
| | | We need to be developing a strategy that has a 20-minute neighbourhood as its goal. Meaning, that people can access all the important things for them within a 20 minute walk, cycle ride, public transport. |
| | | Much of this land is useful horticultural land. More importantly, the majority of these people who live in these properties will be travelling to Nelson on a regular basis. Possibly many of them will commute every day. This will simply clog up our roads, it is unlikely that people living in these villages will travel by public transport or bicycle. This is an old model of city development that we need to reject. We are facing a climate crisis, and creating commuter villages outside of Nelson is not the solution. |

| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | N/A | Current traffic congestion from Whakatu Drive to Three Brothers Corner needs to be addressed as well as allowing for growth. In particular the Lower Queen St area seems to have been developed without any consideration for its impact on the Queen St Gladstone Rd intersection. |
|-------------------------------------|-----|--|
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | N/A | Building upwards is a solutionbut not to the exclusion of citizen's privacy. Having a three stroey building within one metre of your boundary is an invasion of the rights of people to live privately. Not to have the right to object to such buildings is a travesty of justice. High rise buildings should be confined to town centres not suburbs or green field sites. |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | N/A | These are leading questions, multi choice not the way to get feedback. |
| 31284 Mr Jarmo Saloranta | N/A | I will attach a detailed supporting document to this questionnaire. |
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | N/A | No |
| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | N/A | I do. We have to consider adopting a Resource Based Economy. If the outcomes, of all proposals actually, do not meet the absolutely critical Parameters to our survival as an organised species, then we had better do whatever is required to assure them. Doing 'the best we can', simply may not be good enough. We have to do 'whatever is necessary'. Even if this includes currently, for some, unimaginable changes. But we have a duty to make those changes. The short list of the Parameters is as follows: Climate Change Resource Consumption/Renewal Inequality Stress and finally Technological Unemployment As we have established, only by abandoning the monetary system can we assure those parameters are met. Nothing else comes even close. |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | N/A | Please see attached for further details talks about multiple different locations and outcomes. Summarised below: opposes greenfield development, secondary part of proposal does not support creating more compact sustainable areas, Maitai Valley development does not support Outcome 11. Detailed submission on each area, summarised for other questions. |
| 31316 John Heslop | N/A | We believe that rural residential serviced and non serviced should re-look at allowing smaller land parcel sizes. Rural residential lot sizes were set back in the days when the average size of residential were 600-1000 square metres. Residential density has increased with smaller allotment sizes so allowances for rural residential should be factored into the FDS. |
| 31322 Mrs BARBARA AND TIM ROBSON | N/A | Yes - the FDS document is missing an opportunity! The strategy suggests BAU is ok and doesn't include the ideal of Energy Descent" in it's plan - in layman's terms this means that we can't swap Fossil Fuel energy for Clean energy, infrastructure without large scale carbon emissions in the process. The scale of |
| | | |

| | | expansion anticipated by the FDS is not compatible with our regions meeting our climate targets, nor with reducing our ecological footprint |
|----------------------------|-----|--|
| 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | N/A | The development plan states that T136 area is not required to meet future housing needs, if this development is approved it would attract purchasers from far away and that would result in more pressure on our overloaded existing infrastructure and environment. |
| 31325 Dr Ann Briggs | N/A | The FDS 'outcomes' are largely worthy aims. But these aims will never be achieved by simply re-zoning and releasing land for development. There needs to be a strategic infrastructure: green space, walking/cycleways / public transport, land allocated for schools, health, recreation and basic retail, around which housing is developed. Within the permitted housing stock must be houses of all types to meet all needs (not just the needs of developers). |
| 31334 Diane Sutherland | N/A | The FDS reads as a largely a "Business as Usual" strategy. To me it fails to take a strong enough visionary, transformative and science-based view of climate issues, community needs and individual/collective wellbeing. Now is the time for ambitious outcomes, no fiddling around the edges and going ahead with such narrow lenses. |
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | N/A | I agree with a lot of the wording and intention of the FDS draft. However, it leave far, far too much opportunity for it to be bent into a 'business as usual' approach and does not acknowledge the inequities in society, or -if you think this should not be a platform for that- the rights (to healthy homes and work near housing) of all your residents (also the tenants, not only the home owners, as I believe that 'our ratepayers' are ALL, because after all, the tenants pay the rates to the landlords, who then pay it to you) |
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | N/A | The FDS, or better TDC and NCC, are relying on the market to provide for all housing needs. This hasn't worked thus far and I can't see how this will work in the future with just an 'enabling' and 'leave it to the market' strategy. The current toolbox hasn't worked. The FDS needs to identify better delivery mechanisms to achieve what we need. |
| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | N/A | Please favour intensification of existing neighbourhoods, and actively discourage greenfield expansion |
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | N/A | I think more emphasis should be put in providing housing where people want to live. |
| 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | N/A | All 'Outcomes' are well captured in this form. HOWEVER, the proposed strategy will not achieve these. I urge the council to look at what we need - i.e. affordable housing for people who actually live here, work, raise families - NOT people from other regions and parts of the world who want to buy a piece of paradise to retire or invest their money. There is pressing need for eco-friendly TINY HOUSE rules and regulations so young couples can afford to live here and own a home. |

| | | The FDS seems to provide capacity for houses that sell at a high price rather than considering first that we need smaller houses and units close to work, school and public transport. If we continue to sell out our area to outsiders, we'll end up having nothing ourselves. |
|----------------------------|-----|--|
| | | Also, it would be much better to allow people to build up and provide more and smaller units. |
| 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | N/A | FDS is too scared. Civic leaders should think about how scary climate change will be and act with confidence and courage now. |
| 31346 Martin Hartman | N/A | All 'Outcomes' are well captured in this form. HOWEVER, the proposed strategy will not achieve these. I urge the council to look at what we need - i.e. affordable housing for people who actually live here, work, raise families - NOT people from other regions and parts of the world who want to buy a piece of paradise to retire or invest their money. |
| | | There is pressing need for eco-friendly TINY HOUSE rules and regulations so young couples can afford to live here and own a home. |
| | | The FDS seems to provide capacity for houses that sell at a high price rather than considering first that we need smaller houses and units close to work, school and public transport. If we continue to sell out our area to outsiders, we'll end up having nothing ourselves. |
| | | Also, it would be much better to allow people to build up and provide more and smaller units. |
| 31347 Ms Paula Baldwin | N/A | The questions so far have been too generic and have been included to be politically correct. Thankfully, some people with more technical knowledge and skills will have given you their responses, but I would have liked to see a question about - How did you find out about this Development Strategy and opportunity to submit? My answer would be - from the community I live in. Haven't heard anything from the Councils. |
| 31349 Laurien Heijs | N/A | Have made extra comments alongside some of the above objectives (e.g. Q10 response). In addition, I endorse the NelsonTasman2050 submission. |
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | N/A | Strongly oppose intensification along Stepneyville historical precinct |
| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | N/A | I think that it is too easy for Council to write reports using greenwash and do little, given we have a Climate Emergency. This area MUST reduce it's car-use radically, so Councils need to design for no cars. I know that both Councils have been doing this, while the public won't get out of their cars. Development direction has made this much worse. Government leadership has been lacking, and social media has |
| | | ······································ |

| | | created a blizzard of abuse in all directions. Hopefully we will get some sensible leadership from government in May on reduction policy, but I'm not holding my breath. The future is becoming increasingly turbulent. |
|------------------------------|-----|---|
| 31358 George Harrison | N/A | This whole process is a joke |
| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | N/A | Only the details around the practical changes the councils will make to their involvement in plannning. |
| 31360 Ms Thuy Tran | N/A | I am attaching a supporting document. |
| 31363 Mr Steve Cross | N/A | I reject the premise of this question |
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | N/A | Any greenspace areas should be kept for future generations for recreational activities and not used for housing at all. |
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | N/A | I wonder if calling the objectives "outcomes" is actually misleading, given that the strategy does very little to achieve these. |
| | | - selling out the character and land productivity to accommodate everybody who wants to buy a house rather then protection of the landscape |
| | | - missing the focus on providing variety of housing |
| | | - TDC said that the projected very high growth (compared to Nelson) is due to being able to offer stand- |
| | | alone houses on the edge of town. TDC also says that we need greenfield development to accommodate all that growth and that we cannot do that in our existing towns and centres. Why don't we stop offering |
| | | houses in greenfield developments and focus instead on what we really need? This will help deter people |
| | | looking for houses from outside the region. Wouldn't that immediately make it much easier for us to cope with a more manageable growth rate? |
| | | - The FDS seems to provide capacity for houses that are known to sell well rather than considering first what this community really needs. |
| | | - It looks to me that 99% of our existing housing stock consists of large stand alone houses. There is a lot of unmet demand for smaller houses and units. |
| | | - The FDS, or better TDC and NCC, are relying on the market to provide for all housing needs. This hasn't |
| | | worked thus far and I can't see how this will work in the future with just an 'enabling' and 'leave it to the |
| | | market' strategy. The current toolbox hasn't worked. The FDS needs to identify better delivery |
| | | mechanisms to achieve what we need. |
| | | When we try to get more people to live in our centres, how do we make sure that they don't have to live |
| | | in slums? Are there any controls to make sure that everyone has a nice view, gets sunlight and that there are playgrounds for children and families, parks etc.? There is a lot of talk about packing more people |
| | | into our centres, but not a lot about the quality of living conditions that we should provide to make urban |
| | | living an attractive choice. |
| | | It appears that the council is reluctant to intensify and is afraid of local backlash, people objecting against |

| | | change that may change their views or bring more people to their neighbourhoods. I feel that the Counci needs to look past such individual concerns and prioritise doing what is right for all of us as a community. |
|-----------------------------|-----|---|
| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | N/A | Microchip cats - make it your strategy to help control cats and enhance wildlife protection. |
| 31384 Mr Jace Hobbs | N/A | I do not support the greenfield expansion housing anywhere in the Maitai Valley, especially Kaka tributary or Orchard Flats. |
| | | The Nelson Council and then the NZ Government has declared a climate emergency. Extreme weather events are increasing world wide. Nelson Council needs to be evaluating how to mitigate the effects of increased flooding in the very near future, particularly around rivers and particularly around the Maitai river. This is quite apparent when one considers the ongoing flooding crises in New South Wales and Queensland currently and also across all parts of New Zealand. |
| | | It is the duty of the Nelson Council to protect the current housing stocks and not to inflame the situation by allowing further development that will add to the current stock of highly at risk property in the Nelson region. |
| 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett | N/A | Councils need to learn to be innovative and encourage changes that can protect the earth. They need to grasp some nettles and acknowledge some of the elephants in the room. e.g. population growth, global warming, Permanent loss of productive land and protective forest, inappropriate activities on steep land. |
| 31400 Miss Heather Wallace | N/A | Yes limiting growth. Our population needs to remain stable. Extra hosuing can be provided within current infrastructures. We need radical new thinking for our planet not more of the same growth at day price philosophy, just because we " want it ". |
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | N/A | The FDS is not bold enough to address climate change. More needs to be invested in public transport, intensification of housing growth, and low-to-zero carbon housing using more wood and less concrete. |
| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | N/A | Repeat answer to number 10 in relation to Waimea Basin Soils especially as they have critical location reasons for maintaining their productive source related to availability of labour and distribution. The irony of building a dam to supply irrigation water to these soils (in addition to guaranteeing urban water quantities and Waimea river flow minimums) should highlight the need to maintain the remaining area of Waimea Basin Soils for future food production for regional and national consumption and export income. |
| 31405 Mr Doug Hattersley | N/A | Refer to my attachment. |
| | | Summarised below: Objection to Tasman Village proposal Various questions on the detailed typologies proposed in Tasman Village and servicing. Reasons for objection: - expensive servicing - no detail of layout |

| | | or typologies - only supporting landowners for their benefit - process of analysis used in the FDS - traffic impacts - highly productive land (disputes the assumption that T166 has low productive values) - support for existing RC consent at T166 for less intensive resi development (more rural res/lifestyle) |
|--------------------------------|-----|---|
| 31406 Ms Floortje van Lierop | N/A | Re the often mentioned modal shift – our region should aim to become the biking capital of Aotearoa. It could be a serious drawing card and help bring the modal shift about. We have world class recreational trails, now we need the infrastructure in town so people can safely bike everywhere rather than having to take the car. The number of parents in Nelson Whakatū who will not let their children walk or bike because they feel its unsafe, is staggering. The number of teenagers that want to drive (and own!) a car as soon as they can cause its fast and safe, is staggering. It can all change if NCC really invests in cycling and ignores the conservative nay-sayers. The mindset/culture will not shift until the infrastructure is there and can be depended on. |
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle | N/A | Please see uploaded file. |
| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling | N/A | The outcomes should meet the needs of the local community , not developers. This is not evident as there is no cost-befit analysis of the preferred outcomes |
| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling | N/A | We must not sell off our scenic country areas for 3 bedroom stand alone housing when the schools, medical facilities, shops and essential facilities will require these residents to drive their cars evetywhere. Developers must not dictate what happens in our district. Instead, we need to build upwards in our residentialareas to accommodate the people who need to live there. The government has asked for intensification of infill housing -townhouses and flats. That's what we need. The outcomes should meet the needs of the residents. |
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin | N/A | I would like local government to take the lead rather than the developers taking the lead. We do not need more of the same. We need intensification and we need it to be done well, so we do not end up with intensive developments that are future slums. Nelson Tasman has a reputation for beauty and creativity. Those are the two values which we need to work hard to maintain, rather than killing the goose which has laid our golden egg. Unmitigated urban sprawl is at risk of creating a huge new set of problems, not the least of which will be traffic. Tauranga, in particular, is an example of a city whose development has led to huge traffic problems, where none previously existed. |
| 31415 Mrs Zanahe Ruth Galloway | N/A | Please see attached for further detail: FDS should really revise its vision concerning our future with the new reality of Climate Change Emergency with the latest IPCC report confirming that we are in a dire situation if we continue business as usual. Allowing an increase in population in need for housing which means a chocking of cars especially in the the town of Nelson which geographically is not suitable for such an increase with very few alternative road accesses and exits from narrow valleys confined also by the ocean . Reviving small towns like Wakefield for example and other country side villages who need a fresh |

| | | input of new citizens to make them viable friendly secure is where the demand has to be promoted. To allow greedy developers to put houses on wetland (Kaka Valley) too near a river (Maitai River) that will flood again is madness. The Maitai River has flooded in the past and will again with more devastating effects based on the NASA report on the moon cycle wobble. See (https://www.cnet.com > science > nasa-predicts-moon-wobble-and-climate-change-will-lead-to-more-floods-more-often) NASA predicts moon 'wobble' and climate change will lead to more floods, more often The slightest change in the moon's orbit could see big problems for coastal regions.) |
|------------------------------------|-----|---|
| 31416 Tim Leyland | N/A | TDC appear to underestimated the growth potential for Tapawera. |
| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors | N/A | I think it vital that communal green spaces are enhanced, developed and are plentiful. The emotional wellbeing of all our peoples is so important to healthy communities |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | N/A | Building new towns on land held by developers prior to this round of FDS should not be considered. This is not "Town planning" as we traditionally know, its "Town Building" |
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | N/A | Let's provide new, creative options for living in this beautiful area. This proposal seems to be following the status quo - building more conventional houses and gardens that sprawl into our rural areas and sell well; that make profits for our developers and destroy are natural land forever. This strategy needs to 'roll up its sleeves' and work really hard to give us an alternative future, challenging yes, but brighter and healthier. Creative urban intensification with a range of residential options that offer people new types or lifestyles is what is needed. Not more of the same which is what much of this proposal offers. Many people cannot afford traditional houses and don't even want them. They want cheaper, smaller houses and apartments that allow them easy access to work, school and facilities. These developments must be planned carefully to maintain quality of living conditions and there is not much in the proposal about how this can be achieved. We all have to change our expectations of our living environment and hence adapt to the threat of global warming and climate change. |
| 31422 Mrs Marga Martens | N/A | The outcome of more greenfield developments, more traffic for commuting is surely not an outcome we need or want. |
| 31423 Mr Roger Frost | N/A | I don't see anything about the quality of the development that is envisaged, in terms of aesthetics, health, circular economies, durability, character, bringing nature into the city. |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas Hollyman | N/A | We'd like to see Nelson North included in future development & not become 'the forgotten land' |
| 31430 Muriel Moran | N/A | No further comments. |
| | | |

| 31431 Katerina Seligman | N/A | You have not addressed air quality as a result of burn-offs. This is a specific problem that needs specific solutions. Regulation and financial and practical help to growers to transition to clean air for the health of people and the climate. Encourage the making of biochar for soil health, water retention, clean air and climate mitigation. |
|---------------------------------------|-----|--|
| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn Ball | N/A | Re-zooming land from rural to high density residential will change the nature of the community. |
| 31439 Mr Bruce Gilkison | N/A | See attached. National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPSUD) The Objectives of this NPS are important, and can be used to judge whether this FDS actually meets them, in the light of the predictions by climate scientists and IPCC AR6 for our future. Objective 1. New Zealand has well-functioning urban environments that enable all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety now and into the future. (our emphasis) |
| | | Objective 4. Includes future generations when considering changes over time. |
| | | Objective 8 (b) New Zealand's urban environments are resilient to the current and future effects of climate change. |
| | | In summary this FDS does not prepare for the future effects of climate change. The DAPP process will star to do that, particularly because it includes a 100 year time frame. This FDS proposal for intensification in inundation zones, greenfield development and infrastructure proposals before this process has been undertaken does not meet the Objectives of the NPSUD that this Future Development Strategy is based on. |
| 31441 Mr Chris Head | N/A | I think the amount of proposed greenfield expansion is at odds with many elements of the FDS outcomes. You've said you're focused on: |
| | | "Supporting reductions in greenhouse gas emissions by integrating land use and transport" "New housing is focused in areas where people have good access to jobs, services and amenities by public and active transport" "New infrastructure is planned, funded and delivered to integrate with growth and existing infrastructure is used efficiently to support growth" |
| | | - "Nelson Tasman is resilient to and can adapt to the likely future effects of climate change" |
| | | yet you're proposing greenfield expansion in areas that are a long way from any planned public |

| | | transport/walkways/cycleways, and planned/existing industrial/commercial zones. I can't see any planned public transport infrastructure serving planned expansion out to Hira. |
|-----------------------------|-----|---|
| 31443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | N/A | There are two aspects that I feel are not highlighted enough or even contradicted: There has to be a clear reflection in any new housing considerations that we are in a climate change emergency and that it is absolutely crucial to make this first priority. To even suggest Mahitahi and Orchard Flats as potential urbanization options goes totally against the notion of enhancing natural spaces |
| 31452 Mr David Bartle | N/A | Three further outcomes are needed covering 1. Organisational outcomes- A new Urban Regeneration Agency is necessary to meet core housing needs 2 Consistency with Council financial viability 3. Low cost affordable housing |
| 31457 Mr J Santa Barbara | N/A | You have overlooked the issues of energy descent and carrying capacity. Both need to be understood and incorporated into the plan. |
| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | N/A | I do not know what FDS outcomes are. I could check back but it would e helpful if abbreviations are not used invariably. |
| 31460 Kris Woods | N/A | I just saw one mention of schools. Plus, instead of "infilling", purchasing land and creating a Planned Community. Instead of allowing 6 storey buildings in the Wood why not use the great location of the area to create a Planned Community that is of mixed use and highly functioning. Stop the patch work that is determined by Developers and not very positive for really anyone. Many of the older houses in central area are dilapidated and the "newer builds 2000+ are of such poor quality they won't last another 30 years. So why not maximise the area with a Fully Functioning Plan instead of a cobble job of poor quality. |
| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | N/A | The FDS should, but fails to, take a suitably large and integrative view of the key climate issues; • when it is crucial we have innovative, transformative planning (such as TDC's recent draft Walking and Cycling Strategy) we are presented instead with largely a "Business as Usual" plan; • it talks the talk on responding to climate change but does not come near to really walking the walk, and as such it perpetuates many of the problematic activities we must urgently cease, and is grossly inadequate to safeguard our region's future; • it should engage with our energy futures and does not (and expressly avoids renewable electricity), and should also address the inevitability of "energy descent" and transitioning to a low energy society; • it is fundamental that it addresses the daunting decarbonisation trajectory set by the IPCC and our Zero Carbon Act, but it does not even recognise it as a significant factor; • to be plausible, the FDS must identify strategies to undertake urban development that has virtually zero carbon housing - critically shown in BRANZ's world-leading research; |

| | | the FDS must address core viability issues around affordable low-emissions transport to service all future development. It is also seemingly unquestioning in accepting the feeble (under 0.5% per year) rate of urban intensification, which renders such intensification all but ineffective in denting our urban and emissions, and as such becomes be a failure of strategy. The FDS is in essence a "strategy" that perpetuates many of our most climate-damaging activities when we critically need strategies that address them with robustness and urgency. |
|----------------------------|-----|--|
| 31472 Dr David Briggs | N/A | What you describe as outcomes, of course, aren't outcomes: they're objectives or aims. Calling them outcomes simply confuses the issue. What I fail to see in any of these objectives is any explicit reference to other essential interests affected by development: i.e. health, education, culture (art etc), democracy. Why? |
| 31473 Mr Andrew Downs | N/A | Not enough consultation time for the Tasman communities who could be significantly impacted by some of these plans, especially about Tasman Village, Ruby Bay and Mapua. |
| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | N/A | As alluded to in question 6, I would hope there is consideration of a much bigger picture of the future to work back from, like a one hundred year view. |
| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | N/A | I would like to see that any areas with special character, such as scenic places, areas that are productive and seen as important to the people who have lived in these areas for a significant amount of time are maintained. |
| 31485 Ms Robin Schiff | N/A | The current proposals are too weak and mostly 'Business as Usual'. It is making the right noises but not making strong enough proposed plans to safeguard or plan our region's future. It needs stronger decarbonisation trajectories in transport and for urban development planning. Low to zero carbon housing must be facilitated. All future development must be planned for with low emissions public transport to service it. Urban intensification must occur far faster than proposed. |
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | N/A | I believe that the consultation time has been too short, especially with regard to the secondary proposal which would have significant impact for the local community. I feel this has been rushed through. |
| 31487 Ms Heather Spence | N/A | As long as TDC does not MISS THE POINT of responses to this strategy, it has a good start for future development planning. |
| | | The TDC FDS proposal states 'managed greenfield expansion' - TDC's expansion strategy has not been managed well in the past (eg housing west of Richmond, Mapua - all low density and on greenfield sites) so I hope any future greenfield expansion will be managed better that previously. |
| 31488 Annette Starink | N/A | Probably Can't think of right now |
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | N/A | I think calling the objectives "outcomes" is actually misleading, given that the strategy does very little to |
| | | |

| | | achieve these. It seems like we are selling out the character and productivity of our beautiful landscape to accommodate everybody who wants to buy a house here. We should protect what makes our region so special and focus more on providing more variety in housing choices, which will also provide for cheaper |
|---|-----|---|
| | | options in our towns and centres, helping the resident polulation. TDC said that the projected very high growth (compared to Nelson) is due to being able to offer stand-alone houses on the edge of town. TDC also says that we need greenfield development to accommodate all that growth and that we cannot do that in our existing towns and centres. Consider this: why don't we stop offering houses in greenfield developments and focus instead on what we really need? This will help deter people looking for houses from outside the region. Wouldn't that immediately make it much easier for us to cope with a more manageable growth rate? The FDS seems to provide capacity for houses that are known to sell well rather than considering first what our community really needs. It appears that 99% of our existing housing stock consists of large stand- alone houses. There is a lot of unmet demand for smaller houses and units though Some people are worried that intensification would make us all live in apartments. I think that our councils need to communicate a bit clearer that by |
| | | redeveloping house sites to accommodate more smaller units, we would actually get closer to a housing mix that is better aligned with our real demand. There would still be plenty of traditional houses left for people who prefer them - even without building any new ones. The FDS, or better TDC and NCC, are relying on the market to provide for all housing needs. This hasn't worked to date and I can't see how this will work in the future with just an 'enabling' and 'leave it to the market' strategy. The current idealogy hasn't worked. The FDS needs to identify better delivery mechanisms to achieve what we need. Why do we have such strict zoning rules in our centres that hardly let us build up or house more residents on our land and then argue that we need greenfield expansion to cope with growth? Wouldn't it make more sense to allow people to build up and provide more and smaller units (e.g. divide their large house into a number of independent flats) in our existing centres |
| 31491 Ms Annette Milligan | N/A | I do not get any sense of urgency about the need for climate change mitigation. The latest IPCC Report is clear - this is a crisis and time is rapidly running out. The plan I see presented has a terrifying 'business as usual' feel. |
| 31492 Anton, Benni, Shalom, AJ Bank, Bonnin, Shalom Davis | N/A | The FDS fails to, take a strongly visionary, transformative and science-based view of climate issues, but it is largely a "Business as Usual" strategy. It talks the talk on responding to climate change but does not come near to walking the walk, and is thus a grossly inadequate basis on which to safeguard or plan our region's future. It needs to engage deeply with energy; critical decarbonisation trajectories; transport, with urban development that strongly facilitates the low-to-zero carbon housing critically shown in BRANZ's world-leading research. |

| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | N/A | I think the questions are misleading and appear to be structured to make people tick the agree box as I mostly agree with the outcomes but I don't believe the strategy as written will achieve them. I believe intensification in the major centres is better that more greenfield development but there should be more detail as to what that intensification would look like. |
|------------------------|-----|---|
| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | N/A | Calling objectives 'outcomes' is misleading. The FDS should report back on whether the objectives are met or not. FDS seems to provide for houses that are known to sell rather than what the community needs. A lot of unmet demand for smaller houses and units. The FDS needs to identify better delivery mechanisms to achieve what we need. A lot of talk about packing more people into our centres but not a lot about improving the quality of living conditions. |
| 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | N/A | I wonder if calling the objectives "outcomes" is actually misleading, given that the strategy does very little to achieve these. |
| | | It seems like we are selling out the character and productivity of our beautiful landscape to accommodate everybody who wants to buy a house here. Maybe we should protect what makes our region so special and focus more on providing more variety in housing choices, which will also provide for cheaper options in our towns and centres, helping our resident population. TDC said that the projected very high growth (compared to Nelson) is due to being able to offer standalone houses on the edge of town. TDC also says that we need greenfield development to accommodate all that growth and that we cannot do that in our existing towns and centres. Here's an idea: why don't we stop offering houses in greenfield developments and focus instead on what we really need? This will help deter people looking for houses from outside the region. Wouldn't that immediately make it much easier for us to cope with a more manageable growth rate? The FDS seems to provide capacity for houses that are known to sell well rather than considering first what our community really needs. It looks to me that 99% of our existing housing stock consists of large stand alone houses. There is a lot of unmet demand for smaller houses and units though. Some people are worried that intensification would |
| | | make us all live in apartments. I think that our councils need to communicate a bit clearer that by redeveloping house sites to accommodate more smaller units, we would actually get closer to a housing mix that is better aligned with our real demand. There would still be plenty of traditional houses left for people who prefer them - even without building any new ones. The FDS, or better TDC and NCC, are relying on the market to provide for all housing needs. This hasn't |
| | | worked thus far and I can't see how this will work in the future with just an 'enabling' and 'leave it to the market' strategy. The current toolbox hasn't worked. The FDS needs to identify better delivery mechanisms to achieve what we need. Why do we have such strict zoning rules in our centres that hardly let us build up or house more residents |

| | | on our land and then argue that we need greenfield expansion to cope with growth? Wouldn't it make more sense to allow people to build up and provide more and small |
|--------------------------------|-----|---|
| 31496 Mrs Petra Dekker | N/A | refer to attachment: They should not be called 'outcomes' but rather 'objectives'. An objective is what you want to achieve, whereas an outcome is what you have achieved. Objectives always need to be tested. |
| 31499 Ms Jane Fisher | N/A | The latest IPCC report: "This report is a dire warning about the consequences of inaction," said Hoesung Lee, Chair of the IPCC. "It shows that climate change is a grave and mounting threat to our wellbeing and a healthy planet. Our actions today will shape how people adapt and nature responds to increasing climate risks." No development should be created that does not have public transport within walking distance. The council should say where that is, ie: intensifying existing areas close to the CBD, not leave it to 'demand'. It should encourage de-carbonisation in the building industry. and design urban landscapes that will strengthen community. |
| 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | N/A | I don't agree that we need so much growth. |
| 31502 Ms Caroline Jones | N/A | Please see comments in question 3 |
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | N/A | regarding the Tasman Village, there is no big demand to move in the Waimea Plains, so why let developers change the building regulations for their interests. Productive land will be sacrificed for housing that attracts people who can afford it. This is no answer to our demand for affordable housing close to jobs. It will need funding for infrastructure for people's lifestyle choices instead. Money that could be spent on making living more affordable for families. The way the Tasman Village is introduced in the Strategy is undemocratic as it is not presented adequately but sneaked into a wider strategy. The public is not really aware of the size of the impact and therefore doesn't have a chance for valid submissions. Nobody is aware that Tasman Village will have the population of Motueka. |
| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | N/A | The FDS should, but fails to, take a strongly visionary, transformative and science-based view of climate issues. It is largely a "Business as Usual" strategy. It is an inadequate basis on which to safeguard or plan our region's future. It needs to engage deeply with the more efficient use of energy, decarbonisation, and urban development that strongly facilitates low-to-zero carbon emission housing developments. It should focus more on a robust and viable strategy for effective, affordable, low-emissions public transport to service all future development. and incentivize urban intensification far faster than the 0.5% per year described. |
| 31511 Mr Vincent Riepen | N/A | No mention has been made to the adverse health issues that will be created, and loss in capital values minimum 10% to 50% market value. Where the FDS is proposed very few exiting homes are compliant with minimum insulation and heating |

| | | standards. This proposal will have an adverse effect on health and wellbeing of existing occupiers with colder and damper homes as they are not constructed to exist in high density development. Several initiatives (\$400 heating subsidy) and regulations imposed (rental homes standards) to improve housing standards - this proposal reverses these gains and will place others particularly those unable to afford increased energy cost to maintain their health and well being at risk. |
|----------------------|-----|--|
| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | N/A | NMH does note that the following outcomes have not been included as priority areas and NMH continue to advocate for their inclusion a. Social housing is considered as an important component of housing supply b. NMH would like to see the adoption of inclusionary zoning into greenfield developments. Inclusionary zoning can offer opportunities to expand access to affordable housing and to encourage economic opportunity by reducing the proportion of family income spent on rent, building wealth through homeownership, and creating or preserving mixed-income neighbourhoods. Local governments should be able to use inclusionary zoning, which requires a portion to be retained for affordable housing, as rental or for-sale units, in return for benefits such as fast-tracked consenting, density bonuses, zoning variances reduced mandatory fees, or other appropriate incentives. Inclusionary zoning is one of a range of tools to use where there is a mismatch between what the market is delivering and what the local community needs to house its workforce and under-served communities. Queenstown Lakes District Council, with developer support, piloted this policy to show how low-moderate income New Zealanders can get into safe, warm, affordable homes. The Council has combined this with shared home ownership and rental programmes. Research on this project found no significant variation in house price changes in Queenstown between houses neighbouring affordable properties and control groups and that the benefits clearly outweigh any risks. The planning provisions need to require retention of the affordable housing in perpetuity in the social sector, or similar. The likes of Community Action Nelson and Habitat for Humanity could be engaged in the process c. As intensification occurs, provision and access to green space becomes increasingly important for people's mental and physical health as well as the urban ecology d. House affordability can impact people's wellbeing therefore it is essential that houses remain affordable so that |
| 31515 Geoffrey Vause | N/A | The population predictions presented do not indicate how the impact of variables will be factored into a 30 year plan. This is a very long time frame and, as judged by the historic data, the many peaks and troughs of population growth in the province have been resultant from influences that may be predictab |

| | | but in many cases, will be black swan events ie unpredictable. Therefore there need to be not only a continual review of the predictable population changes but also resilience needs to be introduced into the FDS to cope with significant events such as brain drain verse gain associated with easing of border restrictions. |
|---------------------------|-----|--|
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers | N/A | there need to be action in both the short and long terms, a full review will take to long and prices will continue to rise and people miss out on housing that is needed. long term we can plan for better outcomes, but that seems along way away, maybe 10y? the consultation / construction time frame is very long time away. |
| 31523 Ms karen steadman | N/A | Yes you have chosen to overlook how vast an area the TDC is and the distances people have to travel for the basics. The lack of public transport is a cost individual families that live in the smaller towns have to bear, this is why the smaller towns need to be developed to be more self sufficient, so the need to travel to bigger centres is minimised. |
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | N/A | I believe we should be doing more to protecting our regional landscape from sprawling housing development and focus more on providing more variety and cheaper options in housing within our towns and centres without relying on the market to provide all housing needs. The FDS seems to provide capacity for houses that are known to sell well rather than considering first what our community really needs. |
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | N/A | There are far too many that have similar outcomes/responses. The process seems to be designed to overwhelm considered response & cause people to just give up input! |
| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard | N/A | To protect recreational and natural areas that serve the mental and physical well-being of the community such as the Maitai Valley. |
| 31533 Wendy Trevett | N/A | The FDS needs to be revised to reduce the amount of rural land being turned into Greenfield space and there needs to be more residential development in cities and towns where access is close to work and commercial areas. |
| 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | N/A | Refer to full submission. Summarised below (similar to NT2050 submission): singluar focus on growth, challenges underlying growth projections, insufficient consultation, misleading submission form (outcome questions), community feedback ignored, biased process, non-compliance with government directives. Recommends re-think of the draft. |
| 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery | N/A | I am concerned that you have not allowed for business growth to support the boom in residential development areas- saying that there is enough room in the main centres. This does not fit within the preferred outcomes of National policies which aim to reduce travel. I also think you are underestimating |

| | | the population growth in some areas. |
|------------------------|-----|--|
| 31554 Wendy Barker | N/A | A lot. You have had a lot of time to prepare this but have given the public very little. |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | N/A | I find these 'FDS outomes' skewed. In this FDS plan and supporting webinars there appears to be a lack of a basic 'community development' process including creative, smart, visionary urban design on the big questions - where people live and the connection to communities, services & amenities they need; who lives there; what they may require housing options; how they are socially connected; how they get from a-b; how they recreate; to ensure balanced demographics etc etc. the FDS feels devoid of people. Let's ensure the future is something we can be proud of. |
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | N/A | Yes. There is no mention of wildlife corridors. Where are the birds and other taonga of New Zealand's native flora and fauna going to retreat when the coastal erosion takes away nesting and fishing habitat? Humans are on a collision course with the natural world that sustains and revives us in these coastal communities. We need to learn to protect our natural taonga. Mountains to forest to lowlands to sea is a wildlife corridor. This is a unique community full of natural beauty. The humans who are paying their rates are largely comprised of bird enthusiasts and volunteers who trap predators and plant native trees, because they understand the value of restoring nature. Our FDS needs to reflect this. |
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | N/A | YES In Takaka two areas were earlier considered and approved by TDC for residential use, 1 was the area now being subdivided opposite the school - expected to deliver 100 houses, 2 was the Haldane block adjacent to the hospital - ? 3. was the Arapeta Place site that was rejected - further appeals resulted in the current site of 45 affordable homes - almost completely built on and all sold. TDC states that they consulted with stakeholders on Sept 23, 2021? many not aware or notified. 5 October attended a webinar with no mention of GB and told it was still being formulated, 12 October TDC met with GB Community board - still no one contacted the stakeholders who had repeatedly asked to meet. At this stage of development of the Takaka & Collingwood sites, helpful information could have identified suitable areas for consideration delivering POSITIVE OUTCOMES |
| 31562 Grant palliser | N/A | with all progress there is undoubtedly a cost. My bronze hand sculpture (outside the Stoke Library) 'Oraclethe future is in our hands'but don't let opportunity slip through your fingersreflects this sentiment. Initially making reference to the destruction of indigenous forest for exotic species at the expense of powellephanta land snail colonies 20 plus years ago, it is no less relevant to the issues facing TDC and NCC today and in the years ahead. It is imperative that consequences are assets inedible and understood. Once arable land (Berryfields) reverts to housing, once land forms are engineered, lowered, filled or reclaimed, they are lost for ever. It is imperative that we meet the needs of the entire demographic. There are inadequate options for the |

| | older of our residents who wish to downsize yet remain in the neighborhood the know and whom knows themconnectivity and sense of communitywell being in a nutshell! By creating large areas of greenfield, stand alone large house dormitory suburbs that meet the needs of the present purchasers, 40 years down the track the same inadequacy for older folk will have increased exponentially. LAs must set parameters for developers to meet the needs of existing constituents. |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk N/A | I wonder if calling the objectives "outcomes" is actually misleading, given that the strategy does very little to achieve these. |
| | Here's an idea: why don't we stop offering houses in greenfield developments and focus instead on what we really need? This will help deter people looking for houses from outside the region. Wouldn't that immediately make it much easier for us to cope with a more manageable growth rate? The FDS seems to provide capacity for houses that are known to sell well rather than considering first what our community really needs. It looks to me that 99% of our existing housing stock consists of large standalone houses. There is a lot of unmet demand for smaller houses and units though. Some people are worried that intensification would make us all live in apartments. I think that our councils need to communicate a bit clearer that by redeveloping house sites to accommodate more smaller units, we would actually get closer to a housing mix that is better aligned with our real demand. There would still be plenty of traditional houses left for people who prefer them - even without building any new ones. The FDS, or better TDC and NCC, are relying on the market to provide for all housing needs. This hasn't worked thus far and I can't see how this will work in the future with just an 'enabling' and 'leave it to the market' strategy. The current toolbox hasn't worked. The FDS needs to identify better delivery mechanisms to achieve what we need. Why do we have such strict zoning rules in our centres that hardly let us build up or house more resident on our land and then argue that we need greenfield expansion to cope with growth? Wouldn't it make more sense to allow people to build up and provide more and smaller units (e.g. divide their large house |
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer N/A | I wonder if calling the objectives "outcomes" is actually misleading, given that the strategy does very little to achieve these. It seems like we are selling out the character and productivity of our beautiful landscape to accommodate everybody who wants to buy a house here. Maybe we should protect what makes our region so special and focus more on providing more variety in housing choices, which will also provide for cheaper |

| | | options in our towns and centres, helping our resident polulation. |
|---------------------|-----|---|
| | | TDC said that the projected very high growth (compared to Nelson) is due to |
| | | being able to offer stand-alone houses on the edge of town. TDC also says that |
| | | we need greenfield development to accommodate all that growth and that we |
| | | cannot do that in our existing towns and centres. Here's an idea: why don't we |
| | | stop offering houses in greenfield developments and focus instead on what we |
| | | really need? This will help deter people looking for houses from outside the |
| | | region. Wouldn't that immediately make it much easier for us to cope with a |
| | | more manageable growth rate? |
| | | The FDS seems to provide capacity for houses that are known to sell well rather |
| | | than considering first what our community really needs. |
| | | It looks to me that 99% of our existing housing stock consists of large stand- |
| | | alone houses. There is a lot of unmet demand for smaller houses and units |
| | | though. Some people are worried that intensification would make us all live in |
| | | apartments. I think that our councils need to communicate a bit clearer that by |
| | | redeveloping house sites to accommodate more smaller units, we would |
| | | actually get closer to a housing mix that is better aligned with our real demand. |
| | | There would still be plenty of traditional houses left for people who prefer them - |
| | | even without building any new ones. |
| | | The FDS, or better TDC and NCC, are relying on the market to provide for all |
| | | housing needs. This hasn't worked thus far and I can't see how this will work in |
| | | the future with just an 'enabling' and 'leave it to the market' strategy. The current |
| | | toolbox hasn't worked. The FDS needs to identify better delivery mechanisms to achieve what we need. |
| | | Why do we have such strict zoning rules in our centres that hardly let us build |
| | | up or house more residents on our land and then argue that we need greenfield |
| | | expansion to cope with growth? Wouldn't it make more sense to allow people to build up and provide |
| | | more and smaller units (e.g. divide their large house into |
| | | a number of independent flats) in our existing centres? |
| 569 Ms Joni Tomsett | N/A | I think that in the past, the "market" has dictated the housing availability within Nelson and Tasman b |
| | | there is a strong need for alternative housing modes. Richmond and Nelson are one of the most |
| | | unsustainable places to rent, we need to increase the supply for all people and I think TDC need to be |
| | | more bold in enabling intensified development. Christchurch is a prime example of higher density, a |
| | | beautiful city with a thriving CBD. |

| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | N/A | I think you've totally got it wrong. Greed and profit driven in the name of 'progress' See below in Q40 |
|----------------------------|-----|---|
| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | N/A | I think you should serious re-address your projected population growth assumptions. Past growth is not necessarily an indicator of what is likely in the future |
| 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | N/A | It is very short sighted, it is an old fashioned way of thinking, it lacks true long term crative planning to address key issues such as climate change, protecting the environment, reducing pollution. Continuing to expand and build as is currently done just results in the same outcome. It is all driven by a handful of developers who have their own interests in mind. |
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins | N/A | Several things: the FDS should, but fails to, take a strongly visionary, transformative and science-based view of climate issues, but it is largely a "Business as Usual" strategy. It talks the talk on responding to climate change but does not come near to walking the walk, and is thus a grossly inadequate basis on which to safeguard or plan our region's future. It needs to engage deeply with energy; critical decarbonisation trajectories; transport, with urban development that strongly facilitates the low-to-zero carbon housing critically shown in BRANZ's world-leading research. It must offer a robust and viable strategy for effective, affordable, low-emissions public transport to service all future development. and propel urban intensification far faster than the feeble 0.5% per year described. |
| 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | N/A | I wonder if calling the objectives "outcomes" is actually misleading, given that the strategy does very little to achieve these. Here's an idea: why don't we stop offering houses in greenfield developments and focus instead on what we really need? This will help deter people looking for houses from outside the region. Wouldn't that immediately make it much easier for us to cope with a more manageable growth rate? The FDS seems to provide capacity for houses that are known to sell well rather than considering first what our community really needs. Most of our existing housing stock consists of large standalone houses. There is a lot of unmet demand for smaller houses and units though. Some people are worried that intensification would make us all live in apartments. I think that our councils need to communicate a bit clearer that by redeveloping house sites to accommodate more smaller units, we would actually get close to a housing mix that is better aligned with our real demand. There would still be plenty of traditional houses left for people who prefer them - even without building any new ones. The FDS, or better TDC and NCC, are relying on the market to provide for all housing needs. This hasn't worked thus far and I can't see how this will work in the future with just an 'enabling' and 'leave it to the market' strategy. The current toolbox hasn't worked. The FDS needs to identify better delivery mechanisms to achieve what we need. Why do we have such strict zoning rules in our centres that hardly let us build up or house more residents on our land and then argue that we need greenfield expansion to cope with growth? Wouldn't it make more sense to allow people to build up and provide more and smaller units in our existing centres? |

| 31593 Mr William Samuels | N/A | Refer to submission by Nelson Tasman 2050 |
|------------------------------------|-----|--|
| 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner | N/A | Especially reading the FDS outcomes for the TDC region — it does feel to have a major focus on development lead opportunities and growth rather than where the jobs are and with it is not focused on climate change and reducing GHG emissions. Offering constantly to expand with new greenfield site deter people to actively choose what we actually need for the future. Co-living ideas, building within, with the communities to make them better communities. i.e. Mapua — here the character has been lost I think — so adding more stand alone housing options won't bring that back. Nor are there the jobs that would qualify to sprawl Too there is a need to address keeping young people here, giving them options of smaller houses, etc. Intensification doesn't mean all apartments, our councils need to be clearer or enthusiastic that by redeveloping house sites to accommodate more smaller units, we would actually get closer to a housing mix that is better aligned with our real demand. There would still be plenty of traditional houses left for people who prefer them - even without building any new ones. The FDS, or rather I am too concerned about the proposed backyard fill ins — how is it ensured that these are actually places to ensure good living conditions? Views to enjoy, light that isn't restricted by fences or too close to a multi storey building? I think councils should provide to make urban living an attractive choice. And to help people see the value in intensification as a community and reduce the individual concerns. It can't brush off that responsibility to educate the people it is serving to be diligent in their future needs in respect to climate change and reducing of GHG emissions by a FDS that seems guiding by the feedbakc of outdated desires, rather than the need to doing much much better! I found it frustrating to read statements from TDC - like an excuse to follow people rather than being leaders. |
| 31595 Gary Clark | N/A | The FDS does not provide any new commercial areas for the Mapua area. This will require new communities to travel out of the area to work which is against the NPSUD. T-125 area has been dismissed without any engagement with land owners. |
| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | N/A | I wonder if calling the objectives "outcomes" is actually misleading, given that the strategy does very little to achieve these. It seems like we are selling out the character and productivity of our beautiful landscape to accommodate everybody who wants to buy a house here. Maybe we should protect what makes our region so special and focus more on providing more variety in housing choices, which will also provide for cheaper options in our towns and centres, helping our resident polulation. TDC said that the projected very high growth (compared to Nelson) is due to being able to offer standalone houses on the edge of town. TDC also says that we need greenfield development to accommodate |

all that growth and that we cannot do that in our existing towns and centres. Here's an idea: why don't we stop offering houses in greenfield developments and focus instead on what we really need? This will help deter people looking for houses from outside the region. Wouldn't that immediately make it much easier for us to cope with a more manageable growth rate?

The FDS seems to provide capacity for houses that are known to sell well rather than considering first what our community really needs.

It looks to me that 99% of our existing housing stock consists of large stand- alone houses. There is a lot of unmet demand for smaller houses and units though. Some people are worried that intensification would make us all live in apartments. I think that our councils need to communicate a bit clearer that by redeveloping house sites to accommodate more smaller units, we would actually get closer to a housing mix that is better aligned with our real demand. There would still be plenty of traditional houses left for people who prefer them - even without building any new ones.

The FDS, or better TDC and NCC, are relying on the market to provide for all housing needs. This hasn't worked thus far and I can't see how this will work in the future with just an 'enabling' and 'leave it to the market' strategy. The current toolbox hasn't worked. The FDS needs to identify better delivery mechanisms to achieve what we need.

Why do we have such strict zoning rules in our centres that hardly let us build up or house more residents on our land and then argue that we need greenfield expansion to cope with growth? Wouldn't it make more sense to allow people to build up and provide more and smaller units (e.g. divide their large house into a number of independent flats) in our existing centres

31600 Ms Jane FAIRS

N/A

It seems like we are selling out the character and productivity of our landscape to accommodate everybody who wants to buy a house here. We should protect what makes our region special and focus more on

providing variety in housing choices.

TDC said that the projected very high growth is due to being able to offer stand-alone houses on the edge of town. TDC also says that we need greenfield development to accommodate all that growth and that we cannot do that in our existing towns and centres. Why don't we stop offering houses in greenfield developments and focus instead on what we really need? This will help deter people looking for houses from outside the region. Wouldn't that immediately make it much easier for us to cope with a more manageable growth rate?

The FDS seems to provide capacity for houses that are known to sell well rather than considering first what our community really needs. There is a lot of unmet demand for smaller houses and units. Some people are worried intensification would make us all live in apartments. I think our councils need to communicate that by redeveloping house sites to accommodate more smaller units, we would actually get closer to a housing mix that is better aligned with our real demand.

The FDS, or better TDC and NCC, are relying on the market to provide for all housing needs. This hasn't

| | worked thus far and I can't see how this will work in the future with just an 'enabling' and 'leave it to the market' strategy. The FDS needs to identify better delivery mechanisms to achieve what we need. Why do we have such strict zoning rules in our centres that hardly let us build up or house more residents on our land and then argue that we need greenfield expansion to cope with growth? Wouldn't it make more sense to allow people to build up and provide more and smaller units (e.g. divide their large house into a number of independent flats) in our existing centres? It would be good to see a stronger strategy for Nelson City Centre, where 6000 people come to work everyday but only about 100 people liveIt appears that the council is reluctant to intensify and is afraid of local backlash, people objecting against change that may change their views or bring more people to their neighbourhoods. I feel that the Council needs to look past such individual concerns and prioritise doing what is right for all of us as a community. |
|-----|---|
| N/A | I don't think you should allow intensification in the wood to allow unrestricted development to 6 stories hi I think this is a mistake. I think Sam intensification should be allowed, especially on large sections, and maybe up to 3 levels high for apartment dwellings. But not six that will not suit the area and will turn the wood from a pretty suburb into one that looks like a gulag. |
| N/A | As above, there should be a carbon mitigation outcome. |
| | Councils need to consider how they will measure success, in the context of these outcomes. It is not just a matter for strategy setting, but subsequent performance measurement as well. |
| | The FDS relies on the market to provide for all housing needs. This hasn't worked thus far and I can't see how this will work in the future with just an 'enabling' and 'leave it to the market' strategy. The current toolbox hasn't worked. The FDS needs to identify better delivery mechanisms to achieve what we need. |
| | Why do we have such strict zoning rules in our centres that hardly let us build up or house more residents on our land and then argue that we need greenfield expansion to cope with growth? Wouldn't it make more sense to allow people to build up and provide more and smaller units (e.g. divide their large house into a number of independent flats) in our existing centres? It would be good to see a stronger strategy for Nelson City Centre, where 6000 people come to work everyday but only about 100 people live |
| N/A | The future will be electric, mostly solar powered. New building whether residential or commercial should be energy sufficient, ie provide enough power for its own needs. Easy to do at build stage, and should be part of any planning strategy. The days of dragging power from the southern lakes and losing one third in transmission losses and having |
| | N/A |

| | | to use each to top up should and |
|-------------------------|-----|--|
| | | to use coal to top up should end. |
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | N/A | I think examples of town and city centre housing in other parts of the country or the world could be used as examples of how a more intense housing strategy can work in town centres, rather than having token intensification backed up by spreading out wider and wider into the countryside with greenfield developments of separate houses each on its own section, a formula which many can't afford. If town centre living was done thoughtfully with open spaces and gardens and walkways it could provide more homes for more people, many of whom could walk or bike to work, reducing commuting times and carbon emissions. |
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | N/A | I think if you let development be led by developers, they will utilise it to maximise their profits, not provide us with what our region needs. |
| | | The housing strategy needs to be defined, and upheld, supporting the different needs the region has, these excellent ideas and insights mentioned above, or else it will never happen. A vision for housing is needed to lead this, and then it needs to be governed so that it is executed. |
| | | The beauty of the area leads a lot of people to live here. Poorly considered housing will destroy that, hurt our land, tax our resources, our spirit. It's just that important. |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | N/A | I wonder if calling the objectives "outcomes" is actually misleading, given that the strategy does very little to achieve these. Here's an idea: why don't we stop offering houses in greenfield developments and focus instead on what we really need? This will help deter people looking for houses from outside the region. Wouldn't that immediately make it much easier for us to cope with a more manageable growth rate? The FDS seems to provide capacity for houses that are known to sell well rather than considering first what our community really needs. Most of our existing housing stock consists of large standalone houses. There is a lot of unmet demand for smaller houses and units though. Some people are worried that intensification would make us all live in apartments. I think that our councils need to communicate a bit clearer that by redeveloping house sites to accommodate more smaller units, we would actually get closer to a housing mix that is better aligned with our real demand. There would still be plenty of traditional houses left for people who prefer them - even without building any new ones. The FDS, or better TDC and NCC, are relying on the market to provide for all housing needs. This hasn't worked thus far and I can't see how this will work in the future with just an 'enabling' and 'leave it to the market' strategy. The current toolbox hasn't worked. The FDS needs to identify better delivery mechanisms to achieve what we need. Why do we have such strict zoning rules in our centres that hardly let us build up or house more residents on our land and then argue that we need greenfield expansion to cope with growth? Wouldn't it make more sense to allow people to build up and provide more and smaller units in our existing centres? |

| 31617 Ms steph jewell | N/A | Yes. What's the number one problem? GHGs/global warming. As I said I think it mostly comes from transport, (dairy) farming and food waste. So TDC, the 80kph speed limit over the whole district? Car-free days? Free public transport? Shared E-bikes and cars. New apartments to have no garages but residents get first dibs on the shared E-transport. limits on dairying, quickly. Only renewable products to be used. I don't know what to do about food waste apart from raise awareness, and educate people so that supermarket shopping is not the be-all and end-all of their lives. |
|----------------------------|-----|---|
| 31623 Ms Lucy Charlesworth | N/A | I am wary of answering these questions as I cannot be sure of how they will be interpreted. So I will state I do not agree with developing green spaces. These spaces need to be reserved and protected to allow fo sustainable biodiversity and for future generations. Intensification within Nelson CBD needs to be a priority. I do not agrees with building on Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. I do not agree with housing development on green fields. There is a climate emergency. Remove these areas from the FDS. |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | N/A | C/o-NT2050 I wonder if calling the objectives "outcomes" is actually misleading, given that the strategy does very little to achieve these. It seems like we are selling out the character and productivity of our beautiful landscape to accommodate everybody who wants to buy a house here. Maybe we should protect what makes our region so special and focus more on providing more variety in housing choices, which will also provide for cheaper options in our towns and centres, helping our resident polulation. TDC said that the projected very high growth (compared to Nelson) is due to being able to offer stand-alone houses on the edge of town. TDC also says that we need greenfield development to accommodate all that growth and that we cannot do that in our existing towns and centres. Here's an idea: why don't we stop offering houses in greenfield developments and focus instead on what we really need? This will help deter people looking for houses from outside the region. Wouldn't that immediately make it much easier for us to cope with a more manageable growth rate? The FDS seems to provide capacity for houses that are known to sell well rather than considering first what our community really needs. It looks to me that 99% of our existing housing stock consists of large standalone houses. There is a lot of unmet demand for smaller houses and units though. Some people are worried that intensification would make us all live in apartments. I think that our councils need to communicate a bit clearer that by |

| | | redeveloping house sites to accommodate more smaller units, we would actually get closer to a housing mix that is better aligned with our real demand. There would still be plenty of traditional houses left for people who prefer them - even without building any new ones. The FDS, or better TDC and NCC, are relying on the market to provide for all housing needs. This hasn't worked thus far and I can't see how this will work in the future with just an 'enabling' and 'leave it to the market' strategy. The current toolbox hasn't worked. The FDS needs to identify better delivery mechanisms to achieve what we need. Why do we have such strict zoning rules in our centres that hardly let us build up or house more residents on our land and then argue that we need greenfield expansion to cope with growth? Wouldn't it make more sense to allow people to build up and provide more and smaller units. |
|-----------------------------|-----|--|
| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | N/A | The proposed plan change for Mapua is flawed as there is not the job opportunities in this region to support the population increase. It will clearly make Mapua a Dormitory Town requiring long commutes to employment centres like Nelson, Richmond and Motueka. Further, because there are no planned shopping, services nor recreation areas planned for the new developments, those residents will have to commute to Mapua (or further afield). Hence the need for a car. And once people require cars to do every-day activities, the car culture will remain and green house gas reductions from transport will not occur. It does not take great skill to model the impact on green house gas increases from this large increase in residents commuting to higher population centres. |
| 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | N/A | There is no reference to climate emergency. |
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | N/A | Outcomes? A bland sea of ticky tacky houses that the occupants have to buy vehicles to get anywhere from? That's the outcome that is likely to happen if councils don't smarten up their act a LOT. |
| 31628 Mr Daniel Levy | N/A | It is totally irresponsible not to have considered the loss in recreational amenity of the Maitai Valley for all current and future Nelson residents if the proposed 1100 houses are eventually built in the Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats area. The current rural character of the recreation reserves, river and swimming holes, Nelson's Taonga, would be forever lost. This cannot be mitigated by the provision of a few new walking and cycle trails on the private development land. |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | N/A | Not enough emphasis on the climate emergency. |
| 31631 Mrs Joy Shackleton | N/A | The special role of Tahunanui!! |
| 31633 Ms Jacquetta Bell QSM | N/A | The FDS as it stands takes a 'business as usual' approach. It needs to do much more to address energy use, transport including public transport, low carbon housing, urban intensification, repurposing of |
| | | |

| | | buildings and other measures to reduce carbon emissions. |
|---------------------------------|-----|---|
| 31636 Joanna Santa Barbara | N/A | File uploaded. |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | N/A | Additional areas within the St Arnaud township could be made available for residential development |
| 31641 Mr Stephen (Steve) Hayden | N/A | Strong consideration should be given to developing and including policies on: |
| | | 1. Provision of power through solar arrays |
| | | 2. Extending the cycleways to include 'bridleways for horse riding to encourage safe recreation and encourage non fossil fuel transport |
| | | 3. All development should include green access |
| | | 4. Sustainable homes |
| | | 5. Affordable homes |
| 31643 Inge Koevoet | N/A | I do not support the planned intensification zones of Tahunanui. Traffic is an issue, no supermarket, so where are all these extra people going to go. Tahuna needs a supermarket before you start lumping more people here. Sunlight is very important. We have a right to have a say what happens in out community. |
| 31644 Murray Poulter | N/A | There is nothing here to indicate that reducing GHG emissions and environmental impacts is being seriously considered. Growth centered on present thinking can only increase emissions. |
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | N/A | I am not an expert and able to comment everything. Please listen to Joni Tomsett or Tim Neubauer. I think they represent my ideas. |
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | N/A | I wonder if calling the objectives "outcomes" is actually misleading, given that the strategy does very little to achieve these. Here's an idea: why don't we stop offering houses in greenfield developments and focus instead on what we really need? This will help deter people looking for houses from outside the region. Wouldn't that immediately make it much easier for us to cope with a more manageable growth rate? The FDS seems to provide capacity for houses that are known to sell well rather than considering first what our community really needs. Most of our existing housing stock consists of large standalone houses. There is a lot of unmet demand for smaller houses and units though. Some people are worried that intensification would make us all live in apartments. I think that our councils need to communicate a bit clearer that by redeveloping house sites to accommodate more smaller units, we would actually get close to a housing mix that is better aligned with our real demand. There would still be plenty of traditional houses left for people who prefer them - even without building any new ones. The FDS, or better TDC and NCC, are relying on the market to provide for all housing needs. This hasn't worked thus far and I can't see how this will work in the future with just an 'enabling' and 'leave it to the market' strategy. The current |

| | | Why do we have such strict zoning rules in our centres that hardly let us build up or house more residents on our land and then argue that we need greenfield expansion to cope with growth? Wouldn't it make more sense to allow people to build up and provide more and smaller units in our existing centres? |
|--------------------------------|-----|--|
| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | N/A | N/A |
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | N/A | Please see attached submission |
| 31657 Mrs Andrea Hay | N/A | SEE ATTACHED (text copied below): I am disappointed that the FDS as it stands takes a 'business as usual' approach. It needs to do much more to address energy use, transport including public transport, low carbon housing, urban intensification, repurposing of buildings and other measures to reduce carbon emissions. |
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | N/A | I wonder if calling the objectives "outcomes" is actually misleading, given that the strategy does very little to achieve these. Here's an idea: why don't we stop offering houses in greenfield developments and focus instead on what we really need? This will help deter people looking for houses from outside the region. Wouldn't that immediately make it much easier for us to cope with a more manageable growth rate? The FDS seems to provide capacity for houses that are known to sell well rather than considering first what our community really needs. Most of our existing housing stock consists of large standalone houses. There is a lot of unmet demand for smaller houses and units though. Some people are worried that intensification would make us all live in apartments. I think that our councils need to communicate a bit clearer that by redeveloping house sites to accommodate more smaller units, we would actually get closer to a housing mix that is better aligned with our real demand. There would still be plenty of traditional houses left for people who prefer them - even without building any new ones. The FDS, or better TDC and NCC, are relying on the market to provide for all housing needs. This hasn't worked thus far and I can't see how this will work in the future with just an 'enabling' and 'leave it to the market' strategy. The current toolbox hasn't worked. The FDS needs to identify better delivery mechanisms to achieve what we need. Why do we have such strict zoning rules in our centres that hardly let us build up or house more residents on our land and then argue that we need greenfield expansion to cope with growth? Wouldn't it make more sense to allow people to build up and provide more and smaller units in our existing centres? |
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | N/A | I think the draft FDS does not focus enough on identifying areas for development that produce low carbon emissions. |
| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | N/A | I wonder if calling the objectives "outcomes" is actually misleading, given that the strategy does very little to achieve these. Here's an idea: why don't we stop offering houses in greenfield developments and focus instead on what we really need? This will help deter people looking for houses from outside the region. Wouldn't that immediately make it much easier for us to cope with a more manageable growth rate? The FDS seems to provide capacity for houses that are known to sell well rather than considering first what our community really needs. Most of our existing housing stock consists of large standalone houses. There |

| | | is a lot of unmet demand for smaller houses and units though. Some people are worried that intensification would make us all live in apartments. I think that our councils need to communicate a bit clearer that by redeveloping house sites to accommodate more smaller units, we would actually get closer to a housing mix that is better aligned with our real demand. There would still be plenty of traditional houses left for people who prefer them - even without building any new ones. The FDS, or better TDC and NCC, are relying on the market to provide for all housing needs. This hasn't worked thus far and I can't see how this will work in the future with just an 'enabling' and 'leave it to the market' strategy. The current toolbox hasn't worked. The FDS needs to identify better delivery mechanisms to achieve what we need. Why do we have such strict zoning rules in our centres that hardly let us build up or house more residents on our land and then argue that we need greenfield expansion to cope with growth? Wouldn't it make more sense to allow people to build up and provide more and smaller units in our existing centres? |
|------------------------|-----|--|
| 31673 Mike Drake | N/A | I think this type of template is very tedious. Rather than having to read a 76 page document (I haven't) and other supplementary documentation, is it not possible to provide sufficient text with each question so they are self contained? It will take longer to do, but a more cleverly designed online submission form would have better engagement, I suggest. The majority of people don't have the time to read pages and pages of information. |
| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | N/A | I wonder if calling the objectives "outcomes" is actually misleading, given that the strategy does very little to achieve these. Here's an idea: why don't we stop offering houses in greenfield developments and focus instead on what we really need? This will help deter people looking for houses from outside the region. Wouldn't that immediately make it much easier for us to cope with a more manageable growth rate? The FDS seems to provide capacity for houses that are known to sell well rather than considering first what our community really needs. Most of our existing housing stock consists of large standalone houses. There is a lot of unmet demand for smaller houses and units though. Some people are worried that intensification would make us all live in apartments. I think that our councils need to communicate a bit clearer that by redeveloping house sites to accommodate more smaller units, we would actually get closer to a housing mix that is better aligned with our real demand. There would still be plenty of traditional houses left for people who prefer them - even without building any new ones. The FDS, or better TDC and NCC, are relying on the market to provide for all housing needs. This hasn't worked thus far and I can't see how this will work in the future with just an 'enabling' and 'leave it to the market' strategy. The current toolbox hasn't worked. The FDS needs to identify better delivery mechanisms to achieve what we need. Why do we have such strict zoning rules in our centres that hardly let us build up or house more residents on our land and then argue that we need greenfield expansion to cope with growth? Wouldn't it make more sense to allow people to build up and provide more and smaller units in our existing centres? |
| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | N/A | Transport systems should be a main focus. It should be inextricably tied to urban growth. What improvements to our transport network have resulted from the Lower Queen Street development or rural |

| | | residential developments in the Mapua, Tasman area? I can't think of a bigger fail in the our region. We shouldn't be discussing urban growth locations and types without asking about transport planning to support it. |
|--------------------------------|-----|---|
| 31683 Richard Davies | N/A | See comments at end of questionnaire concerning the Takaka Valley. The hazards there are not just flooding & tsunami but devastating outflows of water from valleys like the Rawaka Gorge. A combination of earthworks and landslide breaking the backup of water means considerable risk. |
| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | N/A | Refer to attached submission. |
| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | N/A | I fully support the submissions from the Nelson Tasman Climate Forum and Nelson 2050. Both submissions add other comments that I support. |
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | N/A | No |
| 31692 Mr Alasdair Gardiner | N/A | You've indicated a new walkway within property that I own that's not part of any development, I don't consent to the public having access to my property and want this indicative walkway removed from the plans. I will be stopping any of the public coming onto my property and if necessary I'll erect a fence/gate. Anyone developing land in the Dawson Road/Seaton Valley Road area should be asked to form/contribute to a footway/cycleway along Dawson road from Seaton Valley Road to the Chaytor Track, and have the speed limit on Dawson Road lowered. There is no footway along Dawson Road and the speed limit is currently 80kMH with blind corners and hidden house access's, pedestrians, dog walkers and cyclists all mixing and I believe this is a hazard. As more Developments/sub divisions are approved speed limits on existing local roads including SH60 should be lowered and further junction improvements considered to make the roads safer for all users. |
| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | N/A | Check my comments in Q40 |
| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | N/A | The questions seem (mis)leading, intended to encourage a positive response to the strategy rather than a meaningful engagement with the community. |
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | N/A | Please reference our attached files |
| 31705 Mr Lindsay Wood | N/A | Several things: the FDS should, but fails to, take a strongly visionary, transformative and science-based view of climate issues, but it is largely a "Business as Usual" strategy. It talks the talk on responding to climate change but does not come near to walking the walk, and is thus a grossly inadequate basis on which to safeguard or plan our region's future. It needs to engage deeply with energy; critical decarbonisation trajectories; transport, with urban development that strongly facilitates low-to-zero carbon housing critically shown in BRANZ's world-leading research. It must offer a robust and viable strategy for effective, affordable, low-emissions public transport to service all future development. and propel urban intensification far faster than the feeble |

| | | 0.5% per year described. It must also place much higher emphasis on issues related to a just transition. |
|----------------------------|-----|--|
| 31706 Paul Donald Galloway | N/A | Please take seriously the latest IPCC report and lead us to a still green future. |
| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | N/A | I am endorsing the Nelson Tasman Climate Forum's view . The scale of expansion anticipated by the FDS is not compatible with our regions meeting our climate targets, nor with reducing our ecological footprint to a safe level. |
| 31710 Ms Angela Fitchett | N/A | There seems to be an unquestioning assumption running through the outcomes that medium or high growth in the region is inevitable and desirable. Globally, continued growth leads to destruction of all we hold dear, and eventually, human life on the planet. I would like to see an approach to growth grounded in sustainability, acknowledging that the region has limits to how much growth can happen before degradation of land, community etc begins. When it comes to development, we need a circular, closed system, not an arrow pointing into a future that clearly and logically cannot exist on our finite world. |
| 31711 Sara Flintoff | N/A | Develop in Murchison should have happened before now. |
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | N/A | See attached submission. Summarised - no key points related to this question . |
| 31716 Mr Alan hart | N/A | Alternate transport options are not central to the proposal as they should be. |
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | N/A | The FDS proposal does little to persuade me that these outcomes will be met, the direction seems to be the path of least resistance. Of course people will want to build in a stand a lone dwelling but what is not being portrayed is the precedent that this sets and the long term effect that these proposals will have on our environments and carbon emissions. If you build it they will come: I think you need to lead the way not follow the crowd. The definition of productive land needs revised and the inclusion of greenfield character or defining urban limits needs to be instigated if we are to protect what is important to our region and support the slowing down of climate change. |
| 31720 Ms Rainna Pretty | N/A | I am helping an 87 year old complete this online form. Please could you NOT use acronyms e.g. FDS as we don't understand |
| 31722 Trevor Chang | N/A | What is not covered is the plan to allow high rise building of up to 6 stories in an area bounded by the Tahunanui traffic lights south to the Parkers Road, also a large area east of Tahunanui Drive. An area estimated at 200 acres. If consents are granted what parking areas are envisaged since on-site parking is not a priority |
| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | N/A | The correct and clear information so that residents can make an informed decision |
| 31726 Mr John Jackson | N/A | I recommend the use of futures/foresight tools are used to develop the plan - see the DPMC website for |
| | | |

| | | more information. |
|-----------------------|-----|--|
| | | I recommend that investment decisions are based on the long term and use appropriate decision making tools such as must-criteria decision analysis. |
| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | N/A | I wonder if calling the objectives "outcomes" is actually misleading, given that the strategy does very little to achieve these. It seems like we are selling out the character and productivity of our beautiful landscape to accommodate everybody who wants to buy a house here. Maybe we should protect what makes our region so special and focus more on providing more variety in housing choices, which will also provide for cheaper options in our towns and centres, helping our resident polulation. TDC said that the projected very high growth (compared to Nelson) is due to being able to offer standalone houses on the edge of town. TDC also says that we need greenfield development to accommodate all that growth and that we cannot do that in our existing towns and centres. Here's an idea: why don't we stop offering houses in greenfield developments and focus instead on what we really need? This will help deter people looking for houses from outside the region. Wouldn't that immediately make it much easier for us to cope with a more manageable growth rate? The FDS seems to provide capacity for houses that are known to sell well rather than considering first what our community really needs. It looks to me that 99% of our existing housing stock consists of large stand alone houses. There is a lot of unmet demand for smaller houses and units though. Some people are worried that intensification would make us all live in apartments. I think that our councils need to communicate a bit clearer that by redeveloping house sites to accommodate more smaller units, we would actually get closer to a housing mix that is better aligned with our real demand. There would still be plenty of traditional houses left for people who prefer them - even without building any new ones. The FDS, or better TDC and NCC, are relying on the market to provide for all housing needs. This hasn't worked thus far and I can't see how this will work in the future with just an 'enabling' and 'leave it to the market' strategy. The current toolbox hasn't w |
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | N/A | I wonder if calling the objectives "outcomes" is actually misleading, given that the strategy does very little to achieve these. It seems like we are selling out the character and productivity of our beautiful landscape. Maybe we should protect what makes our region so special and focus more on providing more variety in housing choices, which will also provide for cheaper options in our towns and centres, helping |

| | | our resident polulation. TDC said that the projected very high growth (compared to Nelson) is due to being able to offer stand-alone houses on the edge of town. Some people are worried that intensification would make us all live in apartments. I think that our councils need to communicate a bit clearer that by redeveloping house sites to accommodate more smaller units, we would actually get closer to a housing mix that is better aligned with our real demand. There would still be plenty of traditional houses left for people who prefer them - even without building any new ones. The FDS, or better TDC and NCC, are |
|-----------------------|-----|---|
| | | relying on the market to provide for all housing needs. This hasn't worked thus far and I can't see how this will work in the future with just an 'enabling' and 'leave it to the market' strategy. The current toolbox hasn't worked. The FDS needs to identify better delivery mechanisms to achieve what we need. Why do we have such strict zoning rules in our centres that hardly let us build up or house more residents on our land and then argue that we need greenfield expansion to cope with growth? Wouldn't it make more sense to allow people to build up and provide more and smaller units (e.g. divide their large house into a number of independent flats) in our existing centres? It would be good to see a stronger strategy for Nelson City Centre, where 6000 people come to work everyday but only about 100 people live When we try to get more people to live in our centres, how do we make sure that they don't have to live in slums? Are there any controls to make sure that everyone has a nice view, gets sunlight and that there are playgrounds for children and families, parks etc.? There is a lot of talk about packing more people into our centres, but not a lot about the quality of living conditions that we should provide to make urban living an attractive choice. It appears that the council is reluctant to intensify and is afraid of local backlash, people objecting against change that may change their views or bring more people to their neighbourhoods. |
| 31734 Eric Thomas | N/A | Rural areas need different approaches to towns. Look listen to these areas requirements. What has worked best in past and the needs there now. Town ideas do not totally fit rural townships needs. Draw on knowledge in centres currently. There is a natural resource that can be used within. |
| 31736 Ms Carol Curtis | N/A | All of the OUTCOMES could offer a good way for future development of the Nelson Tasman Region, HOWEVER, the current strategies being offered do not MEET THE OUTCOMES. The city zones, and inner suburbs, (urban suburbs) all need less restrictions on the zones to encourage QUALITY, low carbon, small scaled living environments, shared living communities to minimise the built environment, with a focus on centres with good quality services and natural amenities, for more than just people, native fauna and flora, and food production. |
| | | Also the FDS does not critically evaluate the recent "greenfields" examples to then understand and recommend how these new "greenfield" developments could be different from these. The recent Built greenfield areas supported by Tasman and Nelson all fail on most of these current objectives / OUTCOMES as proposed in this FDS strategy. |

| 31739 Philippa Hellyer | N/A | Yes, you have definitely missed taking notice of what the current ratepayers have been telling you for years. Your modus operandi is totally flawed. An absolute disgrace. |
|---|-----|---|
| 31744 Mrs Lorna CRANE | N/A | Rental accommodation to be provided by Council? |
| 31747 Mr (Tom) Neil BRETT | N/A | I feel that the inundation issue has not been adequately addressed and that affected residents are being sold a big problem that insurance companies will react to in the first instance. If infrastructure is affected by sea level rise whether it is private or publicly owned, the owners will immediately approach the local authority for redress. This will definitely be a burden on future ratepayers unless the reasoning is "buyer beware". The issue of speed of sea level rise is in all probability being under-estimated to not "scare the horses" and possibly could well happen sooner than presently expected. |
| | | It seems absolutely crazy to propose high rise housing in the areas adjacent to Beach Road and Muritai Streets when the NCC have only just finalised a potential inundation zone of 0.5m which covers the area bounded by the above streets. Remembering that intensification of housing also means intensification of capital value whether it is privately or publicly owned. To be clear, the developers will not take any responsibility. See portion of NCC Inundation overlay attached. |
| 31748 Jo Brooks | N/A | NO |
| 31751 Hazel Pearson | N/A | Incomplete, cannot have growth without limits in a finite area. |
| 31752 Jill Pearson | N/A | It is important to know the maximum sustainable population number that for the District that TDC is aiming for, and the timeframe it is considering. Maybe TDC thinks 5 million might be nice? We cannot go into the future REACTING to the situation. In 30 years' time I don't want grandchildren to be saying "but granny, why did you do nothing way back then when it would have been so easy?" |
| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | N/A | Please see submission for further detail (summarised) Essential to decide the maximum and optimum population. that land, air, water, costal zone can accommodate. At present all are under stress. |
| 31756 Ronald Alfred & Phylis Kinzett | N/A | Very happy to see light industrial and residential being provided for. Long overdue. |
| 31761 Karen Steadman | N/A | Yes I think you have overlooked the vast area of the TDC region - Not all of the region will have access to public transport - "Bigger is not better" - more development in the smaller towns would work better - 120km away from Richmond is Murchison - we will need more of just about everything in the near future |
| 31763 Susan Rogers | N/A | YES this survey has not considered any of the natural hazards or desires of the people in Nelson to preserve their environment |
| | | |

| 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | N/A | More weight on the climate impact of further development. |
|----------------------------|-----|--|
| 31765 Mrs Lorna Ivy Cooper | N/A | Being in an area tagged for rural residential I am more concerned about the effect it may have on rates. Especially if the property is left as farmland. |
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | N/A | Calling the objectives "outcomes" is actually misleading, given that the strategy does very little to achieve these. We should focus on providing more variety in housing choices, which will also provide for cheaper options in our towns and centres, helping our resident population. TDC said that the projected very high growth (compared to Nelson) is due to being able to offer standalone houses on the edge of town. TDC also says that we need greenfield development to accommodate all that growth and that we cannot do that in our existing towns and centres. Why don't we stop offering houses in greenfield developments and focus instead on what we really need? The FDS seems to provide capacity for houses that are known to sell well rather than considering first what our community really needs. Most of our existing housing stock seems to consist of large stand-alone houses. There is a lot of unmet demand for smaller houses and units though. Some people are worried that intensification would make us all live in apartments. I think that our councils need to communicate a bit clearer that by redeveloping house sites to accommodate more smaller units, we would actually get closer to a housing mix that is better aligned with our real demand. There would still be plenty of traditional houses left for people who prefer them. TDC and NCC are relying on the market to provide for all housing needs, this is not appropriate as it doesn't work in terms of lowering the ecological including carbon, imprint. The FDS needs to identify better delivery mechanisms to achieve what we need. Why do we have such strict zoning rules in our centres that hardly let us build up or house more residents on our land and then argue that we need greenfield expansion to cope with growth? Wouldn't it make more sense to allow people to build up and provide more and smaller units? It would be good to see a stronger strategy for Nelson City Centre, where 6000 people come to work everyday but only about 100 people liveWhen we try to get more people to |
| 31769 Ms Jo Gould | N/A | The outcomes also need to include maintaining and enhancing amenity values and recreation values. |
| | | The high amenity and recreation value of Nelson is a key reason many, including myself, choose to live here. Both are critical to our wellbeing. It includes the existing green, leafy and heritage character of many of our residential streets and buildings. It also includes easy access to the Maitai River and the high quality of that river which means we can swim in it. It includes our access to open green spaces, both on the town fringe, along the river and within our residential neighbourhoods. Creating dedicated and safe |

| | | cycleways is a part of this too. |
|--|-----|--|
| | | Balancing decisions on intensification with impacts on our currently high amenity and recreation values should be a key requirement. |
| 31771 Colleen Shaw | N/A | -Focus on low to zero carbon housing developments - focus on increasing intensification in built-up areas at a greater rate rather than using low density housing by converting greenfieldsfocus on affordable and effective low emission public transport |
| 31773 Ms Jo Leyland | N/A | See uploaded file. Summarised: concerned Tapawera is missed from FDS/growth is understated, supports intensifications, opposes greenfield expansion. |
| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | N/A | TDC and NCC should take a more active role in shaping our region and not leave it to commercial developers. Intensification within our urban areas. No more suburban sprawl. More focus on housing affordability. |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | N/A | Please see attached: NZ and Nelson-Tasman in particular is not post WW2 Europe. People move to Nelsor for open space, natural environment, clean air and water and somewhere healthy for their kids to grow up. Most of the FDS is not that. |
| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | N/A | A: Settlement patterns have a long shadow in setting the emissions intensity of an area. In this climate emergency, it is crucial that settlement patterns reflect a low energy, low emission ways of living. Your first FDS outcome does not make this clear enough, and the whole strategy ignores it. |
| 31801 Joan Skurr | N/A | I don't know enough about the current rules and regulations to do more than comment. It seems to me that town planning, rather than individual choices about any development, should determine what is built. There are many ways to intensify housing with attractive buildings as we can see from overseas. The first priority seems to be to discover what is needed, then to address those needs in the best way possible. Accommodation suitable for elderly (not retirement villages) needs to be prioritised. |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | N/A | Totally insufficient time and capacity for TDC's and NCC's co-management partner - Tangata Whenua Iwi to be meaningfully involved. |
| 31815 Peter Wilks | N/A | No. |
| 31830 K.M. McDonald | N/A | Intensification as of right without notification or right of objection is an erosion of our democratic rights. This is a very biased submission form. The pretty pictures in no way represent the reality of intensive development. The pleasant outlook of hills, sea and sky are being replaces by views of tall buildings, not conducive to people's wellbeing. |

| 31835 Mr Ian Wishart | N/A | Please see attached for further detail: Yes intensification cannot beget the idea of how & what. Few people want to live in ?? or ??. Please see final comments at end of submission. |
|----------------------|-----|---|
| 31836 Paula M Wilks | N/A | I think over all great but with development of Tasman we will end up merging Mapua & Tasman and lose a beautiful rural/coastal area and perception of beautiful Nelson. Which is what brings people to our area. Keep Tasman Village and hinterland as rural as possible. |

13 Do you support the proposal for consolidated growth along SH6 between Atawhai and Wakefield but also including Māpua and Motueka and meeting needs of Tasman rural towns? This is a mix of intensification, greenfield expansion and rural residential housing. Please explain why?

| 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren | Agree | However, any greenfield land should not be expanded for any proposed housing or other residential developments. |
|-----------------------------|-------|--|
| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | Agree | |
| 31185 Myfanway James | Agree | But minimise the greenfield expansion and keep farmland or parkland in between. |
| 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | Agree | Growth of existing settlements only !!! Villages can have high density additional housing. Do not create new cookie cutter towns in lifestyle areas. Lifestylers choose these blocks for the lifestyle. Not to be in suburbia. |
| 31227 Ms Lee Eliott | Agree | |
| 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | Agree | But with more cautions we can do this sensibly and keep Nelson looking beautiful, or we can junk it up by erecting tall buildings and eliminating native trees and plants. I live in Atawhai and LOVE its peace and quiet. I was in Richmond and Stoke a few days ago between 10am and 3pm so many cars, lots of noise and smelly exhaust. Spare me! |
| 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | Agree | Small self reliant and services enclaves seem the way to go to me. This will create stronger community bonds and support systems. |
| 31240 Michael Markert | Agree | Atawhai and Wakefield look like a natural extension, infrastructure and jobs already or almost there. Motueka south: what had happened to the proposed Mariri heights development? Off the table? on what reason? This would be the location to go for Motueka, close to town, jobs and infrastructure. Mapua: some more greenfield development might be commercially viable but I doubt that there will be an endless demand from wealthy people. |
| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | Agree | I agree to SH6 and Motueka Only. |
| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | Agree | The need for housing is required but worry that infrastructure will not be at the same level. Nelson Tasman traffic at peak times are already at breaking point. More houses mean more traffic, how will this be addressed We need that h Hope bypass now, not in 10 years |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | Agree | I agree with consolidation along SH6 and the need to grow existing rural towns that can be serviced with active or public transport. I am opposed to urban development around Tasman Village as I see this as the antithesis of what the FDS |

| | | is trying to achieve. Just because a developer has land doesn't mean you should plan to allow it. |
|---|-------|--|
| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | Agree | |
| 31285 Dr Hamish Holland | Agree | |
| 31286 Mr David Short | Agree | I support this proposal but not at the levels of intensification suggested especially in rural locations. |
| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | Agree | |
| 31309 Mr & Mrs Rose & Phillip Windle | Agree | |
| 31318 Mrs Isobel Mosley | Agree | |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | Agree | Infrastructure is already in place. |
| 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | Agree | The houses in these areas are on hills, and they will not take up rural land. The growth should be vertical in two ways - up a hill and also vertical in its building plans. Avoid greenfield expansion and moderate rural residential housing. Rural areas should stay rural, regardless of the demand for individuals to live there, because the quiet areas provide the soul hinterland for the people. |
| 31355 Mr Barney Hoskins | Agree | |
| 31356 Stephen Williams | Agree | |
| 31360 Ms Thuy Tran | Agree | Agree as long as the ill-advised idea of a massive new Tasman Village town is thrown to the rubbish bin |
| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | Agree | |
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | Agree | Reduce the greenfield expansion. |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | Agree | Green field development to the west should be built on ex forestry land behind Mapua Tasman Mapua, not on higher productive land along Aporo Rd. |
| 31423 Mr Roger Frost | Agree | Linear development of this nature, which is almost dictated by our topography, does provide for an efficient corridor for the movement of goods and people. |
| 31435 Mr Alan Eggers | Agree | Yes, I agree it is important to provide a mix of intensification, green field and rural res to cater for the different houses choice that people want. |
| 31441 Mr Chris Head | Agree | As long as smart and innovative thinking is undertaken around how these areas tie in to efficient transport options, sustainable & responsible use of resources (not just continuing to expand infrastructure at an ever-increasing cost to ratepayers). My worry about this proposal in general is that it's just an traditional expansion plan with little thought put into how the Nelson/Tasman district could become a world-class example of a "future-proof" city |
| | | |

| 31449 Mr John Chisholm | Agree | However the roads need to be upgraded to support this growth |
|-----------------------------|-------|--|
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | Agree | Support the t-32 Rural Residential Development Area in Pigeon Valley but it needs to be extend further up the valley to include 405 &433 Pigeon Valley Road (see attachment). |
| | | Attachment summarised below: Reasons for inclusion given rural residential character, access, servicing and no flooding. Includes images/maps of site. |
| 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon | Agree | |
| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | Agree | Expanding on the existing infrastructure and amenities makes sense. |
| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless | Agree | However - its most important to maintain green fields - beach side parklands etc & provide regular & reliable non expensive public transport to main work areas - I could never understand why the original railway reserve through to Wakefield, has not been utilised to connect all smaller town centres into main city centres - especially now with the ability to have solar powered trams that actually run on road style tyres - wake up New Zealand!! |
| 31511 Mr Vincent Riepen | Agree | |
| 31516 Mr Peter Lole | Agree | Absolute minimum of greenfield development though. |
| 31520 Andrew Stirling | Agree | |
| 31523 Ms karen steadman | Agree | It makes sense. |
| 31529 Mr Steven King-Turner | Agree | |
| 31537 Mrs Juliana Trolove | Agree | |
| 31549 Mr Ian McComb | Agree | |
| 31574 Mr David Bolton | Agree | Support the proposal for the Greenfield FDA T-194 in Wakefield as way of allowing for growth of Wakefield. |
| 31595 Gary Clark | Agree | |
| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | Agree | Where is plenty of land out that way and development of heading that way anyway. I should be encouraged |
| 31608 Robbie Thomson | Agree | Expansion has to happen somewhere. Modern civilised countries like Japan have a population decline which happens with high education levels and cost of living. New Zealand will be filling up for some time, and housing, jobs, infrastructure will all be needed. But we mustn't build on our good land, which is why the Moutere gravels, hills behind |
| | | |

| | | Nelson,Richmond,Stoke,Brightwater,Wakefield are the best residential option. Tasman Centre is a good idea,there is a lot of second class land under forestry and scrub that could be housing with good feeder access. |
|-----------------------------|-------|--|
| 31633 Ms Jacquetta Bell QSM | Agree | |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | Agree | St Arnaud has limited options for growth. The small 2.0ha area at the end of Beechnest Drive (39 Beechnest Drive) would provide for growth. Minimum lot size should be reconsidered to make effective use of the potential residential land resource It is within very close proximity to the village, and all necessary services are provided to the boundary. The underlying geology is gravel deposits and is more than suitable for development. (this area is outside the existing wetland area) SEE ATTACHED (map). |
| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | Agree | |
| 31644 Murray Poulter | Agree | |
| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | Agree | These are places that people travel to and from, so it makes sense to develop these areas some more. |
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | Agree | Waka Kotahi support intensification of existing urban areas along SH6 and also at Māpua and Motueka that already have social and economic infrastructure in place, supporting moving away from a reliance or private vehicle transport. Waka Kotahi support the FDS Core Proposal of focussing on the SH6 corridor, particularly as the Richmond Programmed Business Case has identified opportunities to expand public transport, park and ride, and improved active mode transport options through this corridor. Although Waka Kotahi support intensification of existing urban areas as a priority, growth locations and housing choice also needs to considered in order for it to be viable. |
| 31662 Joe Roberts | Agree | Support as per 2 above. A mixture of housing is required to meet the range of needs. |
| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | Agree | |
| 31683 Richard Davies | Agree | Yes to intensification. No to greenfield expansion if that means building on productive food producing land. |
| 31685 Chris A Freyberg | Agree | I agree, reluctantly. This seems to be the best of the options presented. |
| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | Agree | |
| 31688 Gerard McDonnell | Agree | |
| 31697 Robert King-Tenison | Agree | |
| 31703 Ms Paula Holden | Agree | Housing close to transport, workplaces & schools is a good plan. But maintaining as much greenspace as |
| | | |

| | | possible for the enjoyment of the community. |
|---|----------|---|
| 31704 Mr Paul Bucknall | Agree | Residents resisting growth in places like Māpua and Wakefield are not thinking of the challenges facing our children and future generations. The idea that we can concentrate all growth in Nelson and Richmond and change them to some sort of huge conurbation with a few small towns nearby that don't grow at all is fanciful. We need to limit the partitioning of land into rural residential lots as this hurts the efficiency of primary production - ban subdivision of our best soils and decide which places are the best to enable growth. |
| 31713 Mrs Debora Scholl Dos Santos | Agree | I know that eventually we won't be able to avoid expanding into greenfields, but we should first do all that we can to avoid that by intensifying builds infill, permitting small and tiny houses to be constructed in peoples backyards, build higher buildings, drop parking requirements, improving options of public transport. |
| 31756 Ronald Alfred & Phylis Kinzett | Agree | |
| 31759 Mr Damian Campbell | Agree | |
| 31774 Mrs Jane Sutherland | Agree | |
| 31777 Mr David Lucas | Agree | |
| 31783 Mr Peter Jones | Agree | As below I do not agree with SH6 inclusion around Tahunanui. |
| 31815 Peter Wilks | Agree | Yes but a limit must be put on it. |
| 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | Disagree | Too much greenfield expansion without guarantees of developer-financed public transport and local amenty |
| 31114 Ms Jill Rogers | Disagree | This question should deal with each area separately - Atawhai and Wakefield - yes -Mapua - no as currently the surgery has difficulty dealing with the number of residents which included developments along Harley Road and Redwood valley. The schools are full and any development will have significant effect on social, environmental and infrastructure. Tasman village (T168 - T166) proposed development would be a disaster for the same reasons as Mapua but there is no water in the proposed plans. The development of a village proposed off between Horton and Williams road would be an environmental disaster - this was proposed by Carsten Buschkuhle some time ago and was turned down and should be again - if the development is the same as Permin road that would be acceptable |
| 31171 Ms Sallie Griffiths | Disagree | Do not build on arable land |
| 31186 Mr Gary Scott | Disagree | Traffic congestion along this route will be a concern. Traffic noise and access to the main road will be diabolical. Houses should be built away from any main thoroughfare. |
| | | |

| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | Disagree | Wakefield to Richmond contains productive flat land. Put the houses on the hills. |
|----------------------------|----------|--|
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | Disagree | There is enough growth already. Restraint is required from now on. |
| 31216 Ms Judith Holmes | Disagree | Mainly disagree with proposed rezoning of rural land surrounding Mapua. There are no jobs and few services in Mapua. Recent housing expansion creating a dormitory suburb has led to a huge increase in private car use into Richmond and Nelson for work, shopping, high schools etc.which is completely counter-productive for ensuring future sustainability. |
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | Disagree | Not greenfield no. Building 4-6 storey buildings in residential areas that are predominately 1 storey is also challenging especially if people have no say in losing their views or daylight. This would radically change Nelson to a different kind of living environment which needs further consultation and explanation and visualisation. |
| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | Disagree | There should be less emphasis on greenfield development. |
| 31284 Mr Jarmo Saloranta | Disagree | I do support the SH6 consolidated growth, but strongly oppose any proposals such as the Tasman Village town. |
| 31328 Ms Karen du Fresne | Disagree | I disagree because of the emphasis on greenfield expansion, and because this kind of ribbon development forces people to travel (most likely by car) to access jobs and services. The infrastructure demands are also likely to be huge, and ditto the pressure on roading. |
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | Disagree | |
| 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman | Disagree | |
| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | Disagree | The IPCC position is the most important. 45% reduction in GHG emissions by 2030 is the top priority, beyond ALL others. That translates into no more developments anywhere that encourage car use or extra roads. UP only, where existing development has already happened, but particularly in the centres. No more green field at all. The deck chairs are already sliding, our playing field is tipping. All the new double cab utes parked by Pak and Save represent the worst possible outcome! Flying, concrete and steel use, private cars and utes, big new houses, all this has to end. On the basis that it doesn't end, Brightwater will be getting wet in a few generations, Mapua Motueka Takaka and half of Nelson and Richmond will already be gone. Your choice with this FDS! |
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | Disagree | Intensification is fine but definitely a no to using greenspace area. |
| 31384 Mr Jace Hobbs | Disagree | The growth question is moot considering the climate challenge we are in. |
| 31400 Miss Heather Wallace | Disagree | Too much new infrastructure needed and productive land to be used for housing. |
| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | Disagree | Greenfields development and Village intensification Increases SH6 traffic density and GHG emissions, and destroys more high value Soils |
| | | |

| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling | Disagree | The Atawhai-Wakefield axis seems logical but to include Motueka and Mapua is not sufficiently justified. |
|---------------------------------------|----------|---|
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | Disagree | Not sure the balance between intensification and greenfield expansion is right. |
| 31415 Mrs Zanahe Ruth Galloway | Disagree | With risks of ocean level rise risks of flooding not a good idea to do any more development along Atawhai But from Richmond to Wakefield is probably more sensible away from the ocean. |
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | Disagree | increase intensification, less greenfield development |
| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn Ball | Disagree | Greenfield expansion will change the character of smaller townships forever. |
| 31443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | Disagree | No - intensification not urban sprawl and commuting |
| 31447 Dr David Jackson | Disagree | As I said above, it makes no sense why a village at Hira was removed from the consultation draft. I would support the statement "consolidated growth along SH6 between Hira and Wakefield but also including Māpua and Motueka and meeting needs of Tasman rural towns". That is removing the word 'Atawhai. Hira is still close enough to Nelson City to be able to meet transport proximity etc objectives. |
| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | Disagree | AS above I believe town centres should be developed through intensification. It is unclear what greenfield expansion means in this context but I believe this proposal is a recipe for urban sprawl. |
| 31481 Mrs Lucy Harrhy | Disagree | Mapua has grown enough thank you very much. If there were to be any more housing I would be ok with rural residential, but not more urban development. Mapua has changed drastically from what it was 5 years ago and I don't know if it's for the better. How can you have greenfield expansion if you're busy carving up rural areas? That's a bit of an oxymoron isn't it? |
| 31485 Ms Robin Schiff | Disagree | Only if the planning starts from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | Disagree | I don't agree with the greenfield expansion and extending urban sprawl out into the countryside and I believe growth should be limited to what can be achieved within existing urban areas. |
| 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | Disagree | I don't like the 'greenfield expansion'. |
| 31508 Mr Roger Barlow | Disagree | Don't waste good productive land, use lower value land. |

| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | Disagree | Future greenfield and rural residential housing expansion must be minimised. Growth should be focused on consolidation within the main centres, particularly Nelson and Richmond. |
|--------------------------------|----------|---|
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | Disagree | A big question - SH6 growth appears sound area for growth - interconnected transport; amenties such as schools, hospitals etc; as long as intensification & enhancement of present locales are considered first. I do not support greenfield expansion willy-nilly. Meeting the needs of Tasman rural towns??? whose needs? |
| 31558 Mr Steve Jordan | Disagree | I support the general thrust but object to the concept of 'high rise' in and around the city centre. |
| 31563 Mrs Loretta Anne Hogg | Disagree | Put people in the rural towns - let people be pioneers and help toe create the towns and villages - and have a sense of belonging and ownership. |
| 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett | Disagree | |
| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | Disagree | I do not agree with greenfield expansions, seeing so much land being used to build unnecessarily large one-story dwellings. |
| 31579 Jane Tate | Disagree | I do not agree with greenfield expansion. If this land is high quality (or even medium quality), it should be left for food production. |
| 31580 Jenny Long | Disagree | I agree with intensification along transport corridors provided that the creation of convenient, cheap and effective public transport as well as the installation of safe and efficient cycling infrastructure are priorities. I strongly disagree with all greenfields expansion. We have ample scope for building upwards in our existing footprint. Destroying green spaces by allowing urban sprawl is a mistake that will send us backwards with regards to reducing carbon emissions, and negatively affect the wellbeing of individuals. |
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins | Disagree | I do not support the development of low density urban development as this leads to higher carbon emissions. I belive that our productive land should be used for high value food production which will support our regions economic outlook, in a future world where food production will not be as productive due to climate change, and also nutrient depletion. In turn, this creates employment opportunities and access to proper nutrition for our population, which has a flow on effect of better well-being outcomes. I do support housing intensification and advancements in public and active transport as good urban design has a flow on effect of reducing carbon emissions. |
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | Disagree | Depends what you mean by 'consolidated growth'. There is too much greenfield expansion - the same mistakes we have made in the past. Instead the FDS should concentrate development on existing centres in close proximity to employment, services and public transport. Neither greenfield land expansion nor more rural residential housing actually deliver the outcomes claimed in the FDS. All Tasman's rural towns should be allowed to grow through quality intensification, as long as there are enough local jobs. Where there is an employment shortage, future development must be limited to |

| more congestion unless more employment opportunities are available. 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren Disagree There is too much emphasis on greenfield development. The focus should be on development of excisting centres. 31626 Mr Shalom Levy Disagree I do not support the greenfield development areas proposed for the Nelson City region. 31643 Inge Koevoet Disagree Infrastructure, infrastructure! Same old short term views of just plonking houses where ever you want without thinking about how everything is going to cope with more cars and more people. 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert Disagree I am not an expert and able to comment everything. Please listen to Joni Tomsett or Tim Neubauer. I think they represent my ideas. 31651 Dr Patrick Conway Disagree Growth should be in established areas - not involving ribbon development 31742 Mr tim manning Disagree Growth should be in established areas - not involving ribbon development 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert-Watene Disagree Low density development leads to higher carbon emissions. Currently productive land is best kept for production - especially land already close to towns. If greenfield development? At least that way the downsides are reduced. 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri Disagree We need more time to identify what the needs of these areas are. | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|----------|--|
| our region so special after all. The 'along SH6' jargon as a selling point is disingenuous. It's a highway that will need to cater for many more cars and probably need to be upgraded when the proposed developments go ahead. More kilometers driven, more greenhouse gases, and higher rates. I cannot see how this proposal meets the objectives. I think that the proposed strategy needs to be reconsidered to better reflect the Council's objectives. 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster Disagree Growth in housing should be near jobs. So growth in Motueka is good but in rural areas will just lead to more congestion unless more employment opportunities are available. 31626 Mr Shalom Levy Disagree I here is too much emphasis on greenfield development. The focus should be on development of excistin centres. 31628 Mr Daniel Levy Disagree I do not support the greenfield development areas proposed for the Nelson City region. Infrastructure, infrastructure infrastructure! Same old short term views of just plonking houses where ever you want without thinking about how everything is going to cope with more cars and more people. 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert Disagree I am not an expert and able to comment everything. Please listen to Joni Tomsett or Tim Neubauer. I think they represent my ideas. 31726 Mr John Jackson Disagree 31742 Mr Im manning Disagree Growth should be in established areas - not involving ribbon development This they represent my ideas. 1 think the main focus should be on existing centres Watene 31745 Mr Dylan Mackie Disagree Low density development leads to higher carbon emissions. Currently productive land is best kept for production - especially land already close to towns. If greenfield development is used - why not have it as a high density development? At least that way the downsides are reduced. | | | |
| need to cater for many more cars and probably need to be upgraded when the proposed developments go ahead. More kilometers driven, more greenhouse gases, and higher rates. I cannot see how this proposal meets the objectives. I think that the proposed strategy needs to be reconsidered to better reflect the Council's objectives. 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster Disagree Growth in housing should be near jobs. So growth in Motueka is good but in rural areas will just lead to more congestion unless more employment opportunities are available. There is too much emphasis on greenfield development. The focus should be on development of excistin centres. There is too much emphasis on greenfield development. The focus should be on development of excistin centres. There is too much emphasis on greenfield development. The focus should be on development of excistin centres. There is too much emphasis on greenfield development. The focus should be on development of excistin centres. There is too much emphasis on greenfield development. The focus should be on development of excistin centres. There is too much emphasis on greenfield development. The focus should be on development of excistin centres. There is too much emphasis on greenfield development. The focus should be on development of excistin centres. There is too much emphasis on greenfield development areas proposed for the Nelson City region. There is too much emphasis on greenfield development areas proposed for the Nelson City region. There is too much emphasis on greenfield development areas proposed for the Nelson City region. There is too much emphasis on greenfield development areas proposed for the Nelson City region. There is too much emphasis on greenfield development areas proposed for the Nelson City region. There is too much emphasis on greenfield development areas proposed for the Nelson City region. There is too much emphasis on greenfield development areas proposed for the Nelson City region. There is too much emphasis on greenfield development | | | |
| more congestion unless more employment opportunities are available. 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren Disagree There is too much emphasis on greenfield development. The focus should be on development of excistin centres. 31626 Mr Shalom Levy Disagree I do not support the greenfield development areas proposed for the Nelson City region. 31643 Inge Koevoet Disagree Infrastructure, infrastructure! Same old short term views of just plonking houses where ever you want without thinking about how everything is going to cope with more cars and more people. 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert Disagree I am not an expert and able to comment everything. Please listen to Joni Tomsett or Tim Neubauer. I think they represent my ideas. 31651 Dr Patrick Conway Disagree Growth should be in established areas - not involving ribbon development 31742 Mr tim manning Disagree Growth should be in established areas - not involving ribbon development 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert-Watene Disagree Low density development leads to higher carbon emissions. Currently productive land is best kept for production - especially land already close to towns. If greenfield development? At least that way the downsides are reduced. 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri Disagree We need more time to identify what the needs of these areas are. | | | need to cater for many more cars and probably need to be upgraded when the proposed developments go ahead. More kilometers driven, more greenhouse gases, and higher rates. I cannot see how this proposal meets the objectives. I think that the proposed strategy needs to be reconsidered to better reflect the |
| centres. 31626 Mr Shalom Levy Disagree I do not support the greenfield development areas proposed for the Nelson City region. 31643 Inge Koevoet Disagree Infrastructure, infrastructure infrastructure! Same old short term views of just plonking houses where ever you want without thinking about how everything is going to cope with more cars and more people. 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert Disagree I am not an expert and able to comment everything. Please listen to Joni Tomsett or Tim Neubauer. I think they represent my ideas. 31651 Dr Patrick Conway Disagree Town John Jackson Disagree Growth should be in established areas - not involving ribbon development 31742 Mr tim manning Disagree Growth should be in established areas - not involving ribbon development 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert-Watene 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie Disagree Low density development leads to higher carbon emissions. Currently productive land is best kept for production - especially land already close to towns. If greenfield development is used - why not have it as a high density development? At least that way the downsides are reduced. 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri Disagree We need more time to identify what the needs of these areas are. | 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | Disagree | |
| Disagree I do not support the greenfield development areas proposed for the Nelson City region. Disagree Infrastructure, infrastructure infrastructure! Same old short term views of just plonking houses where ever you want without thinking about how everything is going to cope with more cars and more people. Disagree I am not an expert and able to comment everything. Please listen to Joni Tomsett or Tim Neubauer. I think they represent my ideas. Disagree Disagree Growth should be in established areas - not involving ribbon development I think the main focus should be on existing centres Watene Disagree Low density development leads to higher carbon emissions. Currently productive land is best kept for production - especially land already close to towns. If greenfield development is used - why not have it as a high density development? At least that way the downsides are reduced. Disagree We need more time to identify what the needs of these areas are. | 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | Disagree | There is too much emphasis on greenfield development. The focus should be on development of excisting centres. |
| Disagree Infrastructure, infrastructure! Same old short term views of just plonking houses where ever you want without thinking about how everything is going to cope with more cars and more people. Disagree I am not an expert and able to comment everything. Please listen to Joni Tomsett or Tim Neubauer. I think they represent my ideas. Disagree Disagree Growth should be in established areas - not involving ribbon development I think the main focus should be on existing centres Watene Disagree Low density development leads to higher carbon emissions. Currently productive land is best kept for production - especially land already close to towns. If greenfield development is used - why not have it as a high density development? At least that way the downsides are reduced. We need more time to identify what the needs of these areas are. | 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | Disagree | |
| ever you want without thinking about how everything is going to cope with more cars and more people. 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert Disagree I am not an expert and able to comment everything. Please listen to Joni Tomsett or Tim Neubauer. I think they represent my ideas. 31651 Dr Patrick Conway Disagree 31726 Mr John Jackson Disagree Growth should be in established areas - not involving ribbon development 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert-Watene 31746 Mr Dylan Mackie Disagree Low density development leads to higher carbon emissions. Currently productive land is best kept for production - especially land already close to towns. If greenfield development is used - why not have it as a high density development? At least that way the downsides are reduced. 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri Disagree We need more time to identify what the needs of these areas are. | 31628 Mr Daniel Levy | Disagree | I do not support the greenfield development areas proposed for the Nelson City region. |
| think they represent my ideas. 31651 Dr Patrick Conway Disagree 31726 Mr John Jackson Disagree Growth should be in established areas - not involving ribbon development Disagree I think the main focus should be on existing centres Watene Think the main focus should be on existing centres Usagree Low density development leads to higher carbon emissions. Currently productive land is best kept for production - especially land already close to towns. If greenfield development is used - why not have it as a high density development? At least that way the downsides are reduced. | 31643 Inge Koevoet | Disagree | |
| 31742 Mr tim manning Disagree Growth should be in established areas - not involving ribbon development 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert-Watene 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie Disagree Low density development leads to higher carbon emissions. Currently productive land is best kept for production - especially land already close to towns. If greenfield development is used - why not have it as a high density development? At least that way the downsides are reduced. 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri Disagree We need more time to identify what the needs of these areas are. | 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | Disagree | , , , |
| 31742 Mr tim manning Disagree Growth should be in established areas - not involving ribbon development Disagree I think the main focus should be on existing centres Usagree Unique I think the main focus should be on existing centres Disagree Unique I think the main focus should be on existing centres Disagree I think the main focus should be on existing centres Disagree Unique I think the main focus should be on existing centres Disagree I think the main focus should be on existing centres Unique I think the | 31651 Dr Patrick Conway | Disagree | |
| 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert- Watene Disagree | 31726 Mr John Jackson | Disagree | |
| Watene 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie Disagree Low density development leads to higher carbon emissions. Currently productive land is best kept for production - especially land already close to towns. If greenfield development is used - why not have it as a high density development? At least that way the downsides are reduced. 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri Disagree We need more time to identify what the needs of these areas are. | 31742 Mr tim manning | Disagree | Growth should be in established areas - not involving ribbon development |
| production - especially land already close to towns. If greenfield development is used - why not have it as a high density development? At least that way the downsides are reduced. 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri Disagree We need more time to identify what the needs of these areas are. | 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert- Watene | Disagree | I think the main focus should be on existing centres |
| | 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | Disagree | production - especially land already close to towns. If greenfield development is used - why not have it as a high density development? At least that way the |
| 31771 Colleen Shaw Disagree | 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | Disagree | We need more time to identify what the needs of these areas are. |
| | 31771 Colleen Shaw | Disagree | |

| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | Disagree | Please see attached - determined Disagree from submission: A: No, we support consolidated growth in the Nelson-Stoke-Richmond conurbation, not building up of outlying villages as dormitory towns |
|------------------------------|---------------|---|
| 31835 Mr Ian Wishart | Disagree | Please see attached: I oppose all greenfield expansion. I request TDC to reduce, minimize allotment sizes on Rural 1,2,3 & Rural Residential. |
| 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | Don't know | |
| 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward | Don't know | |
| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | Don't know | |
| 31219 Mrs kate windle | Don't know | |
| 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | Don't know | |
| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | Don't know | |
| 31406 Ms Floortje van Lierop | Don't know | I dont know enough about this. |
| 31431 Katerina Seligman | Don't know | |
| 31502 Ms Caroline Jones | Don't know | |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne | Don't know | |
| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard | Don't know | |
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | Don't know | New settlement based on Rangihaeta rural residential zoning and Rangihaeta - CLOSED - available for infil as requested. 5 minutes to Takaka township and close for cycling to school and town. Not highly productive land that has already proven to be suitable for home owners and a hub that could provide facilities and infrastructure for extensive future growth |

| 31572 Mr David Todd | Don't | |
|------------------------------|---------|---|
| | know | |
| 31693 Carolyn Rose | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31709 Ofer Ronen | Don't | Support Creating Settlements of the main highway. |
| | know | |
| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | Don't | Not answering any of these leading questions |
| | know | The tall the land of the control of |
| 31784 Ms Teresa James | Don't | |
| 51764 IVIS Teresa James | know | |
| | | |
| 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS | N/A | AGREE INTENSIFICATION BUT STRONGLY DISAGREE GREENFIELD AND RURAL RESIDENTIAL HOUSING |
| | | UNLESS ON A LOW INTENSITY BASIS I.E. MINIMUM 5 ACRE LOTS. |
| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | N/A | Yes along SH6 seems to make sense, however Mapua already has hugely increased development over |
| | | recent years. |
| 31363 Mr Steve Cross | N/A | I reject the premise of this question |
| 31364 Mrs Christine Tuffnell | N/A | Will SH6 always follow this present path?? |
| 31460 Kris Woods | N/A | • New infrastructure and services are needed to support growth – public transport, active transport, three |
| | | waters, roads, schools, open space, local shops, cafes, community facilities. • Highly productive land |
| | | should be protected from development. • The natural environment, water quality and landscape are |
| | | important. • New development should not be to the detriment of existing open spaces and recreation |
| | | areas |
| 31623 Ms Lucy Charlesworth | N/A | I am wary of answering these questions as I cannot be sure of how they will be interpreted. So I will state |
| | , | I do not agree with developing green spaces. These spaces need to be reserved and protected to allow for |
| | | sustainable biodiversity and for future generations. Intensification within Nelson CBD needs to be a |
| | | priority. I do not agrees with building on Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. I do not agree with housing |
| | | development on green fields. There is a climate emergency. Remove these areas from the FDS. |
| 31631 Mrs Joy Shackleton | N/A | Any higher rise building alond the Haven Rd, waterfront, Tahunanui corridor should be build along the |
| , | , | hillside. This minimises the impact of high rise (3 stories) on the existing communities. |
| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | Neutral | As above, north nelson has been excluded from this. |
| 31129 Mrs Gaynor Brooks | Neutral | |
| 00 0 00, 2.00 | | |

| 31173 Mr Roderick Watson | Neutral | |
|--------------------------|---------|--|
| 31174 Ms Alison Westerby | Neutral | |
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | Neutral | |
| 31250 Mr Richard Wyles | Neutral | |
| 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan | Neutral | |
| 31261 Mr John Weston | Neutral | yes, as long as retention of productive land and protection against sea level rise is a major component. |
| 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman | Neutral | Since there are several different areas mentioned here, they need commentary on each separately. I approve of the idea of siting a new settlement on poor soils near Tasman. A new resilient centre of population will be needed in future as sea-level rise affects Motueka in a few years' time. Motueka may also be affected before that, by a tsunami, and a decision will have to be made whether to build back in the same place it presently occupies. Motueka should prudently be following a policy of managed retreat and not intensifying on land that will be inundated within the lifespan of the new buildings. Mytton Heights is another excellent position for more housing. Mapua is ripe for sea-level inundation and erosion of sands. Recent developments behind a sea wall that is already cracked are a folly. Residents should be encouraged to undertake managed retreat while they can. Landfill waste must not be used to build up the ground level. Wakefield has a population of about 2,500 in 2022. The new development of 80 houses will increase that by about ten percent. The further development of 300 houses would be a 50% increase in population in the near future. Fast increases in population cause social problems and a loss of social cohesion as recent population is not absorbed into the community. The proposed thirty-year increase of 2200 new homes in Wakefield, giving about 7000 more people in new housing developments is too many and will overwhelm the established present community of 2500. |
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | Neutral | Some development is necessary but must take the feelings of residents into account. |
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | Neutral | Intensification needs to consider access to services within a close range to achieve the vision of outcome one. Roads and SAFE shared access ways need to be carefully considered. How can rural residential be achieved while preserving the needs of rural life on neighbouring productive land? e.g. the need to burn plant matter on an orchard or vineyard. |
| 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | Neutral | If it can be kept off productive land, this type of land will be needed for future food production, and only |
| | | infrastructure, city and town bypasses have been put in place first. |

| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | Noutral | |
|------------------------------|---------|--|
| | Neutral | |
| 31347 Ms Paula Baldwin | Neutral | Are you serious???!!! This question is bigger than any of these six options. The best I can do, is to be interested in the area I live in and expect to live in for some years to come. I do not support any zoning o intensified 3+ storey building in the Roto St area (bounded by Centennial Road, Muritai Street, Parkers Road and Golf Road). |
| 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | Neutral | |
| 31365 michael monti | Neutral | |
| 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer | Neutral | |
| 31403 Mr Richard Deck | Neutral | Some of the hilly land in the area is of lower productivity than land on the flats, and it makes sense that the harder to manage, less profitable land be uses for residential purposes. |
| 31416 Tim Leyland | Neutral | There is too much greenfield expansion. All Tasman's rural towns including Tapawera should be allowed to grow through quality intensification, as long as there are enough local jobs. |
| 31434 Mrs cushla Moorhead | Neutral | Some areas yes and some no. |
| 31457 Mr J Santa Barbara | Neutral | No greenfield expansion in this area. Focus on expanding existing areas with med density mixed use. |
| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | Neutral | |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | Neutral | |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | Neutral | |
| 31480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | Neutral | |
| 31505 Cheryl Heten | Neutral | Alternative roading, better public transport (subsidized) and cycle ways. |
| 31521 Mrs Marie Waterhouse | Neutral | |
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | Neutral | Yes to SH6 corridor. I believe Motueka could be expanded but it needs enormous investment, visionary planning & radical & difficult decisions. No more development for Mapua than currently locked in. Expanding Mapua defeats all that is required for us to mitigate against environmental damage & climate change. |
| 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery | Neutral | |
| 31560 Ms Steph Watts | Neutral | I think a focus on cycleways, walkways and public transport is important alongside any roading. For rural or greenfield land being turned into residential we should prioritize smaller sustainably focused houses as opposed to enormous houses. |

| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | Neutral | This is impossible to answer as it incorporates good and bad aspects of the FDS |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| • | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | This is impossible to answer as it incorporates good and bad aspects of the FD3 |
| 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz | Neutral | |
| 31604 Mr Peter Moot | Neutral | |
| 31606 Mr Trent Shepard | Neutral | |
| 31614 Mr mark Morris | Neutral | |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | Neutral | |
| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | Neutral | |
| 31641 Mr Stephen (Steve) Hayder | n Neutral | There may be significant issues with T-166 to T-168 with local residents and Iwi which will not be the case with the Braeburn Road development |
| 31647 Mrs Rebecca Parish | Neutral | |
| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | Neutral | Favour more intensification of city centre for residential. Less lifestyle blocks are needed to protect productive land. |
| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | Neutral | |
| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | Neutral | |
| 31692 Mr Alasdair Gardiner | Neutral | |
| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | Neutral | Not if Greenfield means taking more prime horticultural land. |
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | Neutral | See attached submission. Summarised: generally supports the Draft FDS, providing opportuntiles for growth in Brightwater and Takaka, supports the proposed business growth sites in Brightwater, need to be cognisant of reverse sensitivity at T139 however generally supports with change to outcome 5 as above. |
| 31741 Mr Robert Stevenson | Neutral | |
| 31744 Mrs Lorna CRANE | Neutral | |
| 31751 Hazel Pearson | Neutral | More than one question here. |
| 31752 Jill Pearson | Neutral | Needs to be thought out before it happens, not after. What are all these people doing for a living anyway |
| 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | Neutral | Richmond South should be cancelled. Focus on Richmond foothills and rezoing Rural 3 near Mapua to Rural Residential |
| | | Protect the Waimea Plains quality soils |

| 31765 Mrs Lorna Ivy Cooper | Neutral | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|---|
| | | |
| 31769 Ms Jo Gould | Neutral | |
| 31809 Mr Andrew Spittal | Neutral | While this is a greenfield development, a large part of this site is already zoned for residential development (the hill block) with the balance immediately adjoining this existing zoning. The subject site at 49 Stafford Drive therefore is not remote from the Mapua village and would in many ways consolidate growth as per Outcome 13. |
| 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | Strongly agree | |
| 31130 Trevor James | Strongly agree | Yes, but limit the greenfield expansion so we can achieve the outcomes of the FDS (eg reducing the human ecological footprint, productive land). |
| 31257 Mr Kent Inglis | Strongly agree | See all answers above. Intensification (in particular) within proximity of the Nelson and Richmond CBD's, will achieve a number of outcomes including increased vitalization of the the areas, better existing infrastructure use, reduced reliance on personal transport (and increased use of public transport). Improved zoning will allow for construction of dwellings more suited to an aging population and smaller households. |
| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | Strongly agree | As long as the road and transport infrastructure is improved at the same time. |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | Strongly agree | Has rewritten question. Brightwater and Wakefield should be classified as 'other outlying towns' |
| 31316 John Heslop | Strongly agree | Yes, as per Q12. Development should be looked at by clustering the land parcels. |
| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | Strongly agree | I think it's pragmatic and reasonable. I look forward to sharing this piece of paradise with more people |
| 31438 Aleisha Hosie | Strongly agree | Yea, with a mixture of housing with pockets of commercial to allow for shopping hubs ie foodsuplies, takeaways, chemist, etc. |
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | Strongly agree | There is far too much greenfield expansion - the same mistakes that we have made in the past. Instead the FDS should concentrate development on existing centres in close proximity to employment, services and public transport. Neither greenfield land expansion nor more rural residential housing actually deliver the outcomes claimed in the FDS. All Tasman's rural towns should be allowed to grow through quality intensification, as long as there are enough local jobs. Where there is an employment shortage, future development must be limited to development that increases the number of jobs locally. We need to |

| | | protect our natural and productive landscape better from development, as this is what makes our region so special after all. Let's not kill the golden goose! The 'along SH6' jargon as a selling point is disingenuous. It's a highway that will need to cater for many more cars and car movements and probably need to be upgraded when the proposed developments go ahead. More kilometers driven, more greenhouse gases, and higher rates. I cannot see how this proposal meets the objectives. I think that the proposed strategy needs to be reconsidered to better reflect the Council's objectives. |
|-------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | Strongly agree | NMH supports the proposed developments along State Highway (SH) 6 between Wakefield and Atawhai along with development around existing Tasman towns. There are a range of benefits from this approach: a. The cost efficiencies of close living within smaller areas of land make it possible to provide drinking water, wastewater, and sewerage services with lower set-up and maintenance costs per individual. b. There are environmental benefits, such as the lower volume of land and other resources needed to support the same population e.g. efficient public transport is possible in a sufficiently dense area and this can reduce energy consumption per capita. c. Proximity to transport corridors mean that people can easily walk and cycle or use public transport to get to key destinations. This caters to the ageing population who want to easy access to services and shops. d. Intensification can allow for a greater diversity of housing to suit a range of incomes and household structures. NMH is pleased to see that this consolidated growth reduces the need to develop on greenfield sites subject to significant natural hazards, flooding risk or coastal inundation. |
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers | Strongly agree | yes using existing roads is a good idea |
| 31551 Mrs Jo Kitchen | Strongly agree | Strong local community support for smaller lots and houses to support empty nesters wishing to remain in the locality. |
| 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart | Strongly agree | |
| 31589 Mrs Renee Edwards | Strongly agree | Strongly agree with the proposal to allow for growth in these areas (in particular, rural residential in Pigeon Valley, Wakefield). There is a huge demand for land and housing here - it has become really difficult to find homes outside the main centres (South of Richmond) - especially anything with a reasonable section size. |
| 31591 Mr Ben Edwards | Strongly agree | Strongly agree with the proposal to allow for growth in these areas (in particular, rural residential/greenfield development in Pigeon Valley, Wakefield). There is a huge demand for land and |
| | | |

| | | housing here. |
|---------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | Strongly agree | |
| 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin | Strongly agree | These places are highly sought after and there are limited growth options without the changes being proposed. |
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | Strongly agree | There is too much greenfield expansion. The FDS should concentrate development on existing centres in close proximity to employment, services and public transport. Neither greenfield land expansion nor more rural residential housing actually deliver the outcomes claimed in the FDS. All Tasman's rural towns should be allowed to grow through quality intensification, as long as there are enough local jobs. Where there is an employment shortage, future development must be limited to development that increases the number of jobs locally. |
| 31656 Mr brad malcolm | Strongly agree | |
| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | Strongly agree | |
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | Strongly agree | The current FDS does not appear to be accounting for placing new commercial infrastructure away from hazards like rising sea level, liquifaction, and the distance of proposed developments from those services. |
| 31735 Mrs Ashleigh Calder | Strongly agree | Strongly agree with the proposal to allow for growth in these areas (in particular, rural residential in Pigeon Valley, Wakefield). There is a huge demand for land and housing here - it has become really difficult to find homes outside the main centres (South of Richmond) - especially anything with a reasonable section size. |
| 31738 Mrs Ngaire Calder | Strongly agree | Strongly agree with the proposal to allow for growth in these areas (in particular, rural residential in Pigeon Valley, Wakefield). There is a huge demand for land and housing here - it has become really difficult to find homes outside the main centres (South of Richmond) - especially anything with a reasonable section size. |
| 31740 Mr Kevin Calder | Strongly agree | Strongly agree with the proposal to allow for growth in these areas (in particular, rural residential in Pigeon Valley, Wakefield). There is a huge demand for land and housing here - it has become really difficult to find homes outside the main centres (South of Richmond) - especially anything with a reasonable section size. |
| 31743 Mr Zak Lyttle | Strongly agree | Strongly agree with the proposal to allow for growth in these areas (in particular, rural residential in Pigeon Valley, Wakefield). There is a huge demand for land and housing here - it has become really |

| | | difficult to find homes outside the main centres (South of Richmond) - especially anything with a reasonable section size. |
|---------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31758 Mr Brayden Calder | Strongly agree | Strongly agree with the proposal to allow for growth in these areas (in particular, rural residential in Pigeon Valley, Wakefield). There is a huge demand for land and housing here - it has become really difficult to find homes outside the main centres (South of Richmond) - especially anything with a reasonable section size. |
| 31761 Karen Steadman | Strongly agree | it makes sense. |
| 31762 Mr Mark Hewetson | Strongly agree | fully support the FDS statement of proposal, that a range of density and affordability choices for housing should be available to district residents, and in particular statements such as the FDS must be flexible to respond to growth as it occurs andmix of growth accommodated through intensification and greenfield |
| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | Strongly disagree | As mentioned above, I strongly oppose the development of the block of land T136 set out in the draft FDS Significant upgrades will be required to both roading and services to develop this property. There are absolutely no services, no water, no sewerage in that block. It will be an incredibly expensive undertaking and I believe there are better options available to the council. As the FDS states, this block is not required to meet the needs of housing requirements for the region and it will exceed the council's requirements. There is no public transport in the area and the development of this site will increase GHG emissions. |
| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson | Strongly disagree | As for 12 & 6. The population growth that will follow such development will reduce the quality of life for the people of the region. |
| 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert | Strongly disagree | We need to intensify first |
| 31192 Ms Rebecca Patchett | Strongly disagree | Too many people along the coast undermine the unique identities of the smaller settlements, puts pressure on roads and other infrastructure and does nothing to mitigate the effects of climate change. |
| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | Strongly disagree | NO greenfield use for building. No residences higher than 2 storeys; we should be looking at row housing not apartments. |
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | Strongly disagree | See my comments above |
| 31242 Ms Suzie Ilina | Strongly disagree | Disagree with more housing |
| 31252 Mr Trevor Howie | Strongly disagree | Noone would want to build along the Motueka river valley in the vicinity of our property if the shingle extraction proposal by CJ Industries for the next 15 years is granted. |
| | | |

| | | Until this decision is made I am against re-zoning this land for residential development. |
|----------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley | Strongly disagree | |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | Strongly disagree | Only allow pockets of intensification. |
| 31278 Wendy Ross | Strongly disagree | "Nelson Tasman's highly productive land is prioritized for primary production." I rest my case - the mix of intensification, greenfield expansion and rural residential housing will not save important farmland for growing future food!!!!! |
| 31279 Mr Jeremy Thompson | Strongly disagree | See answer 3 |
| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | Strongly disagree | Growth. Nope. Sorry. |
| 31298 Mr Duncan Macnab | Strongly disagree | We need to focus on intensification - If we keep on putting houses where we grow food we will have to import food and that is a green miles disaster |
| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | Strongly disagree | Nelson and Tasman region is huge but I feel the majority of the housing and business growth should stay in the city of Nelson and nearby towns. The productive land with all the diversity we have in this region is the sight and flavour of our region. Keeping the increases of the population close to where the work/social/sport/schools/other education and training/medical and hospital services/etc so that travel is easy and travel time is reduced plus the infrastructure is already present. |
| 31308 Mr John Elsom | Strongly disagree | Given I own an apartment in the Sands Complex, 623 Rocks Road, I specifically disagree with the proposed strategy of up to 6 storey high intensification directly across our view from our apartment. The current car yard on corner of Bisley Road & Rocks Road in particular, falls in to the dark maroon area as per your future development proposed strategy schematic (and the local tom toms are signalling a strong desire by the owner of that yard to develop it should your proposed legislation gets railroaded thru as is oft the case with elected officials who do not listen to the silent majority of their voters, of which I am one) Given SH6 is right on the doorstep, any further intensification will only make way for more congestion issues, traffic movements, continual roadworks/re-alignment/various services to be installed.Just more urbanisation in a totally inappropriate area. Keep the beachfront as pristine as possible I say. Please don't treat this submission as classic "nimbi-ism" I have been coming to Nelson for the better part of 55 years and have directly owned property here for the last 2 years and direct family members who live here permanently for many many years. I have a strong passion and connection for the town and environs of Nelson. |
| 31322 Mrs BARBARA AND TIM | Strongly | |
| | | |

| ROBSON | disagree | |
|------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31334 Diane Sutherland | Strongly disagree | There is too much greenfield expansion - ie the same mistakes we have made in the past. Instead the FDS should concentrate development on existing centres in close proximity to employment, services and public transport. |
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | Strongly disagree | Yes I support that nicely inclusive vague sentence you poured it into, because there is nothing to disagree with in the sentence itself, but NO I do not believe your draft plan is heading in that direction and misses the inequity aspect |
| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | Strongly disagree | No, too much greenfield. |
| 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | Strongly disagree | Too much greenfield expansion - not enough quality intensification. I'm strongly against any new development that increases road traffic. We're better off to invest in public transport in and around existing centres. |
| 31346 Martin Hartman | Strongly disagree | Too much greenfield expansion - not enough quality intensification. I'm strongly against any new development that increases road traffic. We're better off to invest in public transport in and around existing centres. |
| 31349 Laurien Heijs | Strongly disagree | Endorse NelsonTasman2050 submission. |
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | Strongly disagree | |
| 31358 George Harrison | Strongly disagree | |
| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | Strongly disagree | Tasman decides for Tasman and Nelson for Nelson residents. I totally object that Tasman decides on Nelson residents zones and intensification changes |
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | Strongly disagree | There is too much greenfield expansion - the same mistakes we have made in the past. Instead the FDS should concentrate development on existing centres in close proximity to employment, services and public transport. Neither greenfield land expansion nor more rural residential housing actually deliver the outcomes claimed in the FDS. |
| 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann | Strongly disagree | Do not expand too much into greenfields! For both ecological and economical reasons as well as our quality of life future development should be built closer to work, services and public transport. Nobody needs a rather dense stand-alone housing plan away from these points of interest and thus, need to use their car on a daily basis. This will not only cost a lot in petrol, other running costs of the car and road |
| | | |

| maintenance. There will be even more congestions, too. Strongly disagree was once very frowned upon. It would still encourage high vehicle usage. Rural Residential housing in Tasman 'rural towns' will also encourage high vehicle usage. Rural Residential housing in Tasman 'rural towns' will also encourage high vehicle usage. Rural Residential housing in Tasman 'rural towns' will also encourage high vehicle usage. Rural Residential housing in Tasman 'rural towns' will also encourage high vehicle usage. Rural Residential housing in Tasman 'rural towns' will also encourage high vehicle usage. Rural Residential housing in Tasman 'rural towns' will also encourage high vehicle usage. Rural Residential housing in Tasman 'rural towns' will also encourage high vehicle usage. Rural Residential housing in Tasman 'rural towns' will also encourage high vehicle usage. Rural Residential housing in Tasman 'rural towns' hould lost. Strongly disagree Refer to my attachment. Summarised below: Objection to Tasman Village proposal Various questions on typologies - only supporting landowners for their benefit - process of analys impacts - highly productive land (disputes the assumption that T166 has low pure for existing RC consent at T166 for less intensive resi development (more rural should disagree with the proposed towns) and the same mistakes we have made in should concentrate development on existing centres in close proximity to emp public transport. Neither greenfield land expansion nor more rural residential to outcomes claimed in the FDS. All Tasman's rural towns should be allowed to generally late to the proposal development must be limited to development that increases the number of jo protect our natural and productive landscape better from development, as this so special after all. Let's not kill the golden goose! The 'along SH6' jargon as a selling point is disingenuous. It's a highway that will more cars and probably need to be upgraded when the proposed development kilometers driven, more greenhouse gases, and h | |
|--|---|
| disagree Rural Residential housing in Tasman 'rural towns' will also encourage high vehicle usage. Rural Residential housing in Tasman 'rural towns' will also encourage high vehicle be more intensified to become a proper actual town. Too much new infrastructure required. Too much productive land lost. Strongly disagree Refer to my attachment. Summarised below: Objection to Tasman Village proposal Various questions o proposed in Tasman Village and servicing. Reasons for objection: - expensive sion typologies - only supporting landowners for their benefit - process of analys impacts - highly productive land (disputes the assumption that T166 has low proposed in Tasman Village and servicing. Reasons for objection: - expensive sion typologies - only supporting landowners for their benefit - process of analys impacts - highly productive land (disputes the assumption that T166 has low proposed in Tasman Village and servicing. Reasons for objections: - expensive sion typologies - only supporting landowners for their benefit - process of analys impacts - highly productive land (disputes the assumption that T166 has low proposed development (more rural should concentrate development on existing centres in close proximity to emp public transport. Neither greenfield land expansion nor more rural residential I outcomes claimed in the FDS. All Tasman's rural towns should be allowed to go intensification, as long as there are enough local jobs. Where there is an emplic development must be limited to development that increases the number of jop protect our natural and productive landscape better from development, as this so special after all. Let's not kill the golden goose! The 'along SH6' jargon as a selling point is disingenuous. It's a highway that will more cars and probably need to be upgraded when the proposed development kilometers driven, more greenhouse gases, and higher rates. I cannot see how objectives. I think that the proposed strategy needs to be reconsidered to bett objectives. | |
| disagree Strongly disagree Summarised below: Objection to Tasman Village proposal Various questions of proposed in Tasman Village and servicing. Reasons for objection: - expensive sunder the proposed in Tasman Village and servicing. Reasons for objection: - expensive sunder the proposed in Tasman Village and servicing. Reasons for objection: - expensive sunder the proposed strategy and servicing. Reasons for objection: - expensive sunder the proposed in Tasman Village and servicing. Reasons for objection: - expensive sunder the proposed in Tasman Village and servicing. Reasons for objection: - expensive sunder the proposed in Tasman Village proposal Various questions of typologies - only supporting landowners for their benefit - process of analys impacts - highly productive land (disputes the assumption that T166 has low proposed the assumption that T166 has low proposed that T166 for less intensive resi development (more rural disagree) Strongly There is too much greenfield expansion - the same mistakes we have made in the should concentrate development on existing centres in close proximity to empound to the public transport. Neither greenfield land expansion nor more rural residential loutcomes claimed in the FDS. All Tasman's rural towns should be allowed to go intensification, as long as there are enough local jobs. Where there is an employ development must be limited to development that increases the number of jo protect our natural and productive landscape better from development, as this so special after all. Let's not kill the golden goose! The 'along SH6' jargon as a selling point is disingenuous. It's a highway that will more cars and probably need to be upgraded when the proposed development killometers driven, more greenhouse gases, and higher rates. I cannot see how objectives. I think that the proposed strategy needs to be reconsidered to bett objectives. | · |
| Summarised below: Objection to Tasman Village proposal Various questions of proposed in Tasman Village and servicing. Reasons for objection: - expensive so or typologies - only supporting landowners for their benefit - process of analyst impacts - highly productive land (disputes the assumption that T166 has low proposed in Tasman Village and servicing. Reasons for objection: - expensive so or typologies - only supporting landowners for their benefit - process of analyst impacts - highly productive land (disputes the assumption that T166 has low proposed to existing RC consent at T166 for less intensive resi development (more rural should concentrate development on existing centres in close proximity to empose should concentrate development on existing centres in close proximity to empose lained in the FDS. All Tasman's rural towns should be allowed to go intensification, as long as there are enough local jobs. Where there is an employ development must be limited to development that increases the number of jo protect our natural and productive landscape better from development, as this so special after all. Let's not kill the golden goose! The 'along SH6' jargon as a selling point is disingenuous. It's a highway that will more cars and probably need to be upgraded when the proposed development kilometers driven, more greenhouse gases, and higher rates. I cannot see how objectives. I think that the proposed strategy needs to be reconsidered to bett objectives. 31410 Mr Scott Smithline Strongly Re-Think growth models please | |
| for existing RC consent at T166 for less intensive resi development (more rural 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle Strongly disagree should concentrate development on existing centres in close proximity to emp public transport. Neither greenfield land expansion nor more rural residential I outcomes claimed in the FDS. All Tasman's rural towns should be allowed to g intensification, as long as there are enough local jobs. Where there is an employ development must be limited to development that increases the number of jo protect our natural and productive landscape better from development, as this so special after all. Let's not kill the golden goose! The 'along SH6' jargon as a selling point is disingenuous. It's a highway that wil more cars and probably need to be upgraded when the proposed developmen kilometers driven, more greenhouse gases, and higher rates. I cannot see how objectives. I think that the proposed strategy needs to be reconsidered to bett objectives. 31410 Mr Scott Smithline Strongly Re-Think growth models please | servicing - no detail of layout ysis used in the FDS - traffic |
| disagree should concentrate development on existing centres in close proximity to emp public transport. Neither greenfield land expansion nor more rural residential I outcomes claimed in the FDS. All Tasman's rural towns should be allowed to g intensification, as long as there are enough local jobs. Where there is an employ development must be limited to development that increases the number of jo protect our natural and productive landscape better from development, as this so special after all. Let's not kill the golden goose! The 'along SH6' jargon as a selling point is disingenuous. It's a highway that will more cars and probably need to be upgraded when the proposed developmen kilometers driven, more greenhouse gases, and higher rates. I cannot see how objectives. I think that the proposed strategy needs to be reconsidered to bett objectives. 31410 Mr Scott Smithline Strongly Re-Think growth models please | al res/lifestyle) |
| more cars and probably need to be upgraded when the proposed developmen kilometers driven, more greenhouse gases, and higher rates. I cannot see how objectives. I think that the proposed strategy needs to be reconsidered to bett objectives. 31410 Mr Scott Smithline Strongly Re-Think growth models please | ployment, services and I housing actually deliver the grow through quality lloyment shortage, future lobs locally. We need to |
| | ents go ahead. More w this proposal meets the |
| | |
| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling Strongly More of the same that has been shown to weaken communities and increase of disagree agricultural land. No thanks! | car use and gobble up |
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin Strongly Growth should be through high quality intensification rather than more urban disagree | n sprawl. |

| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors | Strongly disagree | Intensification should happen in existing town centres, CBD areas are dull, offices seem to be empty as more work from home, intensify there, not changes the special character of our small villages |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | Strongly disagree | No. Too much Greenfield expansion. Concentrate on development in existing centres near jobs, schools and services. This proposal will create more and more traffic along SH6, more greenhouse gases, more infrastructure, more destruction of productive land and beautiful countryside. |
| 31422 Mrs Marga Martens | Strongly disagree | Too much greenfield development and development along the SH6 corridor. The strategy should focus or Richmond. Development there is probably harder but creates far better outcomes in the long term. The council is gradually destroying what makes this district so special. |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas Hollyman | Strongly disagree | This should begin at Teal Valley onwards & include all of Hira |
| 31430 Muriel Moran | Strongly disagree | This is replicating the early ribbon development that began in New Zealand and now in many places has been abandoned. However in this case it sets up the possibility for more accidents as all the vehicle movements in and out of such housing disrupt passing traffic on an already very busy passage way. It spreads out the infrastructure making it much less cost efficient. It doesn't make for community connections. |
| 31452 Mr David Bartle | Strongly disagree | The proposal is unaffordable, given the current financials pressures on infrastructure. It is inconsistent with the need to reduce our carbon footprint. It is inconsistent with the agreed 2019 principals. This could lead to judicial review and threaten the viability of property developers, |
| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | Strongly disagree | Only if this mix of intensification/greenfield expansion and rural residential housing follow the principle of deeply engaging with energy; with critical decarbonisation trajectories; transport, with urban development that strongly facilitates the low-to-zero carbon housing critically shown in BRANZ's world-leading research. It must offer a robust and viable strategy for effective, affordable, low-emissions public transport to service all future development. and propel urban intensification far faster than the feeble 0.5% per year described. |
| 31472 Dr David Briggs | Strongly disagree | It's impossible to support any development that seems to be simply an open book for developers to get on and do what they want. The rezoning that's suggested seems not to take account of any of the 'outcomes' (aka objectives) listed above. In hat way does any of it help to make Nelson and Tasman carbon neutral, or safeguard the public good. To put it bluntly, it's arse-about-face. It's zoning of residential land BEFORE the relevant services have been considered. First priority should be to designate the green space, and the other environmental assets. Only then should you define zones for residences or anthing else. It makes a mockery of the whole process. |
| 31473 Mr Andrew Downs | Strongly | There is too much greenfield expansion - the same mistakes we have made in |
| | | |

| | disagree | the past. Instead the FDS should concentrate development on existing centres in close proximity to employment, services and public transport. Neither greenfield land expansion nor more rural residential housing actually deliver the outcomes claimed in the FDS. All Tasman's rural towns should be allowed to grow through quality intensification, as long as there are enough local jobs. Where there is an employment shortage, future development must be limited to development that increases the number of jobs locally. We need to protect our natural and productive landscape better from development, as this is what makes our region so special after all. Let's not kill the golden goose! |
|----------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | Strongly disagree | I feel that opinion on areas in Atawhai and Wakefield should be left to those who currently live and work within these areas. That is not for me to comment on. I live within the Tasman Village / Ruby Bay / Mapura area so believe my thoughts on these areas are relevant. I think that the environment between Appleby and Motueka being intensified or having greenfield expansion would be a huge lose in terms of scenery, tourist attractions and having areas where people can easily escape built-up areas and enjoy rural environments, walking, the bike tracks, beaches, artisan stores and galleries. The area is special and valued by residents and tourists alike. Existing subdivisions within this area are relatively hidden from view. The Tasman Village area is experiencing some development currently, and has more planned within the next 5 years. However, I believe that it fits in with the current zoning being large sections where people residing there can enjoy a rural lifestyle within a small village and a close community. These larger sections hopefully will not change the outlook of the region in a big way. A town in Tasman will simply ruin and change the environment and the enjoyment that people have of the area. The proposed town or sites T166, 167 & 168 do not even meet up with the Tasman Village as it is. The area was left out of the last FDS and I wonder if the only reason it has been included this time is because wealthy landowners want to make even more money with no consideration of any one else - especially as it was them who approached council. The TDC has stated that the Tasman Village proposal is optional and not strictly needed to meet demand. Based on this alone I believe the proposal should be rejected. I accept that expansion is needed, new homes need to be provided for an ever growing population. However, people also need and do see value in scenic areas, in the amenities that are already enjoyed in this area and having the privilege of being able to live in such a beautiful rural area. |
| 31483 Debbie Hampson | Strongly disagree | Please see attached for further detail. I feel completely defeated by NCC & it's total disregard for the residents of Tahunanui, first with the cycle way, then with the upcoming four lane highway cutting through our neighbourhood, & now to complete the trifecta, the destruction of our community with High rise apartment buildings obliterating neighbouring residents daylight. |

| | For me personally, being on the south side of a potential building site would mean the total loss of winter sunlight which would be absolutely & extremely detrimental to my mental health (& all other residents who find themselves in a similar predicament!). |
|----------------------|---|
| Strongly disagree | |
| Strongly disagree | There is too much greenfield expansion. The FDS should concentrate development on existing centres in close proximity to employment, services and public transport. All Tasman's rural towns should be allowed to grow through quality intensification, as long as there are enough local jobs. We need to protect our natural and productive landscape better from development, as this is what makes our region so special after all. |
| Strongly disagree | Focus developing urban areas, NOT greenfields. And provide public transport between existing centres. Including Tapawera. And keep those bloody developers out of the equation. |
| Strongly disagree | Unless there are more roads created. Far too much congestion and over use on SH6 at the moment as it is. More off road cycle possibilities for people to commute. A cycle/pedestrian bridge between Māpua and Rabbit Island. That would be practical, environmental friendly, common sense. From Grossi point. |
| Strongly disagree | We cannot continue to sprawl outwards I am totally opposed to greenfield developments. There is nothing in this report to convince me that increased intensitification will not meet housing needs. |
| Strongly disagree | |
| Strongly disagree | There is too much greenfield expansion. FDS should concentrate development in the centres. Neither greenfield land or rural residential housing actually delivers the outcomes claimed in the FDS. |
| Strongly disagree | There is too much greenfield expansion - the same mistakes we have made in the past. Instead the FDS should concentrate development on existing centres in close proximity to employment, services and public transport. Neither greenfield land expansion nor more rural residential housing actually deliver the outcomes claimed in the FDS. All Tasman's rural towns should be allowed to grow through quality intensification, as long as there are enough local jobs. Where there is an employment shortage, future development must be limited to |
| | Strongly disagree |

| | | development that increases the number of jobs locally. |
|----------------------------|----------------------|--|
| | | We need to protect our natural and productive landscape better from development, as this is what make our region so special after all. |
| | | The 'along SH6' jargon as a selling point is disingenuous. It's a highway that will need to cater for many more cars and probably need to be upgraded if the proposed developments go ahead. More kilometers driven, more greenhouse gases, and higher rates. I cannot see how this proposal meets the objectives. I think that the proposed strategy needs to be reconsidered to better reflect the Council's objectives. |
| 31496 Mrs Petra Dekker | Strongly disagree | refer attachment: The 'along SH6' jargon as a selling point is disingenuous. It's a highway that will need to cater for many more cars and probably need to be upgraded when the proposed developments go ahead. More kilometres driven, more greenhouse gases, and higher rates |
| 31497 Mrs Uta Purcell | Strongly disagree | I absolutely object to greenfield expansion. We need to breathe. |
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | Strongly disagree | There is too much greenfield expansion - the same mistakes we have made in the past. Instead the FDS should concentrate development on existing centres in close proximity to employment, services and public transport. Neither greenfield land expansion nor more rural residential housing actually deliver the outcomes claimed in the FDS. |
| 31515 Geoffrey Vause | Strongly disagree | This outcome contradicts outcome 10 and the FDS does not indicate how such contradictions within the plan will be managed. While such para-highway growth has a suitable construct in terms of roading infrastructure it is not commensurate with FDS outcomes 1, 7 and 10 and would still require other infrastructure, including business and commercial whereas growth closer to existing centres is far more logical. |
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | Strongly disagree | There is too much greenfield expansion. FDS should concentrate development on existing centres in close proximity to employment, services and public transport. Neither greenfield land expansion nor more rural residential housing actually deliver the outcomes claimed in the FDS. All Tasman's rural towns should be allowed to grow through quality intensification, as long as there are enough local jobs. Where there is an employment shortage, future development should be limited to development that increases the number of jobs locally. We need to protect our natural and productive landscape better from development, as this is what makes our region so special. |

| | | The 'along SH6' jargon as a selling point is disingenuous. It's a highway that will need to cater for many more cars and probably need to be upgraded when the proposed developments go ahead leading to more kilometers driven, more greenhouse gases, and higher rates. I cannot see how this proposal meets the objectives. I believe that the proposed strategy needs to be reconsidered to better reflect the Council's objectives. |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31533 Wendy Trevett | Strongly disagree | Don't agree with greenfield expansion being used for potential housing. |
| 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | Strongly disagree | Totally opposed to this. Refer to full submission. Summarised below: Disagrees with methodology used for growth projections and resultant proposal for growth that is heavily focussed on greenfield growth rather than intensification. Also disagrees with backyard infill development as opposed to more widespread, qualitative approach to intensification (amenity, wider urban form). |
| 31554 Wendy Barker | Strongly disagree | "Greenfield expansion" is a euphemism for urban sprawl. |
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | Strongly disagree | Greenfield expansion is the opposite of what we should be doing. Where is your acknowledgement of Greenspace? Why is so little land dedicated to Conservation? |
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | Strongly disagree | There is too much greenfield expansion. The FDS should concentrate development on existing centres in close proximity to employment, services and public transport. Neither greenfield land expansion nor more rural residential housing actually deliver the outcomes claimed in the FDS. All Tasman's rural towns should be allowed to grow through quality intensification, as long as there are enough local jobs. Where there is an employment shortage, future development must be limited to development that increases the number of jobs locally. |
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | Strongly disagree | There is too much greenfield expansion - the same mistakes we have made in the past. Instead the FDS should concentrate development on existing centres in close proximity to employment, services and public transport. Neither greenfield land expansion nor more rural residential housing actually deliver the outcomes claimed in the FDS. |
| | | All Tasman's rural towns should be allowed to grow through quality intensification, as long as there are enough local jobs. Where there is an employment shortage, future development must be limited to development that |

| increases the number of jobs locally. |
|---|
| We need to protect our natural and productive landscape better from development, as this is what makes our region so special after all. Let's not kill the golden goose! |
| The 'along SH6' jargon as a selling point is disingenuous. It's a highway that will need to cater for many more cars and probably need to be upgraded when the proposed developments go ahead. More kilometers driven, more greenhouse gases, and higher rates. I cannot see how this proposal meets the objectives. I think that the proposed strategy needs to be reconsidered to better reflect the Council's objectives. |
| I do not support the proposed plan change forMapua which is far removed from the main areas of employment, from services and from many schools which are mainly located in Richmond/Nelson and Motueka. There is not a lot of employment in Māpua, and it is not expected to change that significantly. The location of the proposed plan change areas in Māpua is about 1.5 – 3 km removed from the village centre which is generally not considered by many as a walkable distance. SEE ATTACHED |
| ly Urban is urban and rural is rural. Consolidated growth?along SH6 between Atawhai and Wakefield is natural to a certain extent but to encompass it all in one plan is impossible, over ambitious and un-natural |
| ly once again, too much greenfield expansion. ee |
| Development should be encouraging sustainable lifestyles. There is no public transport to take people from rural residential housing to jobs in the town/city centres. There should be intensification but not greenfield expansion and rural residential housing should not be at the expense of productive agricultura land. |
| There is too much greenfield expansion. The FDS should concentrate development on existing centres in close proximity to employment, services and public transport. Neither greenfield land expansion nor mor rural residential housing actually deliver the outcomes claimed in the FDS. All Tasman's rural towns shoul be allowed to grow through quality intensification, as long as there are enough local jobs. Where there is an employment shortage, future development must be limited to development that increases the numbe of jobs locally. |
| |

| 31593 Mr William Samuels | Strongly disagree | There is too much greenfield expansion - the same mistakes we have made in the past. Instead the FDS should concentrate development on existing centres in close proximity to employment, services and public transport. Neither greenfield land expansion nor more rural residential housing actually deliver the outcomes claimed in the FDS. |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| | | All Tasman's rural towns should be allowed to grow through quality intensification, as long as there are enough local jobs. Where there is an employment shortage, future development must be limited to development that increases the number of jobs locally. |
| | | We need to protect our natural and productive landscape better from development, as this is what makes our region so special after all. Let's not kill the golden goose! |
| | | The 'along SH6' jargon as a selling point is disingenuous. It's a highway that will need to cater for many more cars and probably need to be upgraded when the proposed developments go ahead. More kilometers driven, more greenhouse gases, and higher rates. I cannot see how this proposal meets the objectives. I think that the proposed strategy needs to be reconsidered to better reflect the Council's objectives. |
| 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner | Strongly disagree | Neither greenfield land expansion nor more rural residential housing actually deliver the outcomes proposed in the FDS. Rural towns should be allowed to grow through quality intensification, as long as there are enough local jobs. Where there is an employment shortage, future development must be limited to development that increases the number of jobs locally. We need to protect our natural and productive landscape better from development, as this is what makes our region so special of terrally. |
| | | our region so special after all. The 'along SH6' selling point is equally confusing – it is a jammed up travel route already – more rural residential housing where no jobs are is quite the opposite to what the FDS aims to do in the first place – address climate change and reduce GHG emission. Too, who would love to live close to a humming highway? In Europe this housing is often then used as the affordable option – or state housing – again supporting the disadvantage, in equality that already exists. I hope this can be reconsidered to actually trust the Council's objectives on different housing choices – wellbeing, etc |
| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | Strongly disagree | There is too much greenfield expansion - the same mistakes we have made in the past. Instead the FDS should concentrate development on existing centres in close proximity to employment, services and public transport. Neither greenfield land expansion nor more rural residential housing actually deliver the |

| | | outcomes claimed in the FDS. [SEP] All Tasman's rural towns should be allowed to grow through quality intensification, as long as there are enough local jobs. Where there is an employment shortage, future development must be limited to development that increases the number of jobs locally. We need to protect our natural and productive landscape better from development, as this is what make our region so special after all. Let's not kill the golden goose! The 'along SH6' jargon as a selling point is disingenuous. It's a highway that will need to cater for many more cars and probably need to be upgraded when the proposed developments go ahead. More kilometres driven, more greenhouse gases, and higher rates. I cannot see how this proposal meets the objectives. I think that the proposed strategy needs to be reconsidered to better reflect the Council's objectives. |
|---------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31598 Mrs Nicola Worsfold | Strongly disagree | These are rural areas which should focus on maintaining rural characteristics and enlarged natural green spaces and areas of current high productive primary production. Growth expansion into residential should remain close to existing urban centres where there is existing infrastructures that can be expande on such as utilities, roading and public transport. Costs can be applied to higher volume densities than when they are isolated out in existing rural environments. There will be increased green house gas emissions from people travelling in private cars from rural to urban areas where there is higher levels of employment. |
| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | Strongly disagree | There is too much greenfield expansion - the same mistakes we have made in the past. Instead the FDS should concentrate development on existing centres in close proximity to employment, services and public transport. Neither greenfield land expansion nor more rural residential housing actually deliver the outcomes claimed in the FDS. All Tasman's rural towns should be allowed to grow through quality intensification, as long as there are enough local jobs. Where there is an employment shortage, future development must be limited to development that increases the number of jobs locally. We need to protect our natural and productive landscape better from development, as this is what makes our region so special after all. Let's not kill the golden goose! The 'along SH6' jargon as a selling point is disingenuous. It's a highway that will need to cater for many more cars and probably need to be upgraded when the proposed developments go ahead. More kilometers driven, more greenhouse gases, and higher rates. I cannot see how this proposal meets the objectives. I think that the proposed strategy needs to be reconsidered to better reflect the |

| | | Council's objectives. |
|-----------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | Strongly disagree | That's a hideous vision. It sounds like the outskirts of a large town, with strip malls and spread out over kilometres, meaning people will drive to get there, the opposite of what is desirable. A lack of planning and intention. |
| 31612 Mr Paul Davey | Strongly disagree | SH 6 is already a congested thoroughfare so intensifying along this route would only make the problem worse |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | Strongly disagree | There is too much greenfield expansion. The FDS should concentrate development on existing centres in close proximity to employment, services and public transport. Neither greenfield land expansion nor more rural residential housing actually deliver the outcomes claimed in the FDS. All Tasman's rural towns should be allowed to grow through quality intensification, as long as there are enough local jobs. Where there is an employment shortage, future development must be limited to development that increases the number of jobs locally. |
| 31617 Ms steph jewell | Strongly disagree | This is so last-century ribbon development thinking and we have so much ribbon already. Between Atawhai and Wakefield, grow UP and don't cover another blade of grass with asphalt. CARBON! I know we need to house people but if we build beautiful apartments it will be a pleasure to cycle the green spaces in between, instead of risking the carbon corridor. |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | Strongly | C/o-NT2050 |
| | disagree | There is too much greenfield expansion, the same mistakes we have made in |
| | | There is too much greenfield expansion - the same mistakes we have made in the past. Instead the FDS should concentrate development on existing centres |
| | | in close proximity to employment, services and public transport. Neither |
| | | greenfield land expansion nor more rural residential housing actually deliver the outcomes claimed in the FDS. |
| | | All Tasman's rural towns should be allowed to grow through quality |
| | | intensification, as long as there are enough local jobs. Where there is an |
| | | employment shortage, future development must be limited to development that |
| | | increases the number of jobs locally. |
| | | We need to protect our natural and productive landscape better from |
| | | development, as this is what makes our region so special after all. Let's not kill the golden goose! |
| | | The 'along SH6' jargon as a selling point is disingenuous. It's a highway that will |
| | | need to cater for many more cars and probably need to be upgraded when the proposed developments go ahead. More kilometers driven, more greenhouse gases, and higher rates. I cannot see how this |

| | | proposal meets the objectives. I think that the proposed strategy needs to be reconsidered to better reflect the Council's objectives. |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | Strongly disagree | I do not wish to live in a strip mall. |
| 31636 Joanna Santa Barbara | Strongly disagree | The large proportion of greenfield expansion is unacceptable to us, as explained above. |
| 31637 Ms Frances Kemble Welch | Strongly disagree | |
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | Strongly disagree | Strongly disagree There is too much greenfield expansion. The FDS should concentrate development on existing centres in close proximity to employment, services and public transport. Neither greenfield land expansion nor more rural residential housing actually deliver the outcomes claimed in the FDS. All Tasman's rural towns should be allowed to grow through quality intensification, as long as there are enough local jobs. Where there is an employment shortage, future development must be limited to development that increases the number of jobs locally. |
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | Strongly disagree | I do not support this. I would support consolidating growth within the Nelson Stoke Richmond area before a longer corridor is developed. |
| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | Strongly disagree | Strongly disagree There is too much greenfield expansion. The FDS should concentrate development on existing centres in close proximity to employment, services and public transport. Neither greenfield land expansion nor more rural residential housing actually deliver the outcomes claimed in the FDS. All Tasman's rural towns should be allowed to grow through quality intensification, as long as there are enough local jobs. Where there is an employment shortage, future development must be limited to development that increases the number of jobs locally. |
| 31673 Mike Drake | Strongly disagree | We need to up, rather than along. Again, integrate with the Walking and Cycling Plan (WCP). This question appears to ignore the WCP. |
| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | Strongly disagree | There is too much greenfield expansion. The FDS should concentrate development on existing centres in close proximity to employment, services and public transport. Neither greenfield land expansion nor more rural residential housing actually deliver the outcomes claimed in the FDS. All Tasman's rural towns should |
| | | |

| | | be allowed to grow through quality intensification, as long as there are enough local jobs. Where there is an employment shortage, future development must be limited to development that increases the number of jobs locally. we dont need more commuters! |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | Strongly disagree | Refer to submission. |
| | J | Both intensification and greenfields development MUST be consistent with the scale, look and feel of the existing community. Building new greenfields standalone med-high density subdivisions around existing rural communities in NOT in keeping with TDC's own principles as espoused in prior FDS, Structure Plan, Development Study documents. |
| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | Strongly disagree | We need to concentrate development in the existing centres. Greenfield expansion must stop in urban and rural areas. |
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | Strongly disagree | It is wrong to link all of these aspects in a single question. I support intensification in Richmond and Motueka and some greenfield expansion south of Richmond but strongly disagree with significant growth in Mapua and other rural towns as this destroys their character and charm, increases the traffic on the roads that negatively impacts on climate change and does not meet most of the outcomes stated in the FDS |
| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | Strongly disagree | No. We should not be supporting/encouraging greenfield expansion in rural towns. This primarily benefits landowners and developers but has a negative impact for others, encouraging more commuter trips for example and paving more of our lanscape. |
| 31706 Paul Donald Galloway | Strongly disagree | Long stretches of urban housing and commercial buildings invite to the usage of cars not walking or biking. Corridors of parks in between . Separatindg not consolidating. |
| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | Strongly disagree | I am endorsing the Nelson Tasman Climate Forum's view . The large proportion of greenfield expansion is unacceptable |
| 31710 Ms Angela Fitchett | Strongly disagree | There is too much Greenfield expansion. Intensification must come first and come simultaneously with new business in the smaller towns along SH6. |
| 31716 Mr Alan hart | Strongly disagree | some of the areas within this proposal are in coastal areas where a more precautionary approach should be taken |
| 31718 Kathryn & Keith Quigley | Strongly disagree | |
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | Strongly | This is unnecessary greenfield expansion. The focus should be on developing in closer proximity to |
| | | |

| | disagree | employment, services and public transport thus building on the bones of existing infrastructure and the location of the existing populous. |
|------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | Strongly disagree | There is too much greenfield expansion - the same mistakes we have made in the past. Instead the FDS should concentrate development on existing centres in close proximity to employment, services and public transport. Neither greenfield land expansion nor more rural residential housing actually deliver the outcomes claimed in the FDS. All Tasman's rural towns should be allowed to grow through quality intensification, as long as there are enough local jobs. Where there is an employment shortage, future development must be limited to development that increases the number of jobs locally. We need to protect our natural and productive landscape better from development, as this is what makes our region so special after all. Let's not kill the golden goose! The 'along SH6' jargon as a selling point is disingenuous. It's a highway that will need to cater for many more cars and probably need to be upgraded when the proposed developments go ahead. More kilometers driven, more greenhouse gases, and higher rates. I cannot see how this proposal meets the objectives. I think that the proposed strategy needs to be reconsidered to better reflect the Council's objectives. |
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | Strongly disagree | There is too much greenfield expansion - the same mistakes we have made in the past. Instead the FDS should concentrate development on existing centres in close proximity to employment, services and public transport. Neither greenfield land expansion nor more rural residential housing actually deliver the outcomes claimed in the FDS. All Tasman's rural towns should be allowed to grow through quality intensification, as long as there are enough local jobs. Where there is an employment shortage, future development must be limited to development that increases the number of jobs locally. We need to protect our natural and productive landscape better from development, as this is what makes our region so special after all. Let's not kill the golden goose! The 'along SH6' jargon as a selling point is disingenuous. It's a highway that will need to cater for many more cars and probably need to be upgraded when the proposed developments go ahead. More kilometers driven, more greenhouse gases, and higher rates. I cannot see how this proposal meets the objectives. I think that the proposed strategy needs to be reconsidered to better reflect the Council's objectives. |
| 31736 Ms Carol Curtis | Strongly disagree | Stop the mindless, developer led, infrastructure driven, greenfield expansion. These do not meet the OUTCOMES objectives. |
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | Strongly disagree | There is too much greenfield development. It doesn't encourage people living within 20 minutes of their job, facilities, ammenities etc. |
| 31739 Philippa Hellyer | Strongly | Whilst there may be a few areas in the proposal that could cope with a few more houses, I cannot express |
| | | |

| | disagree | my opposition strongly enough when it comes to the area in the vicinity of Braeburn Road. The mix of farming and cropping and horticulture is a vital part of the future prosperity of our district and should not have to fight off the pressures of the so-called "demand" for more houses. DO NOT INCLUDE THE BRAEBURN ROAD/FLETTS ROAD AREA IN ANY PROPOSALS FOR NEW HOUSES. |
|--|----------------------|---|
| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | Strongly disagree | Minimise Greenfield development - keep greenfield's green! |
| 31763 Susan Rogers | Strongly disagree | Survey is flawed from the beginning. You need to redesign this entire line of questioning. It leads only to answers desired by the maker of the survey. |
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | Strongly disagree | There is too much greenfield expansion - the same mistakes we have made in the past. Instead the FDS should concentrate development on existing centres in close proximity to employment, services and public transport. Neither greenfield land expansion nor more rural residential housing actually deliver the outcomes claimed in the FDS. All Tasman's rural towns should be allowed to grow through quality intensification, as long as there are enough local jobs. Where there is an employment shortage, future development must be limited to development thatincreases the number of jobs locally. We need to protect our natural and productive landscape better from development, as this is what makes our region so special after all. Let's not kill the golden goose! |
| 31775 Dr Thomas Carl | Strongly disagree | |
| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | Strongly disagree | No more greenfield expansion and more rural residential housing. |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Strongly disagree | Consolidating growth along a state highway is a backwards step. Should be a limited access road. Nearby housing is subject to noise fumes, vibration. Southern link from Wakefield to Atawhai would help. |
| 31801 Joan Skurr | Strongly disagree | This is a continuation of current thinking. It does not realistically look ahead to realities of transport. Housing needs to relate to community and employment, all within proximity. |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | Strongly disagree | No, particularly no more greenfield expansion. History confirms that this will not enable Net Enduring Restorative Outcomes. |
| 31836 Paula M Wilks | Strongly disagree | 50/50 yes agree Atawhai to Wakefield development, Mapua development. No not Motueka & Tasman (village). |
| | | |

14 Where would you like to see growth happening over the next 30 years? Please list as many of the following options that you agree with: (a) Largely along the SH6 corridor as proposed (b) Intensification within existing town centres (c) Expansion into greenfield areas close to the existing urban areas (d) Creating new towns away from existing centre (please tell us where) (e) In coastal Tasman areas, between Mapua and Motueka (f) In Tasman's existing rural towns (g) Everywhere (h) Don't know

| 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | N/A | Intensification within existing town centres |
|-----------------------------------|-----|---|
| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | N/A | Intensification within existing town centres Note only one can be selected. |
| | | Intensification is key. |
| 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | N/A | Intensification within existing town centres It's only possible to 'tick' 1 option - not 'as many as you like'. That invalidates this process. Intensification AND limited greenfield expansion with developer-financed public transport and local amenity. |
| 31114 Ms Jill Rogers | N/A | Intensification within existing town centres |
| 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS | N/A | Intensification within existing town centres |
| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | N/A | Intensification within existing town centres |
| 31118 Ms Sarah Varey | N/A | Intensification within existing town centres |
| 31122 Mr Johan Thomas Wahlgren | N/A | Intensification within existing town centres That didn't work, can only tick one, but wanted to also tick in tasmans existing rural towns. |
| 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | N/A | Intensification within existing town centres |
| 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren | N/A | Intensification within existing town centres |
| 31130 Trevor James | N/A | a,b,c,e - providing the intensification is a considerable increase, not just a few double-story buildings here and there. |
| | | |

| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson | N/A | As for 13. |
|---------------------------|-----|---|
| 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward | N/A | Growth should be focussed within existing town centres. |
| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | N/A | a and b. I think the land between the glen and the sewage treatment ponds would be good if you raised the ground level |
| 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert | N/A | b |
| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | N/A | Port Nelson reclaimed Land close to the city. |
| 31165 Mr Vincent Dickie | N/A | (e) In coastal Tasman areas, between Mapua and Motueka |
| 31171 Ms Sallie Griffiths | N/A | Leave the Matai alone, build high density in towns, away from rivers and the seaside |
| 31173 Mr Roderick Watson | N/A | h |
| 31185 Myfanway James | N/A | a,b,f, |
| 31186 Mr Gary Scott | N/A | Create new towns away from existing centers. Hira, upper moutere or Golden downs. |
| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | N/A | On non productive land away from rivers and sea shore. Definitely not on productive low lying land like lower Queen Street and must be back from the seashore on firm ground |
| 31192 Ms Rebecca Patchett | N/A | Intensification within existing town centers, including Richmond and Motueka. Leave the coast alone. We can't expect housing developers to come up with lovely plans that beautify the coast. We might end up with something like the sprawl of never ending suburbs that occupy the Australian Queensland coast from the nsw border up to Brisbane. The houses along the coast will not be affordable for many as there are few reasonable paying jobs in the small settlements. |
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | N/A | Why make this assumption? Show me where growth has led to improvements to towns like Nelson? especially this sort of growth as proposed. |
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | N/A | A B F |
| 31197 Ms Catherine Parry | N/A | (b) There is so much underutilized space within Nelson's CBD that intensified housing will not be harmful In fact more housing above shops, multistoried apartments, and building on empty lots will bring a more healthy look to our town. I was very impressed by Rangiora township and its revitalized centre city. Many multistory dwellings, and more people living in the city and using city businesses. |
| 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | N/A | b, c, f 100% not d, e |
| | | |

| 31216 Ms Judith Holmes | N/A | (b) Intensification within existing town centres. Build multi story buildings. |
|-----------------------------|-----|--|
| 31219 Mrs kate windle | N/A | F, Park avenue, out of natural disasters zone, on bus route, close to schools, land owners keen to develop this area, close to medical centre, next door to rec centre, its the most sensible area |
| 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | N/A | Intensification and vitalisation of satellite hubs outside of the town centres (Tahunanui) |
| 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | N/A | a, b, c (sorta), d (don't know where), e (maybe I have concerns about anything coastal because of global warming) |
| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | N/A | (a) and (b) and (e) and (f): DISAGREE STRONGLY with any residential building over 2 storeys here.(c) NO expansion into greenfield areas.(d) Strongly disagree with new towns- research shows they don't work- too many social problems. |
| 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | N/A | A. Increased appropriate housing and support systems in Nelson and Richmond. B Motueka, Richmond, Nelson. D where? I dont knowbut dont ruin our delightful spots like Mapuaor Riwaka |
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | N/A | Only option B |
| 31240 Michael Markert | N/A | a) yes b) yes c)yes d) NO e) NO Planning 3200 houses in rural Tasman is not a "new village", this is a new town like Motueka (I don't know how many houses there are in Motueka but it must be close to it?), a new town with 3200 houses is 7000 to 10000 people, more than Motueka? needs a few petrol stations, big supermarkets, pharmacies, hairdressers, shops, doctors, schools, kindergarten etc, most importantly jobs, jobs, jobs, which industries please? This number of people shall not commute daily to Motueka or Richmond! Double lane highways would be needed, big traffic, etc, the opposite what the FDS is about. It makes you think of how TDC came up with this idea: these locations are earmarked for a possible future development in about (how many?) years? These location are owned by willing owners to develop their land right now, not later. Can't believe that they will put their money making plans on hold. The location are not connected but isolated to each other. So, planning a combined development of infrastructure is ridiculous. This looks like a no-brainer, just taking into account the hectares of willing developers divided 500sqm and you have the numbers of houses needed to show the central government that we did our homework. Those landowners are most welcome to subdivide under current rules. On the land between Marriages Road and Horton Road might be the possibility to create a small village with 50-100 houses with dense |

| | | housing/apartments, something that fits under the original idea of Rural3. |
|----------------------------|-----|--|
| 31242 Ms Suzie Ilina | N/A | Let growth happen in other cities, and retain our special quality of life and uniqueness in these areas. |
| 31247 Mr yuri aristarco | N/A | In the city and intensification of existing residential areas. Adding a second flat (whenever possible) of existing houses, adding a second smaller dwelling on the same property. Copying our Aussie neighbours and installing in all these new house/flat units only compostable toilets, and smart grey water recycling systems to do not put pressure to the existing infrastructures. This will also create the perfect environment for small tradesman people companies to thrive. This will take out of the picture the big and large building firms and will create a new middle class which has always been the core of an healthy western society. |
| 31248 Mr Will Bosnich | N/A | I would like to see small communities develop further to allow locals to shop and live locally. Particularly, I would like to see Tahunanui become a community unto itself providing a retail and community sector that encourages local shopping and community interaction and can be accessed by walking. As it stands, Council has encouraged SH6 'strip development' which is vehicle rather than pedestrian focused, and further has not established the retail or community environment or infrastructure necessary to allow locals to interact, shop and meet their needs locally. This is a shameful lack of community planning, and resulted in increased vehicle use and congestion. In addition, the lack of a community shopping & retail sector and community square or 'hub' has resulted in a lack of community interaction and the increase in crime and social isolation that accompany all such 'suburbs'. |
| 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan | N/A | A,B |
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | N/A | a) a bit b) a lot, c) definitely not d)definitely not e) don't know I don't know enough to comment f)don't know I don't know enough to comment g) no |
| 31257 Mr Kent Inglis | N/A | (a) and (b) |
| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | N/A | A and B |
| 31261 Mr John Weston | N/A | Intensification within existing town centres, Creating new towns away from existing centres - on the hills. in coastal Tasman areas between Mapua and Motueka. in Tasman's existing rural towns. |
| 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman | N/A | (b) (d) The poor soils on the Moutere Gravels. |
| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | N/A | bintensification and c greenfield near urban areas if really necessary. |
| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | N/A | F- Tasmans existing rural towns |

| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | N/A | I don't agree with the Richmond South development because of the use of productive farm land. I agree with the rest of the areas identified in the FDS. |
|----------------------------|-----|--|
| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley | N/A | Intensification within existing town centres. |
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | N/A | (b) That would breathe new life into our decaying CBDs. High rents and spreading malls are driving people out of town. |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | N/A | A, B, C, E, F I am firmly opposed to the development of any new towns |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | N/A | (b) |
| 31278 Wendy Ross | N/A | Creating a new town in a safe rural place with great thought given to saving important existing farmland. Nelson cannot spread any further and needs to be safeguarded as it is now with small infills to let it be a place that encourages people to visit. |
| 31279 Mr Jeremy Thompson | N/A | Nowhere |
| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | N/A | A, B, G (D if necessary) |
| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | N/A | "b" above (intensification within existing town centres |
| 31284 Mr Jarmo Saloranta | N/A | I support (a), (b), (c) and (f), but strongly oppose (d), (e) |
| 31285 Dr Hamish Holland | N/A | I agree with options (a), (b), (e), (f). |
| 31286 Mr David Short | N/A | (a), (b), (c). I do not support creating new towns away from existing centres due to the transportation logistics, work opportunities. I support the idea that it should be near existing towns not in greenfield areas. |
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | N/A | (a) Largely along the SH6 corridor as proposed (b) Intensification within existing town centres (e) In coastal Tasman areas, between Mapua and Motueka (f) In Tasman's existing rural towns |
| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | N/A | No growth. Finite planet. Freed of the shackles and exploitation of the monetary system, people will (a) not need most of the commercial building/shops etc, thus they will be free to re-purpose (b) people will be able to live in natural, family/whanau groupings, as in previous centuries, and not be lonely, isolated, depressed, disconnected etc. |
| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | N/A | Largely along the SH6 corridor as proposed |
| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | N/A | a) maybe SH6 is sort of OK b) YES intensify existing centres c) NO green fields are lost for ever |
| | | |

| | | d) NO we cannot and should not try to create a new town with this size of population when we can't manage the existing ones we have. |
|-------------------------------------|-----|---|
| | | e) NO |
| | | f) YES intensify existing centres |
| | | g) NO |
| | | h) I DO KNOW as I believe it is best to concentrate for the next 30 years on intensify existing centres, reducing the need to travel for GHG emission and PPT Peoples personal time |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | N/A | Intensification within existing town centres. |
| 31316 John Heslop | N/A | a, b, c (but with careful thought and higher density), e, f. |
| 31318 Mrs Isobel Mosley | N/A | a, b,c,f |
| | | Not d |
| 31322 Mrs BARBARA AND TIM ROBSON | N/A | Intensification within existing town centres |
| 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | N/A | b; Intensification within existing town centres, f; in Tasman's existing rural towns, and a; along SH6 only in it can be kept off productive land. |
| 31325 Dr Ann Briggs | N/A | Not (c) greenfield, not (e) coastal. Yes to (b) if local infrastructure supports it. |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | N/A | Creating New Towns is a tricky business, just look at overseas examples. A large manufacturing business for example has to be in place before housing can be considered. Or investment by a company to achieve both at the same time. |
| 31328 Ms Karen du Fresne | N/A | (b) (f) |
| 31334 Diane Sutherland | N/A | В |
| | | Growth should only be enabled through intensification and in existing town |
| | | centres. It needs to keeps residential with jobs - otherwise people will only have to commute long distances. |
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | N/A | a b c yes |
| - | | d no, what a mistake, it goes against your outcome 1 |
| | | e no |
| | | f sure, especially Motueka to just up it a notch to keep amenities supported, and if that is relevant for Ta |
| | | and Murch, then for them too. But work creation in those areas is just as important. Good jobs-housing |

| | | balance. |
|----------------------------|-----|---|
| | | g, oh no, not at all. |
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | N/A | A, Definitely not E or F |
| 31339 Ms Karen Berge | N/A | a and b. |
| 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman | N/A | (b) |
| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | N/A | В |
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | N/A | (f) In Tasman's rural towns and settlements. |
| 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | N/A | (b) Intensification within existing town centres(f) In Tasman's existing rural townsHousing needs to balance residential with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only have to commute long distances. |
| 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | N/A | SH6 corridor, intensification within existing town centres. Avoid greenfield areas, even those close to urban areas. It's part of the satisfaction of nature to be aware that plants are growing food nearby, and some of it isnot brought in on trucks. People need to see that we are growing at least some of our food. Grenfield areas close to existing urban areas are green, quiet and productive, and the more intensive the urban areas become, the more people need and love these quiet places. |
| 31346 Martin Hartman | N/A | (b) Intensification within existing town centres (f) In Tasman's existing rural towns Housing needs to balance residential with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only have to commute long distances. |
| 31347 Ms Paula Baldwin | N/A | Intensification within existing town centres. Merge the councils - Tasman is far more central; Nelson can stay as a satellite town, and build everything up within the current CBD. There are many many young people as couples / flatmates ie: without children, moving into residential housing that don't require either a lawn or the maintenance demands, who could be enjoying living in a CBD - making the CBD a vibrant, lived-in area, rather than retail and offices which are all closed up and not in use for half of every day. The hospitality sector would benefit from residents near-by. Without proper infrastructure - services and transport - there's no gains (certainly not changes/improvement to climate effects) by building on greenfields and rural land. The services in Tahunanui area already maxed out - it will not and can not sustain residential intensification. |
| 31349 Laurien Heijs | N/A | (b) - let's see where we can get with this first! (c) - only if done sensitively and not in areas of high amenity, biodiversity, productivity, natural character |

| | | or historic value (NOT the Maitai valley!). New greenfield development close to existing urban areas should only go ahead if deemed absolutely necessary (current growth forecasting not convincing). New developments should come without minimum size requirements for houses, to encourage diversity and innovation in housing stock to meet diverse needs of the community. Developments should be low impact urban design, and should promote connections between neighbours, connection with new and existing green spaces, and connection with town centres. Small commercial hubs can promote liveliness and liveability. No suburban sprawl please. (f) - good to focus new housing development in areas where jobs exist or, where partnered with new commercial areas, they can support a non-commuter community. Let's stay away from growth in sensitive locations, and in areas that promote a reliance on cars. |
|------------------------------|-----|--|
| 31350 Ms Janet Tavener | N/A | (b) intensification within existing town centres. This preserves agricultural and recreational land use, reduces need for people to use cars and makes public transport more cost effective. |
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | N/A | On the hills above the city. Use the land presently covered in pine forest. It is poor use of this 650ha. |
| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | N/A | a, b, and f, on existing developed land only, in all existing towns well above coastal inundation zones, and UP only from now on. No new coastal development, no new towns, no more green field subdivision, no new roads. Pedestrianise all central city areas. All new building with minimum concrete or steel, using mostly local laminated timber to 6-10 storeys. |
| 31355 Mr Barney Hoskins | N/A | Intensification within existing town centres but with a focus on main centres including The City, Stoke & Richmond. I do however support the intensification up to 3 stories and in some cases 3-4 story low rise residential intensification (including mixed use) in Tahunanui not not any higher due to impacts previously discussed around access, safety and community feel. Aesthetics also play into this as a desirable location for recreation. |
| 31356 Stephen Williams | N/A | Given the need for expensive infrastructure (waste and water) and the poor accessibility to the centers (e) is not suitable. |
| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | N/A | a, b, f |
| 31360 Ms Thuy Tran | N/A | Support a), b) c), f). Strongly opposed d) and especially e) |
| 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | N/A | In order of preferred priority (b) Intensification within existing town centres. (f) In Tasman's existing rural towns and (a) largely along the SH6 corridor |
| 31363 Mr Steve Cross | N/A | I reject the premise of this question |
| 31364 Mrs Christine Tuffnell | N/A | С |
| | | |

| 31366 Ms Maree Sharland | N/A | (b) Intensification within existing town centres |
|------------------------------|-----|---|
| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | N/A | Tasman: dont care . Atawhai to the Glen and further around. Plenty of land there. |
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | N/A | b - intensification thereby providing much needed life to city centres rather than spreading out housing which would rely on transport for jobs etc. We really need to keep any greenspace areas, ie Maitai Valley for the future generations for recreation and mental health needs. |
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | N/A | (b) Intensification within existing town centres and(f) In Tasman's existing rural towns |
| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | N/A | b) Intensification within existing town centresf) In Tasman's existing rural townsIn some cases - c) Expansion into greenfield areas close to the existing urban areas |
| 31384 Mr Jace Hobbs | N/A | b |
| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | N/A | g |
| 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann | N/A | Definitely (b) Intensification within existing town centres and (f) In Tasman's existing rural towns! |
| | | Plus hands off of (c)!! |
| 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett | N/A | Intensification within existing town centres. in Tasman's existing rural towns. |
| 31400 Miss Heather Wallace | N/A | Infrastructure within existing town centres. in Tasman existing rural towns. |
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | N/A | I agree with a, b, f. |
| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | N/A | b, d (Tasman), e |
| 31405 Mr Doug Hattersley | N/A | b |
| 31406 Ms Floortje van Lierop | N/A | Build UP, not out, close to CBDs. Think of quality, and usability. Enable sustainable, community-oriented, and light-footprint developments. Keep green spaces where you can and look at Richmond for an idea of what NOT to do (Bateup Rd, Paton Rd, Hart Rd) |
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle | N/A | (b) Intensification within existing town centres (f) In Tasman's existing rural towns |
| | | Growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing |

| | | rural towns, but it needs to balance residential with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only have to commute long distances. |
|------------------------------------|-----|--|
| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling | N/A | (a); (b) |
| 31410 Mr Scott Smithline | N/A | Let's start creatively with B. Lots of good models around the world to emulate |
| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling | N/A | (B) and (a) |
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin | N/A | B. Intensification with existing town centres F. In Tasman's existing rural towns |
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | N/A | b. Intensification within existing town centres. |
| 31415 Mrs Zanahe Ruth Galloway | N/A | (d): Creating new towns away from existing centre (f) In Tasman's existing rural towns |
| 31416 Tim Leyland | N/A | (b) Intensification within existing town centres (f) In Tasman's existing rural towns |
| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors | N/A | B and C and F |
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | N/A | (b) intensification, but also including elements change of land use and reduction of |
| | | Review of housing occupancy is needed as there is a huge portion of the existing housing capacity used fo low density occupancy (people per household) or other commercial use (eg holiday houses / Air BnB). The traditional NZ model of low density housing on large land areas with very low occupancy is not logical to continue, the FDS doesn't address any of these issues. |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | N/A | A,B,C |
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | N/A | B - Intensification within existing town centres F - in Tasman's existing rural towns |
| 31422 Mrs Marga Martens | N/A | Intensification in existing town centres (Richmond, Motueka and possibly Wakefield). |
| | | Build close to the place where the jobs are. People having to commute to their jobs is not sustainable. |
| 31423 Mr Roger Frost | N/A | Frankly, I would not like to see growth happening at all, but given local governments having little control over this I think the SH6 corridor as proposed makes sense (option a). Options b and c also make sense, although I am not happy with productive land being used. |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas Hollyman | N/A | A/A Hira is getting forgotten |
| | | |

| 31430 Muriel Moran | N/A | a) NO b) YES |
|---------------------------------------|-----|--|
| | | c) NO |
| | | d) I have previously stated my opinion about not developing satellite areas that have no local work opportunities. |
| | | Using land that is not needed for agriculture is preferred around cities. |
| | | Realising that growth is not the only goal. |
| 31431 Katerina Seligman | N/A | Creating new towns away from existing centres on higher ground. |
| 31434 Mrs cushla Moorhead | N/A | a, yes b, yes c no expansion. |
| 31435 Mr Alan Eggers | N/A | Do need greenfield development close to existing settlement, but with Rural Res there should be more p |
| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn Ball | N/A | Intensification within existing town centres. |
| 31438 Aleisha Hosie | N/A | All of the above. |
| 31441 Mr Chris Head | N/A | I think we should be focusing on making the best use of the areas we have already developed, rather than continuing to expand into new areas. I don't have a problem with some development of new communities around the Tasman area, but I think the big focus should be on how we can turn what we already have into a resource that is second-to-none in keeping with the FDS outcomes. |
| 31443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | N/A | B) Intensification within existing town centres |
| 31447 Dr David Jackson | N/A | As above but: |
| | | a) not up the Maitai and Kaka Valleys |
| | | b) to include a village at Hira |
| 31449 Mr John Chisholm | N/A | a, b, d, f |
| 31452 Mr David Bartle | N/A | b |
| | | It is unclear how much growth is needed or justified. Nelson Tasman should not carry the cost of weak policies in Auckland or Christchurch. This will require councils to urgently regulate for substantia green belts to support farming and prevent further lifestyle block subdivision |
| 31457 Mr J Santa Barbara | N/A | b, f. |
| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | N/A | F, E |

| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | N/A | Definitely (b) If (a) is considered I believe that any development should be in clusters with suitable community facilities shops, under 5s centres, clinic facilities etc to allow for local use without travel to larger urban unless for specific recreation or other reason. |
|------------------------------|-----|--|
| 31464 Mr David Matulovich | N/A | HIRA! |
| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | N/A | B intensification within existing town centers |
| 31472 Dr David Briggs | N/A | I don't want growth in any of these specifically. I want a properly integrated plan to minimise GHG emissions and serve the public good which explicitly achieves these aims. In otherwords the question at thuis stage is not where, but how? If you did tackled the issue in that way - i.e. by setting clear requirements for, and constraints on, development, you could then quantify the suitability of the whole region fir development and come up with a set of proposals that would optimise those objectives. |
| 31473 Mr Andrew Downs | N/A | Growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance residential with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only have to commute long distances. |
| 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon | N/A | (a) Largely along the SH6 corridor as proposed (b) Intensification within existing town centres (c) Expansion into greenfield areas close to the existing urban areas (d) |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | N/A | b with first priority, then a. Do not expand into greenfield areas. |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | N/A | (b) intensification of existing urban areas. No expansion into greenfield areas which should be kept for agriculture or recreation. We need to keep as much nature as possible. |
| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | N/A | H (TDC has done the research, not me) |
| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | N/A | A, B, C This would reduce the loss of our rural regions and productive land along with minimising GHG emissions from the large increase of travel that would be required for households out of the town centres. The FDS will increase bus services however, these are rarely able to be utilised by families who often travel in different directions for work, school, and extra-curricula activities. |
| 31480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | N/A | N/A |
| 31481 Mrs Lucy Harrhy | N/A | b. |

| | | I don't support any expansion into greenfield areas, nor new towns away from existing centres, or between the Mapua and Mot, or in Tasman's rural towns. |
|---|-----|---|
| 31483 Debbie Hampson | N/A | Definitely NOT (a) in Tahunanui. (e) or (f) would be acceptable. |
| 31484 Mr Gavin Brent Cook | N/A | Please concentrate on the working people, over the years I've seen way to many people having to chase cheaper housing price outside of the natural working habitat which in turn has created a lot of issues on our Nelson roads |
| 31485 Ms Robin Schiff | N/A | intensification, - in existing town centres. Increase planning for intensification in Hope and Brightwater because they are at great enough altitude to be safe from sea level rise. Only if the planning starts from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | N/A | (b) Intensification within existing town centres and(f) In Tasman's existing rural towns |
| 31487 Ms Heather Spence | N/A | b. as first priority. As previously implied in my responses, to me intensification is achieved by high-density housing and working spaces, making it easier for people to move around without relying on cars. Positive climate action being the primary driver. |
| 31488 Annette Starink | N/A | A. B. C (if controlled) |
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | N/A | b & f Growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance residential with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only have to commute long distances. |
| 31491 Ms Annette Milligan | N/A | Intensification and increased usage within existing urban and village boundaries. I am opposed to building new towns which can only increase the already perilous risk of increasing climate change risk factors |
| 31492 Anton, Benni, Shalom, AJ Bank, Bonnin, Shalom Davis | N/A | to see intensification within our present town centres |

| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | N/A | (b) intensification with existing town centres (f) in Tasman's existing rural towns |
|--------------------------------|-----|---|
| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | N/A | B) intensification within existing town centres and (f) in Tasman's existing rural towns. Growth should only be allowed through intensification in both town centres and rural towns. |
| 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | N/A | (b) Intensification within existing town centres and (f) In Tasman's existing rural towns Growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance residential with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only have to commute long distances. |
| 31496 Mrs Petra Dekker | N/A | Growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance residential with jobs. I |
| 31497 Mrs Uta Purcell | N/A | Same as above, no. 13 |
| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless | N/A | A) largely along the SH6 corridor in smaller groups & maintaining green field mix |
| 31505 Cheryl Heten | N/A | Intensification within existing town centres. Expansion into greenfield areas close to existing urban areas. CBD where existing multi story buildings exist. |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne | N/A | Ticked: Don't know |
| 31508 Mr Roger Barlow | N/A | b, f, and the foothills from Brightwater to Wakefield. This land is not suitable as productive land as the majority is clay based with minimal topsoil and unsuitable for agricultural machinery. It is close to Towns and SH 6. The valley floors could be used as retention ponds to control storm water flows. Flooding from the Wakefield area is getting worse every year as development progresses as little or no storm water control has been used. No fear of problems from increased sea levels caused by global warming. |
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | N/A | b,f |
| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | N/A | (b), intensification within existing town centres - see answer to 13 above. Strongly oppose (c), (d) and (g) |
| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | N/A | Yes: Largely along the SH6 corridor as proposed Yes: Intensification within existing town centres |
| 31515 Geoffrey Vause | N/A | Intensification within existing town centres. |

| 31516 Mr Peter Lole | N/A | (a) - Absolute minimum of greenfield development though. |
|-----------------------------|-----|--|
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers | N/A | c seems the current easiest way forward. Along with B when the community wants it. |
| 31520 Andrew Stirling | N/A | Expansion into greenfield areas close to existing urban areas. In Tasman's existing rural towns. |
| 31523 Ms karen steadman | N/A | I would like to see the smaller towns grow, A lot of people would like to be part of a smaller community, but some of these smaller towns are not able to offer some of the basics and the thought of long distanc travel is off putting. |
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | N/A | (b) Intensification within existing town centres and (f) In Tasman's existing rural towns Growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns. It also needs to balance residential with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, only business opportunities as otherwise people will have to commute long distances. |
| 31529 Mr Steven King-Turner | N/A | a,b,c |
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | N/A | a), b), c) & to some extent in f). |
| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard | N/A | Intensification within existing town centres. |
| 31533 Wendy Trevett | N/A | Intensification within existing town centres. Creating new towns away from existing centres (Hira, Tasman/Lower Moutere). |
| 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | N/A | Carefully planned and 'economic' monitored growth so that we grow the wellbeing of our communities and protect our natural environment for those communities to enjoy it. Why would we want to destroy what we have - any more than it has been to date - for the sake of economic growth for growths sake. This is flawed thinking . Refer full submission. Summarised below (similar to NT2050 submission): challenges reliance on greenfield expansion and recommends broadening of approach taken to intensification. |
| 31549 Mr Ian McComb | N/A | Priorities as follows: (b) intensification within existing town centres (f) in Tasman's existing rural towns (a) largely along State Highway corridor as proposed (c) Expansion into greenfield areas |
| 31551 Mrs Jo Kitchen | N/A | I would like |

| 31553 Mr Wim van Dijk | N/A | (b) Intensification within existing town centres(f) In Tasman's existing rural towns |
|-------------------------------|-----|---|
| 31554 Wendy Barker | N/A | within existing town centres - there is plenty of room. Get rid of all the rubbish - car sales yards, falling down semi-industrial buildings, car parking areas, old, cold, semi-derelict housing and you will find plenty of room for good quality accommodation. We have an internationally acclaimed cycle trail that starts in Nelson. It's called the Great Taste Trail. When it was first developed around ten years ago, the name was reasonably apt. Now, there are few places along the Trail for people to 'taste' anything other than exhaust fumes while looking sadly at the ever-increasing sprawl of houses and industry. Harley Road, Marriages Road, Aporo Road, into Lower Moutere etc. If this sprawl is allowed to go ahead as proposed, the Trail will have to change its name. I would suggest the Not-so-great-urban-sprawl Trail. |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | N/A | [a] [b - including [f] Tasman's existing rural towns - e.g - not creating a new rural town when such villages/community kernels are already there] NOT: [c]; [d]; [e] [g] |
| 31558 Mr Steve Jordan | N/A | acef |
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | N/A | b only |
| 31560 Ms Steph Watts | N/A | A mixture of theses options, allowing for plenty of green spaces and walk/cycleways. |
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | N/A | Growth close to Takaka township and adjacent to Hospital zone Plus read in conjunction with # 13 |
| 31562 Grant palliser | N/A | (B), (f) |
| 31563 Mrs Loretta Anne Hogg | N/A | b.There are plenty of places - I'm sure you can work it out.d. motueka, brightwater, sarau, moutere, wakefield, springs junction,f., yes |
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | N/A | (b) Intensification within existing town centres and (f) In Tasman's existing rural towns Growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance residential with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only have to commute long distances. |
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | N/A | (b) Intensification within existing town centres and (f) In Tasman's existing rural towns |

| | | Growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance residential with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only have to commute long distances. |
|--------------------------|-----|--|
| 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett | N/A | B x 1000 |
| 31572 Mr David Todd | N/A | I do not know |
| 31573 Mrs Susan Lea | N/A | I do not wish to see extensive growth in Nelson/ Tasman over the next 30 years leave the area as is limit spread of suburbs . Sensitively placed 2 (at max 3) story buildings may not detract from the pleasar nature of our area. |
| 31574 Mr David Bolton | N/A | (c) expansion of greenfield areas close to existing urban centres. |
| 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham | N/A | Growth should happen in the current centres of employment which are Nelson and Richmond with an emphasis onlocal transport and walking to work if we are not to become the urban disasters which are Tauranga and Auckland. |
| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | N/A | I would like to see growth happen in: (b) Intensification within existing town centres (f) In Tasman's existing rural towns |
| 31579 Jane Tate | N/A | Intensification within existing town centres |
| 31580 Jenny Long | N/A | Intensification within existing town centres. Look to European cities for inspiration: multi-storey apartments above all the shops, creating vibrant town centres and saving green spaces for parks, food production and nature. There are so many benefits to increasing the population right in the centres of towns, including: -Lower carbon emissions as residents can do shopping/work/other errands by foot or by bikeResidents' time saved as not stuck in lengthy commutes every daySafer roads with reduced trafficMore customers for local businesses as people live, work and play right at their doorstepHealthier residents as they get more exercise and sleep thanks to not having lengthy commutes, and moving around on foot or by bike moreGreen spaces are saved for public parks, food production, and natureHousing in wider suburbia and in rural areas is kept available for those who truly want it, as demand is reduced by having the segment of the population who appreciates the benefits of central urban living |

| | actually having the option of living in town centre apartments. |
|-----|--|
| N/A | Expansion into greenfield areas close to the existing urban areas is understandable progression. For example the development at Bateman Road in Richmond. Build more houses and expand near to existing towns like Richmonddon't try to 'create' new ones in rural areas. Expand the infrastructure we already have. |
| N/A | b, c, |
| N/A | option B only |
| N/A | (b) Intensification within existing town centres |
| N/A | development should only occur by intensification within existing town centres (b) |
| N/A | A. |
| N/A | A |
| N/A | (b) Intensification within existing town centres (f) In Tasman's existing rural towns Growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance residential with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only have to commute long distances. |
| N/A | (b) Intensification within existing town centres and (f) In Tasman's existing rural towns |
| | Growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance residential with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only have to commute long distances. |
| N/A | (b) Intensification within existing town centres (f) Intensification in Tasman's existing rural towns Growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance residential with jobs. No more local jobs, no more new houses, otherwise we again suggest it is ok for people to commute long distances. |
| | N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A |

| 31595 Gary Clark | N/A | (e) |
|---------------------------|-----|---|
| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | N/A | (b) Intensification within existing town centres and (f) In Tasman's existing rural towns Growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance residential with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only have to commute long distances. |
| 31598 Mrs Nicola Worsfold | N/A | b) intensification within existing town centres for the reasons above, noting we need our primary production land to grow food to be able to feed the community. |
| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | N/A | Not in the Maitai valley / save it for recreational use. It will only become more important and future generations will thank us for the foresight |
| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | N/A | (b) Intensification within existing town centres and (f) In Tasman's existing rural towns Growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance residential with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only have to commute long distances. |
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | N/A | (b) Intensification within existing town centres and (f) In Tasman's existing rural towns Growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance residential with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only have to commute long distances. |
| 31608 Robbie Thomson | N/A | SH6 Corridor makes sense;Intensification of town centres will happen anyway;Expansion into greenfield areas must be stopped at all cost;New town centre in Tasman is a good start,with housing in the undeveloped land behind |
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | N/A | b) and f), near to employment opportunities |
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | N/A | B. Intensification within existing town centres, creating a beautiful city (cities) where it is easy to walk/cycle/use public transport with facilities within reach. Avoid adding extra motorists to our roads. |
| 31612 Mr Paul Davey | N/A | Mainly in the existing city/town centres and there is a lot of marginal land that has been over utilised with |

| | | forestry etc. |
|------------------------------|-----|---|
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | N/A | (b) Intensification within existing town centres (f) In Tasman's existing rural towns Growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance residential with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be not new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only have to commute long distances. |
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | N/A | b. Intensification within existing town centres f. In existing rural towns |
| 31617 Ms steph jewell | N/A | (a) No (b) yes (c)No (d)only when (b) has intensified to 2-3-4 storeys (e) same as (d) There is so much room above us! But when we cover greenfield space we lose the living, breathing, carbon-neutralising stuff that we need. |
| 31623 Ms Lucy Charlesworth | N/A | I am wary of answering these questions as I cannot be sure of how they will be interpreted. So I will state - I do not agree with developing green spaces. These spaces need to be reserved and protected to allow for sustainable biodiversity and for future generations. Intensification within Nelson CBD needs to be a priority. I do not agrees with building on Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. I do not agree with housing development on green fields. There is a climate emergency. Remove these areas from the FDS. |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | N/A | Our emissions reduction imperative is cuttingly clear (https://www.theguardian.com/environment/video/2022/apr/04/world-on-fast-track-to-climate-disaster-say-un-secretary-general-video), energy availability will be severely limited in 15-100 years due to the aforementioned emissions reduction and the inability of our planet to support 'renewable' technology scaling to the extent we like to think it might. |
| | | We're in the midst of a cultural crisis where larger New Zealand cities are falling apart for lack of human-centric design but rural villages lack public natural amenities. |
| | | and that's just to name a couple of hurts. Nearly all factors are pointing in the same direction. |

--

I'm very clear that we need to get tight and dense, with a network of highly performant population hubs based on existing centres. Jobs must come ahead of residential.

Efficient, human friendly urban centres are good for local productivity, the nation's economy, and quality of life (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7Nw6qyyrTel).

We need to take a leaf from deeply established nations and cultures, and be looking at how their efficient systems were arranged 50-150 years ago. Systems that didn't rely on fertiliser for food, or petrol for a the journey. Such is our relatively low density in NZ that this isn't even an unreasonable comparison.

As an arbitrary example, one could google a town in Germany named 'Fulda' and survey the surrounding landscape. I just happen to know this place. It's a population near that of Nelson, and one can observe some good satellite town distribution in the areas that border it. Note the reasonably regular preservation of green zones and farming around each hub, the strong links etc. Not perfect, could be more dense; but an illustration.

C/o-NT2050

Growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance residential with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only have to commute long distances.

Where?

Don't just build on the highway.

YES intensify.

Limit greenfields as a last resort.

Be very very careful about new towns, but I concede Tasman is well spaced.

Yes in existing towns.

Absolutely not 'everywhere'.

31625 Dr Bruno Lemke

N/A

- 1) intensification
- 2) along SH6 to Wakefield as this is closer to high density urban centres than Mapua.

| 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | N/A | b,f |
|------------------------------------|-----|---|
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | N/A | Intensification linked to local employment opportunity and making it REALLY hard AND expensive for greenfield development/subdivision to occur. |
| 31628 Mr Daniel Levy | N/A | Intensification within existing town areas. A large number of sites within the existing town areas are totally underutilized. Developers should be steered towards developing these areas appropriately with higher density, mixed use models, combining commercial facilities and a range of residential options to meet the cross-section of future rental and owner occupier demand. This would revitalize the urban centres. The Nelson city to sea connection should also be developed with a higher density commercial/residential corridor planned to link the city centre to the Nelson Marina Area. |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | N/A | b, intensification within existing town centres g, existing rural towns. |
| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | N/A | (a) Largely along the SH6 corridor as proposed (b) Intensification within existing town centres (e) In coastal Tasman areas, between Mapua and Motueka (f) In Tasman's existing rural towns |
| 31631 Mrs Joy Shackleton | N/A | (d)(e)(f) Smaller towns |
| 31633 Ms Jacquetta Bell QSM | N/A | a and b |
| 31636 Joanna Santa Barbara | N/A | (b) Intensification within existing town centres. |
| 31637 Ms Frances Kemble Welch | N/A | A, b,f. Ki |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | N/A | B & C |
| 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin | N/A | b,e,f |
| 31641 Mr Stephen (Steve) Hayden | N/A | a, b, |
| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | N/A | a b e f |
| 31644 Murray Poulter | N/A | Growth should occur in compact areas that exist as communities whose requirements can be built on existing urban infrastructure. |
| | | Coastal Tasman areas do not fit any criteria for sustainability, or large scale community and economic development. |
| | | |

| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | N/A | I am not an expert and able to comment everything. Please listen to Joni Tomsett or Tim Neubauer. I think they represent my ideas. |
|--------------------------------|-----|---|
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | N/A | (b) Intensification within existing town centres (f) In Tasman's existing rural towns |
| | | Growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance residential with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be not new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only have to commute long distances. |
| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | N/A | В |
| 31651 Dr Patrick Conway | N/A | In town centers, but also mixed use suburban neighbourhoods, with small supermarkets, cafe's and beautified common areas that bring people together. |
| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | N/A | E) and A) there is alot of development opportunity here and people that would be willing to live there. |
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | N/A | (b) intensification within existing town centres should be a priority (a) intensification and growth along one corridor allows for easier provision of supporting infrastructure such as active mode transport facilities, public transport etc. (c) if greenfield development is required to meet demand (cannot be met by intensification alone), then greenfield development should be adjoining or very close to existing urban areas |
| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | N/A | B & C |
| 31662 Joe Roberts | N/A | All of the above. |
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | N/A | (b) Intensification within existing town centres (f) In Tasman's existing rural towns Growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance residential with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be not new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only have to commute long distances. |
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | N/A | B. Intensification in existing town centres. |
| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | N/A | (b) Intensification within existing town centres (f) In Tasman's existing rural towns Growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance residential with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be not |

| | | new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only have to commute long distances. |
|------------------------|-----|--|
| 31673 Mike Drake | N/A | (b) |
| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | N/A | The extended Braeburn Block T-136 is vital to provide for the long term growth of Motueka. We would recommend that the Sites as set out in our submission be considered for inclusion in the Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy as a Greenfield development area. The proposed rezoning and residential development of the Braeburn site, subject to final detailed design, is in line with the objectives and community expectations of the FDS and will: Allow for a comprehensively designed residential community that can provide for good pedestrian and cycleway connectivity and not adversely affect the overall rural amenity of the Lower Moutere area. Page 9 of 13 Provide for the future demand for residential land in the Motueka and Lower Moutere Area. With the gentle rolling terrain the amount of earthworks required for the development should not be significant. Provide for a residential development area that is not at risk from coastal inundation, river flooding risk or slope instability. Provide for a low impact stormwater management system that with riparian and wetland plantings that can actually improve water quality and biodiversity in the area. Provide an opportunity for public Council reserve and walkways and cycleways that will be benefit to the whole Tasman community. Work in with projected infrastructure upgrades and trunk network extensions, that will benefit adjoining Rural 3 areas and improve connectivity in the area. We believe the disadvantages of the Tasman Village T-166-168 mean that a larger Braeburn Site (T-136) is required to cater for future growth. Meets the eleven projected outcomes of the draft FDS document. Please note with the importance of the Braeburn Secondary Growth Area - SEE ATTACHED |
| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | N/A | (b) Intensification within existing town centres (f) In Tasman's existing rural towns Growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance residential with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only have to commute long distances. |

| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | N/A | Support A & B. Also support development in Hira as this is also on the corridor and will help public transport viability to the north of Nelson. Strongly disagree with residential development in the Maitai Valley. Support the Bayview development on the ridge and western side facing the bay but certainly not the Maitai. |
|--------------------------------|-----|--|
| 31681 Seev Oren | N/A | Creating new towns away from existing centres (if so tell us where) Tasman Village, Williams St to Aporo Road .In Coastal Tasman areas, between Mapua and Motueka. In Tasman existing rural towns. |
| 31683 Richard Davies | N/A | Intensification within existing town centres. Creating new towns away from existing centres: Moutere Hills and other non productive land. |
| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | N/A | All areas may growth some degree of growth over the next 30 years. The more important question is whether the scale and type of growth is consistent with and enhances the communities in which it is being developed. Adding additional homes around or intensifying within existing large townships (e.g. Atawhai, Stoke, Richmond) does not fundamentally change the character of such settlements. Conversely, adding new 1000-3000+ subdivisions around rural villages that would more than double their population or establishing entire new communities within rural areas based of land availability alone is NOT acceptable. |
| 31685 Chris A Freyberg | N/A | i. Intensification within existing town centres ii. In Tasman's existing towns |
| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | N/A | Expansion into greenfield areas close to existing urban centres such as Wakefield. |
| 31688 Gerard McDonnell | N/A | Brightwater and Wakefield - leave the coastal highway area (already too busy) |
| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | N/A | Growth should only be permitted in existing centres, rural and urban, and should not be in greenfield sites. We need intensification in these areas. |
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | N/A | B - intensification within existing town centres, including areas that have already been identified for growth |
| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | N/A | b |
| 31697 Robert King-Tenison | N/A | Largely along the SH6 is proposed. Intensification with existing town centres. In Tasman's existing towns. |
| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | N/A | a b c e f |
| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | N/A | Any growth should be through intensification of existing areas, particularly in areas where there are jobs and services, not in green field developments. |
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | N/A | d) Mapua has potential to serve more people by intensification and expansion, thus reducing the need fo greenfield expansion. 100% NOT in support of taking highly productive farm ground for development. (for example the Waime |
| | | |

| | | Plains, Mot/Riwaka flats, Moutere River flats) |
|---------------------------------------|-----|---|
| 31703 Ms Paula Holden | N/A | a, b, e |
| 31704 Mr Paul Bucknall | N/A | (b) Intensification within existing town centres (d) Creating new towns away from existing centre (please tell us where) - I don't object to the suggested new settlement near Tasman village. More homes, closer together, taking up less space would be a much better use of this land. The idea that it is land that is adding primary production value to the area is ridiculous. The few goats running about between the pine trees are adding nothing - as were the pine trees. Any development needs to be away from land that will be inundated as sea level rises. Are there other places along the SH60 corridor that could be developed without using versatile soils? This must be supported by public transport or new technology - E-vehicles only? There is interesting work going on around power demand management to maximise sustainable renewable energy. (e) In coastal Tasman areas, between Māpua and Motueka - by the coast would be bad, but my response above is supportive of development here. |
| 31706 Paul Donald Galloway | N/A | d and f |
| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | N/A | I am endorsing the Nelson Tasman Climate Forum's view . Intensification within existing town centres. |
| 31709 Ofer Ronen | N/A | Creating new towns away from existing centres - A New Tasman Village. In coastal Tasman areas, betwee Mapua Motueka. In Tasman's existing rural towns. |
| 31710 Ms Angela Fitchett | N/A | (b), (f). |
| 31711 Sara Flintoff | N/A | Largely along the SH6 corridor as proposed. In Tasman's existing rural towns. |
| 31713 Mrs Debora Scholl Dos Santos | N/A | I'd love to see growth happening along the SH6 corridor (a) and intensification within existing town centres (b). |
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | N/A | See attached submission. N/A |
| 31716 Mr Alan hart | N/A | Green field expansion will continue to happen and should be accompanied by better public transport in the region including bus routes to Mapua and Motueka. Farm land should not be preserved in aspic for the sake of sentimentality or misguided self sufficiency thinking. All generations end up saying "this was once farmland its changed so much", some intensification may be needed but the same applies to occupying farmland. A balance is requied. |
| 31718 Kathryn & Keith Quigley | N/A | (b) and (c). |
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | N/A | (b) Intensification within existing town centres |

| | | (f) In Tasman's existing rural towns |
|---------------------------|-----|---|
| 31722 Trevor Chang | N/A | Since most of the properties along the formerly proposed "Southern Link" have been purchased by Transit, there is an opportunity to demolish older properties and erect higher density housing. I understand that the southern corridor is no longer in Transit's sights therefore the properties in this area are only providing rental income to a government department. |
| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | N/A | Not answering any of these leading questions |
| 31726 Mr John Jackson | N/A | Nowhere until I can see the detail. |
| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | N/A | (b) Intensification within existing town centres and (f) In Tasman's existing rural towns Growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance residential with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only have to commute long distances. |
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | N/A | b & f Growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance residential with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only have to commute long distances. |
| 31735 Mrs Ashleigh Calder | N/A | A |
| 31736 Ms Carol Curtis | N/A | (b) Intensification within existing town centres |
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | N/A | Intensification of the existing town centres and areas already developed i.e. within existing rural towns. There are many vacant areas within the existing urban boundaries that could be developed ie. the Wakatu / Bishopdale hills; the Marybank hill, the innumerable car yards. |
| 31738 Mrs Ngaire Calder | N/A | A |
| 31739 Philippa Hellyer | N/A | (e) but not at the expense of existing orchards or vineyards or well-run farms. |
| 31740 Mr Kevin Calder | N/A | A |
| | | |

| 31741 Mr Robert Stevenson | N/A | Mapua and Motueka |
|---|-----|--|
| 31742 Mr tim manning | N/A | (b) |
| 31743 Mr Zak Lyttle | N/A | A |
| 31744 Mrs Lorna CRANE | N/A | (f) Murchison |
| 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert- Watene | N/A | B,C,F |
| 31747 Mr (Tom) Neil BRETT | N/A | Utilize the lower hilly areas between Brightwater and Atawhai. |
| 31752 Jill Pearson | N/A | There probably should be no expansion till we know what it is. We need to look at our young people. |
| 31754 Ms Joanna Hopkinson | N/A | Expansion in to greenfield areas close tot he existing urban areas. |
| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | N/A | Please see attached for more details. |
| 31756 Ronald Alfred & Phylis Kinzett | N/A | Largely along the SH6 corridor. In Tasman's existing rural towns. |
| 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | N/A | Richmond South should be cancelled. |
| | | Focus on Richmond foothills, hills to the east of Wakefield and rezoing Rural 3 near Mapua to Rural Residential |
| | | Intensification with eixsting town centres, yes |
| | | Grow Tasman existing rural towns, Upper Moutere, St Arnaud, Belgrove, Mapua |
| 31758 Mr Brayden Calder | N/A | A |
| 31761 Karen Steadman | N/A | 1,2,3,6 where ticked |
| 31762 Mr Mark Hewetson | N/A | fully support the FDS statement of proposal, that a range of density and affordability choices for housing should be available to district residents, and in particular statements such as the FDS must be flexible to respond to growth as it occurs andmix of growth accommodated through intensification and greenfield |
| | | also support the secondary proposal of a new community near Tasman village and the Lower Moutere area near Braeburn Rd, especially due to the ongoing restrictions being placed on development in the Motueka township |

| 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | N/A | (b) Intensification within existing town centres |
|--|-----|---|
| 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | N/A | (b) Intensification within existing town centres being mindful of the fact that vehicle congestion and access to services is already a problem with the existing population |
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | N/A | (b) and (f) |
| 31769 Ms Jo Gould | N/A | I think intensification of existing town centres makes sense. However, the extent of this beyond the immediate core of the town needs to be well thought through. I do not favour expansion into Greenfield areas, as this has high potential to impact on existing amenity values and natural values. |
| 31771 Colleen Shaw | N/A | a) and b) in order to limit the need to transport to and from amenities and expansion into greenfield spaces which must be preserved. |
| 31774 Mrs Jane Sutherland | N/A | (a), (b) - to a certain extent, (c), (e) - I agree with the secondary part of the proposal (Tasman expansion) to reduce to some extent too much intensification elsewhere. (f) |
| 31775 Dr Thomas Carl | N/A | Largely along the SH6 corridor as proposed (b) Intensification within existing town centres (c) Expansion into greenfield areas close to the existing urban areas |
| 31777 Mr David Lucas | N/A | (a), (b), (e), (f) |
| 31783 Mr Peter Jones | N/A | A SH6 corridor from Nelson city to Tahuna. This makes no sense what so ever. Inundation and liquefaction have been highlighted in this corridor so this begs the question as to why NCC would ignore this. B agree with this C very important for community support. D Tasman Upper Monterey, Brightwater, Wakefield and Motueka all need to intensify housing. Mapua has issues with Coastal erosion and inundation. |
| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | N/A | Intensification within existing town centres and in Tasman's existing rural towns. |
| 31787 Lilac Meir | N/A | In coastal Tasman area, between Mapua and Motueka and in Tasman's existing rural towns. Specifically mentions Tasman Village T-198 |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | N/A | Ticked: Creating towns away rom existing centres: Wakefield - west of SH6 |
| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | N/A | Intensification within town centres and the areas between the town centres of Nelson-Stoke-Richmond. |
| 31801 Joan Skurr | N/A | Intensification within existing town centres. In Tasman's existing rural towns. |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | N/A | (b) - limited, targeted, defensible growth which is not open-ended. |
| | | |

| | | (f) - note engage with Te Ātiawa personnel, who manage the land portfolio. |
|-------------------------|-----|--|
| 31809 Mr Andrew Spittal | N/A | It is important for a wide range of growth options to be provided for as not everyone has the same needs and preferences. This land at 49 Stafford Drive also has the benefit of meeting a range of needs and preferences. |
| 31815 Peter Wilks | N/A | Largely along SH6 corridor as proposed. Intensification within existing town centres. Creating new towns away from existing centres. Tapawera would be a perfect place for a new town. |
| 31835 Mr Ian Wishart | N/A | Ticked: Intensification within existing town centres as long as well done. Ticked: In Tasman's existing rural towns. |
| 31836 Paula M Wilks | N/A | Largely along the SH6 corridor as proposed. Intensification within existing town centres. In Tasman's existing rural towns. Tapawera. Has work, good travel route and schools and shops. |
| | | |

15 Do you agree with prioritising intensification within Nelson? This level of intensification is likely to happen very slowly over time. Do you have any comments?

| 31114 Ms Jill Rogers | Agree | |
|----------------------------|-------|--|
| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | Agree | |
| 31118 Ms Sarah Varey | Agree | |
| 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | Agree | |
| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | Agree | Intesification is better than greenfields - better utilise the already occupied space that lose more productive land or green space |
| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | Agree | |
| 31165 Mr Vincent Dickie | Agree | |
| 31186 Mr Gary Scott | Agree | Build apartments above the shops in the main street. Bring people back into the center. Increase the height limit. Convert all of the land used by car sales to build apartments on. We don't need commercial operations on Rutherford street like car sales. Better to use it for accommodation. |
| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | Agree | |
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | Agree | |
| 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | Agree | Again, see my answer to 02. |
| 31248 Mr Will Bosnich | Agree | I would like to see small communities develop further to allow locals to shop and live locally. Particularly, I would like to see Tahunanui become a community unto itself providing a retail and community sector that encourages local shopping and community interaction and can be accessed by walking. As it stands, Council has encouraged SH6 'strip development' which is vehicle rather than pedestrian focused, and further has not established the retail or community environment or infrastructure necessary to allow locals to interact, shop and meet their needs locally. This is a shameful lack of community planning, and resulted in increased vehicle use and congestion. In addition, the lack of a community shopping & retail sector and community square or 'hub' has resulted in a lack of community interaction and the increase in crime and social isolation that accompany all such 'suburbs'. |
| 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan | Agree | Services are already there, people can commute to work using shorter distances rather than travelling big distances, enhances the cities for business |
| 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman | Agree | I agree with intensifying developments, but the present proposals are in denial of sea-level change and are a poor response to known natural hazards. |

| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | Agree | |
|---|-------|---|
| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | Agree | |
| 31279 Mr Jeremy Thompson | Agree | Providing a gradual shift towards greater intensification within the existing urban area precludes the change of use of existing greenfield land outside the existing urban area. See answer 3 |
| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | Agree | |
| 31285 Dr Hamish Holland | Agree | |
| 31286 Mr David Short | Agree | |
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | Agree | |
| 31309 Mr & Mrs Rose & Phillip Windle | Agree | |
| 31318 Mrs Isobel Mosley | Agree | |
| 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | Agree | |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | Agree | Yes, infrastructure is already in place. |
| 31334 Diane Sutherland | Agree | As long that intensification is balanced with better living conditions - parks, open spaces, playgrounds, attractive streets. Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. I think that the FDS is an opportunity to redefine intensification and ensure higher, smarter densities in the city |
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | Agree | |
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | Agree | |
| 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman | Agree | |
| 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | Agree | Good plan - please make sure it is balanced with better living conditions. Council needs to be actively guiding - leaving it to landowners to develop their back section is not enough There are amazing examples of good city development in other parts of the world! |
| 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | Agree | |
| 31346 Martin Hartman | Agree | Good plan - please make sure it is balanced with better living conditions. Council needs to be actively guiding - leaving it to landowners to develop their back section is not enough |
| | | |

| | | There are amazing examples of good city development in other parts of the world! |
|------------------------------|-------|--|
| 31349 Laurien Heijs | Agree | Endorse NelsonTasman2050 submission. There appear to be plenty of vacant lots in town. Perhaps start there with demonstrating some quality examples for the community. |
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | Agree | Need to look closely at spaces above shops, and even having underground carparks (as overseas do). Or creating housing above parking areas. So many single height buildings, need to look at how Nelson will look in years to come with specific housing planning essential. |
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | Agree | Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. With all this intensification we need to be careful for Nelson not to lose its wonderful character with historic buildings and leafy streets. Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. With all this intensification we need to be careful for Nelson not to lose its wonderful character with historic buildings and leafy streets. |
| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | Agree | |
| 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer | Agree | |
| 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann | Agree | Intensification yes, but not by building 7-storey-buildings in the middle of town. Keppe those to three, maybe four storeys. |
| 31395 Ms Gretchen Holland | Agree | This is NOT prioritising! It needs to happen faster then 'very slowly over time' as it may not happen at all if other greenfield areas are easier and cheaper for developers to develop. And it needs to be planned and structured intensification - not multi storeyed units blocking the sun of a neighbour or spoiling the ambience of a street of historic villas eg Elliot Street or South Street. Or not so historic villas in other areas of the Wood. |
| 31400 Miss Heather Wallace | Agree | Same answer for 15 to 17. |
| 31403 Mr Richard Deck | Agree | |
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle | Agree | Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. |

| | | historic buildings and leafy streets. Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. I think that the FDS is an opportunity to redefine intensification and ensure higher, smarter densities in the city centre. Leaving it to landowners to develop their back section is not enough. |
|---------------------------------------|-------|---|
| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling | Agree | I agree with intensification but this is only part of the issue. WE need to think about residential "liveability", i.e. health and amenity aspects, otherwise intensification can just least lead cramming people into unsuitable housing |
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin | Agree | Yes, and: 1. Existing large trees should be protected. The inner city is particularly well treed and this is a fabulous asset. Moreporks are currently heard around the cathedral area and the trees are critical to retaining the quality of the city. 2. More heritage areas should be designated, to ensure the best of the city's heritage is retained 3. If Nelson is to implement the new medium density residential standards, allowing up to three storeys on most sites without the need for a resource consent, we need to take great care prior to taking this step. Urban design experts have expressed concern over the implications of these standards and again, local government must take the lead by seeking best practice recommendations in order to avoid destroying the character of our city. |
| 31416 Tim Leyland | Agree | Yes, if jobs are available and concurrently retain character with historic buildings and leafy streets. |
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | Agree | needs to be faster! And come before Greenfield development which has hugely less impact on community environment |
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | Agree | Yes I agree. But it needs to be done with vision - not piecemeal infill. Provide high quality, attractive urban housing developments - not developments on back sections here and there. Create parks and oper areas around these developments. A proactive approach rather than a passive approach does not have to be slow. |
| 31430 Muriel Moran | Agree | |
| 31435 Mr Alan Eggers | Agree | |
| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn Ball | Agree | |
| 31449 Mr John Chisholm | Agree | |
| 31452 Mr David Bartle | Agree | Intensification in Nelson should be accelerated through: 1. Formation of and investment by NCC in an Urban Regeneration Agency. Private investment should also |
| | | |

| | | be sought, as was done for the Waimea Dam 2. Rate rebates for new intensification investment |
|----------------------------|-------|--|
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | Agree | |
| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | Agree | Yes, I do. The intensification of Nelson City seems ideal as a lot of jobs, schools and activities/amenities are situated there and close by. Again, though roading would need to be a major consideration as it is already problematic. |
| 31481 Mrs Lucy Harrhy | Agree | |
| 31487 Ms Heather Spence | Agree | I don't live there but it seems sensible to me. Why would it happen slowly over time in Nelson but not in other urban areas? |
| 31488 Annette Starink | Agree | |
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | Agree | Sounds good, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. With all this intensification we need to be careful for Nelson not to lose its wonderful character with historic buildings and leafy streets. Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. I think that the FDS is an opportunity to redefine intensification and ensure higher, smarter densities in the city centre. Leaving it to landowners to develop their back section is not enough. |
| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | Agree | Intensification within existing urban areas is my preferred option but this must but done in a well designed way to ensure that infill housing does not reduce the quality of urban living. Emphasis should be on smaller houses rather than larger houses crammed in. |
| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | Agree | Great plan but we need to make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions and good design that will contribute to a well functioning urban environment. |
| 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | Agree | Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. With all this intensification we need to be careful for Nelson not to lose its wonderful character with historic buildings and leafy streets. Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density |

| | | urban living. I think that the FDS is an opportunity to redefine intensification and ensure higher, smarter densities in the city centre. Leaving it to landowners to develop their back section is not enough. |
|----------------------------|-------|---|
| 31496 Mrs Petra Dekker | Agree | Great plan, but this needs to be done smartly. The earlier mentioned CCO's (see answer on question are responsible for making sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? |
| 31497 Mrs Uta Purcell | Agree | It would support existing commerce, have fewer empty shops, reduce transport. |
| 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | Agree | If there needs to be a bit of growth, this is best situated in Nelson and Richmond. |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne | Agree | Better than building in the countryside. But there should be no tall structures built without consultation. |
| 31508 Mr Roger Barlow | Agree | |
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | Agree | |
| 31516 Mr Peter Lole | Agree | Regrettably, it's got to happen. Needs to be sympathetic to neighbourhoods and create and sustain community. High(er) rises only if necessary. (Not eight stories as proposed on Rutherford st.) |
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers | Agree | if done properly and not a future slum |
| 31521 Mrs Marie Waterhouse | Agree | As long as this done correctly. I know we need housing but putting in housing options without parking facilities is not going to solve the problems we already have with residential parking. I know you want to try and force people to use public transport, bikes, walking etc but the reality is that everyone has a carthis is not going to change. If you do housing without parking those residents are just going to park in the surrounding streets that are already full. Why not build carparks in the city - Buxton square etc and do apartments / housing on top of that and then the parking is right there and have a couple of floors of parking available to the general public. Don't solve one problem to create another. WE are not New York city where everyone is happy to exist in a few blocks radius of where they live and then have 24/7 access to public transport if they want to go further afield. Build the housing, but make sure parking is involved and build up the inner city before you start building up the neighbourhoods. |
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | Agree | However, intensification needs to be balanced with better living conditions and not just pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. The FDS could be an opportunity to redefine intensification and ensure higher, smarter densities in the city centre. Leaving it to landowners to develop their back section is not enough. |
| 31531 Mr David Bennett | Agree | I disagree with the proposals put forward by Council in its current draft form. Intensification can and should be undertaken with regard to the social and amenity values existing within the areas already. |

| | | commercial zone in Nelson. If high rise is decided upon then it should be limited to 4 storeys and be constrained to the central business district area or VERY close to it and not be allowed in the residential zones. |
|---|-------|--|
| | | Further more blanket allowance for 3 storey townhouses to be built to 1m of the boundary lines "as of right" is not acceptable in the residential zones - be they already be defined as high density or low density zones. Consideration must be afforded to neighbours and their amenity values - all developments must be subject to consent process with adequate notification to possible affected parties. Townhouse complex's within the residential zones should be limited to 2 storey, but with allowed higher density proper design and consideration for dealight angle protection. |
| 21522 Wondy Troyott | Agrao | density, proper design and consideration for daylight angle protection. Consent with affected landowners is key, with proper mitigation and design the existing density can be increased in an appropriate manner to keep the city a desirable place to live. |
| 31533 Wendy Trevett 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery | Agree | |
| 31560 Ms Steph Watts | Agree | I agree intensifying more within reason is better than building outwards into greenfield land, native fores or highly productive land. |
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | Agree | away from inundation areas - Moana area/Tahunanui Community. Brings vitality to city centre and reduction in emissions from less vehicle usage |
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | Agree | Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? |
| | | Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. I think that the FDS is an opportunity to redefine intensification and ensure higher, smarter densities in the city centre. Leaving it to landowners to develop their back section is not enough. |
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | Agree | Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. With all this intensification we need to be careful for Nelson not to lose its wonderful character with historic buildings and leafy streets. |

| | | Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. I think that the FDS is an opportunity to redefine intensification and ensure higher, smarter densities in the city centre. Leaving it to landowners to develop their back section is not enough. |
|--------------------------|-------|--|
| 31572 Mr David Todd | Agree | |
| 31580 Jenny Long | Agree | I agree with intensification right at the centre of town, with affordable multi-storey apartments in business areas where they won't lead to more commuter traffic, and won't affect the view/sun of existing surrounding residential homes. I don't agree with intensification in nearby green spaces or in Nelson suburbia where two houses are jammed into a section that used to only have one house. This is inefficient and won't create the kind of town centre housing that we need, where multiple families/individuals can be housed in multi-storey apartments on the same land footprint. |
| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | Agree | Only where necessary when people indicate they want to, and need to move to Nelson. Nelson is already a small city and will naturally grow which is normal. As above, don't try to 'create' new towns in rural areas. Expand the infrastructure we already have. It's about people not money |
| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | Agree | Go UP not OUT |
| 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | Agree | However we need to come up with some creative planning, include plenty of parks, playgrounds etc perhaps even community gardens |
| 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz | Agree | |
| 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | Agree | Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urbar living. I think that the FDS is an opportunity to redefine intensification and ensure higher, smarter densities in the city centre. Leaving it to landowners to develop their back section is not enough. |
| 31593 Mr William Samuels | Agree | Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. |
| | | With all this intensification we need to be careful for Nelson not to lose its wonderful character with historic buildings and leafy streets. |

| | | Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. |
|------------------------------------|-------|--|
| | | I think that the FDS is an opportunity to redefine intensification and ensure higher, smarter densities in the city centre. Leaving it to landowners to develop their back section is not enough. |
| 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner | Agree | Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. With all this intensification we need to be careful for Nelson not to lose its wonderful character with historic buildings and leafy streets. |
| | | Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. |
| | | I think that the FDS is an opportunity to redefine intensification and ensure higher, smarter densities in the city centre. Leaving it to landowners to develop their back section is not good enough. |
| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | Agree | Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. |
| | | With all this intensification we need to be careful for Nelson not to lose its wonderful character with historic buildings and leafy streets. |
| | | Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. |
| | | I think that the FDS is an opportunity to redefine intensification and ensure higher, smarter densities in the city centre. Leaving it to landowners to develop their back section is not enough. |
| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | Agree | |
| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | Agree | Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. |
| | | With all this intensification we need to be careful for Nelson not to lose its wonderful character with historic buildings and leafy streets. |
| | | |

| | | Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. I think that the FDS is an opportunity to redefine intensification and ensure higher, smarter densities in the city centre. Leaving it to landowners to develop their back section is not enough. |
|------------------------------|-------|--|
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | Agree | Look at other towns and cities and see what works well, intensification can offer more affordable housing options and if thoughtfully done, can be pleasant places to live with green space and walk/cycle commute options. |
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | Agree | But, let's not build slums. There is the potential e.g. in Tahunanui, which is heavily subdivided, to lower quality of live and environment, unless it is well thought through. Existing residents should not suffer. |
| | | The quality of intensification has to be considered and controlled, so Nelson doesn't lose its beauty and charm. Left to developers, this won't happen. |
| | | It needs to be the spearhead of a housing campaign, to get momentum, and encourage people to buy into it offering greenfield sites as well as this, will slow down the uptake. If the region wants intensification, then don't offer other options. |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | Agree | Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. I think that the FDS is an opportunity to redefine intensification and ensure higher, smarter densities in the city centre. Leaving it to landowners to develop their back section is not enough. |
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | Agree | Quality developments and innovative higher density urban living are to be supported. |
| 31622 Peter Butler | Agree | But given climate change, especially saturated air stream events, it should not be allowed happen in areas that have proven especially vulnerable such as the tahuna slump |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | Agree | Agreed, more, faster. With respect for Sea Level Rise. Alan presented well in many respects with the Central City Spatial Plan - but follow through has felt lacklustre and token, probably due to a lack of backing inside council. We need to go up fast, with a strong focus on evicting the personal motor vehicle and liberating spaces for people and nature. Living design |
| | | |

| | | needs to be engaged in, in the sense of a constant and active conversation with the people and place; to yield a truly welcoming and enlivened city centre. Hundreds more trees needed. |
|--------------------------------|-------|--|
| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | Agree | |
| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | Agree | |
| 31644 Murray Poulter | Agree | |
| 31647 Mrs Rebecca Parish | Agree | |
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | Agree | Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urbar living. I think that the FDS is an opportunity to redefine intensification and ensure higher, smarter densities in the city centre. Leaving it to landowners to develop their back section is not enough. |
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | Agree | Waka Kotahi support intensification of existing urban areas that already have social and economic infrastructure in place, supporting moving away from a reliance on private vehicle transport |
| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | Agree | Agree Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. I think that the FDS is an opportunity to redefine intensification and ensure higher, smarter densities in the city centre. Leaving it to landowners to develop their back section is not enough. |
| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | Agree | From the perspective of providing homes close to work, retail and services, this makes sense. However in order to build a thriving inner city residential community, not only the homes are required. Our region's current resident's lifestyle choices needs to be considered as well as the need for additional greenspace, playgrounds etc. |
| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | Agree | There cannot be a blanket answer to this as it depends where the intensification is proposed and whether it meets social and climate change needs! In the case of the Tahunanui slump one must strongly disagree with any proposal to intensify or allow infill. |
| 31697 Robert King-Tenison | Agree | |
| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | Agree | |
| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | Agree | Yes, but we need to ensure that the intensification is done in a way that enhances our community. Currently this has been done with large concrete buildings and walled off areas of our city (do we have |
| | | |

| | | enough artworks to stick on these environmental and social monstrosities?). Intensification needs to be done with a considerate approach that enhances and builds on the character of the city and includes areas such as parks and other social gathering and recreational spaces (community urban vegetable gardens for example). |
|-------------------------------|---------|--|
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | Agree | |
| 31703 Ms Paula Holden | Agree | Increase building of townhouses & apartments to create more affordable housing & revive our CBD. However, protection of heritage & character areas is also important - a fine balance is needed. Nelson w lose some of it's special character if the changes are too extreme. |
| 31710 Ms Angela Fitchett | Agree | Has to happen alongside good planning so it is welcomed in the city and suburbs. |
| 31716 Mr Alan hart | Agree | Urban intensification should be accompanied by design guides and sensitivity to existing amenity |
| 31718 Kathryn & Keith Quigley | Agree | |
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | Agree | The FDS has an opportunity to redefine intensification and ensure higher, smarter density initiatives in th city centre. |
| 31721 Ms Jill Cullen | Agree | I don't agree to having 6 storey apartment buildings especially in areas where there is likely to be liquefaction. |
| 31722 Trevor Chang | Agree | See 14 above |
| 31726 Mr John Jackson | Agree | |
| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | Agree | Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. With all this intensification we need to be careful for Nelson not to lose its wonderful character with historic buildings and leafy streets. |
| | | Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. |
| | | I think that the FDS is an opportunity to redefine intensification and ensure higher, smarter densities in the city centre. Leaving it to landowners to develop their back section is not enough. |
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | A ===== | Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better |
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | Agree | living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more |

| | | With all this intensification we need to be careful for Nelson not to lose its wonderful character with historic buildings and leafy streets. Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. I think that the FDS is an opportunity to redefine intensification and ensure higher, smarter densities in the city centre. Leaving it to landowners to develop their back section is not enough. |
|--------------------------|-------|---|
| 31759 Mr Damian Campbell | Agree | |
| 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | Agree | However, this needs to be balanced with the fact that Nelson residents are already struggling to meet their needs. |
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | Agree | Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? With all this intensification we need to be careful for Nelson not to lose its wonderful character with historic buildings and leafy streets. Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. I think that the FDS is an opportunity to redefine intensification and ensure higher, smarter densities in the city centre. Leaving it to landowners to develop their back section is not enough. |
| 31769 Ms Jo Gould | Agree | Agree with prioritising intensification in Nelson city, as there are already multi-storey buildings in town. I also agree with prioritising intensification over greenfields development in Nelson. |
| | | However, this question doesn't ask about the level of proposed intensification. I have a concern with the level and extent of intensification proposed, particularly in zones N-107, N-019, N-109 and N-110. |
| | | If N-107 is being described as the 'city centre', this is quite a broad interpretation of what constitutes the centre of the town or city. |
| | | Proposing buildings of 4 to 6 storeys in the adjacent zones (N-019, N-109 and N-110) has the potential to greatly impact on existing amenity values and the character of Nelson. I do not agree with spreading out the intensification with multi-storey buildings into the zones around the city edge. A more granular approach to this, taking into account existing amenity value and heritage character would be helpful. A broad-brush approach is not helpful as it drives concern that the current character of the place we live will irrevocably be changed through the impact of multi-storey buildings. |

| | | Retaining a strong balance between intensification and amenity values, including the existing character and heritage character of our residential areas close to the city is required. Figure 5a is too broad and vague, referring to 'some' multi storey buildings, which provides no certainty or confidence that this type of development would be appropriate in terms of amount or location. |
|--|----------|---|
| | | Encroaching into existing parks (eg. Neale Park and Fairfield Park) is not appropriate. |
| 31775 Dr Thomas Carl | Agree | |
| 31783 Mr Peter Jones | Agree | I wonder about the logic of this given the Q100 flooding and inundation issues. Difficult to protect against this in the low lying areas and close to the Matai River etc. |
| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | Agree | If intensification comes along with better living conditions it makes urban living more attractive. |
| 31801 Joan Skurr | Agree | The centres could retain their character, and Nelson, its attractiveness, if intensification could be planned and overseen by planners and architects to ensure bit by bit comprehensive change. |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | Agree | Intelligently developed & defensible "carrying capacity" as moderator. |
| 31835 Mr Ian Wishart | Agree | Nelson is not Paris or Berlin and river city living has minimal appeal for most, but does appeal to some, needs to be one of many options. |
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | Disagree | |
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | Disagree | All areas should be prioritised. Providing the option for something to happen does not mean it will happen right away. Provide many options at once and those who are ready and able will build the houses. The predictions are for great demand in housing and it feels like the FDS wants to make it happen to suit the councils rather than the people wanting the houses. Sure, planning needs to be done but not so rigidly. |
| 31443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | Disagree | Intensification should happen in all the centres, Nelson, Stoke, Richmond, Motueka If we were to regulate in such a way that housing developments were barred from greenfields, intensification could happen much more quickly. As long as greenfield developments are an option, developers will use it as it is more profitable and easier to do it than intensify. |
| 31485 Ms Robin Schiff | Disagree | faster would be better than slower Only if the planning starts from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport |

| | | -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
|---------------------------|---------------|--|
| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless | Disagree | |
| 31505 Cheryl Heten | Disagree | Not seen as the main priority. |
| 31525 Murray Davis | Disagree | |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | Disagree | Yes/no - we have to stop the land grab & sprawl but with RMA changes we can think smarter about intensification across the two regions |
| 31558 Mr Steve Jordan | Disagree | Intensification that lifts buildings over three stories will destroy the character of the town centre and surrounding area. Three storeys in the Wood and town centre would be about the highest. |
| 31621 Dr Kath Walker | Disagree | |
| 31643 Inge Koevoet | Disagree | |
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | Disagree | Stoke and Richmond urban areas should also be prioritised with medium and high intensity housing |
| 31741 Mr Robert Stevenson | Disagree | Should only be done in greenfield sites. |
| 31753 Mr Gerald Thomas | Disagree | Intensification within inner suburban areas, especially The Wood, would be undesirable. Buildings over two storeys would damage the overall character of the area, reducing privacy and general amenity. Any new buildings should have off-street parking to avoid the growing parking congestion in The Wood and areas between The Wood and City Centre. However, intensification within the narrower confines of City Centre itself, i.e. within the boundary of the Maitai, could bring benefits to the life and commerce of the city centre and beyond. |
| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | Disagree | Please see attached - determined Disagree from submission: A: No Richmond should be intensified too. And we disagree that this level of intensification will happen slowly. We show elsewhere in the submission that partitioning can happen very fast and in a widespread manner unconstrained by needing new infrastructure. The partitioning example we give in the appendix results in densities similar to what you assume require 2 and 3 story townhouses. The thing is we need more small and two bedroom houses. But also there is a role here for local bodies or Kianga Ora to take the lead as land aggregators and townhouse development catalysers. Lastly if developers and people in general are not given the option of sprawling onto Greenfield sites and planning rules are changed to allow intensification, intensification will happen just as fast as it needs to happen. |
| 31219 Mrs kate windle | Don't know | |

| Don't know Don't know Don't know Don't know Don't know Don't know Don't | |
|---|---|
| Don't know Don't know Don't know Don't | |
| know Don't know Don't know Don't know | |
| Don't know Don't know Don't know | |
| know Don't know Don't know | |
| Don't know Don't know | |
| know Don't know | |
| know Don't know | |
| know | |
| know | |
| | |
| 170111 | agree if it is in Nelson city, but do not know what are the boundaries of Nelson. |
| | agree if it is in Neison City, but do not know what are the boundaries of Neison. |
| | |
| | It's already a town, so develop that further without destroying countryside |
| | |
| | It depends upon where the intensification occurs. If it occurs in geologically unstable areas such as steep |
| | hillside suburbs, this could be a catastrophic mistake. |
| | |
| know | |
| Don't | Not answering any of these leading questions |
| know | |
| Don't | |
| know | |
| Don't | |
| know | |
| Don't | |
| know | |
| N/A | Where exactly is "within Nelson?"? |
| , , . | If you mean CBD - then, yes. |
| | If you mean Tahunanui, then, NO. |
| | As for speed slowly is how everything Council does. |
| N/A | I reject the premise of this question |
| k | Con't |

| 31364 Mrs Christine Tuffnell | N/A | Best commented on by local people of that area |
|------------------------------|---------|--|
| 31460 Kris Woods | N/A | It is the slow infill that I disagree with. This allows for Lot to Lot to be decided by the purchaser or developer and what they want to do with it. That is not a cohesive plan, nor does it produce the best outcome for Nelson. |
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | N/A | Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? A vibrant urban centre has parks and open spaces, playgrounds and attractive streets. Where are the city playgrounds currently? |
| | | With all this intensification we need to be careful for Nelson not to lose its wonderful character with historic buildings and leafy streets. |
| | | Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. |
| | | I think that the FDS is an opportunity to redefine intensification and ensure higher, smarter densities in the city centre. Leaving it to landowners to develop their back section is not enough. |
| 31623 Ms Lucy Charlesworth | N/A | I am wary of answering these questions as I cannot be sure of how they will be interpreted. So I will state I do not agree with developing green spaces. These spaces need to be reserved and protected to allow fo sustainable biodiversity and for future generations. Intensification within Nelson CBD needs to be a priority. I do not agrees with building on Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. I do not agree with housing development on green fields. There is a climate emergency. Remove these areas from the FDS. |
| 31698 Mrs Kelly Atkinson | N/A | There cannot be a blanket answer to this as it depends on where intensification is proposed and whether it meets social and climate change needs. In the case of the Tahunanui Slump one must strongly disagree with any proposal to intensify or allow infill |
| 31129 Mrs Gaynor Brooks | Neutral | |
| 31173 Mr Roderick Watson | Neutral | |
| 31174 Ms Alison Westerby | Neutral | |
| 31192 Ms Rebecca Patchett | Neutral | |
| 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | Neutral | Just make sure the character is maintained and we dont end up with ugly buildings nobody will appreciate in the future. |

| 31250 Mr Richard Wyles | Neutral | |
|---------------------------|---------|---|
| 31261 Mr John Weston | Neutral | As long as I don't have to live there!! |
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | Neutral | Yes but due consideration must be paid to environmental considerations. |
| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | Neutral | |
| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | Neutral | Aah. If you must. |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | Neutral | (Didn't specifically answer multi choice question) Yes to prioritising intensification within Nelson. However the extent shown on maps I disagree with. |
| | | Please see attached - summarised below: - all future housing should be through intensification - Nelson North - Weka Street, Cambria Street, Grove Street, Milton Street, Lower Nile Street - no to intensification of 4-6 storeys, infill with some 3 storey housing is sufficient Nelson South - as bove - Tahunanui - as above - Nelson CBD - 6 storeys too high - intensification needs careful consideration as alters the ambience/character of neighbourhoods - Maitai Valley, oppose |
| 31325 Dr Ann Briggs | Neutral | No encroachment of the valley areas inland: they are the 'lungs' of Nelson, for people and for wildlife. |
| 31355 Mr Barney Hoskins | Neutral | Nelson City yes and to a slightly lesser extent Stoke. I support smaller levels of intensification in small suburbs and do not support development up to 6 stories such as Tahunanui. I do however support the intensification up to 3 stories and in some cases 3-4 story low rise residential intensification (including mixed use) in Tahunanui not any higher due to impacts previously discussed around access, safety and community feel. Aesthetics also play into this as a desirable location for recreation. As NCC can no longer require developers to provide off street parking, this creates a large potential burden on the parking at Tahunanui beach and will reduces access for visitors. |
| 31365 michael monti | Neutral | |
| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | Neutral | |
| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling | Neutral | |
| 31423 Mr Roger Frost | Neutral | I agree but on the proviso that it is done in such a way to improve the overall environment. I hear talk of Auckland having an option of an "urban national park". While I don't like using the term national park in Aotearoa for anything other than natural environments, I have the feeling that the concept is worth |
| | | |

| | | considering in order to bring many more elements of nature in to the city to make the the urban environment much healthier for humans and for nature. |
|------------------------------------|---------|---|
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas Hollyman | Neutral | Could spread to Nelson North |
| 31439 Mr Bruce Gilkison | Neutral | Neal Park is mostly an old landfill, and it is imperative that no dwellings are built over or too near the landfill waste footprint, as methane and other emissions from the refuse can cause houses to subside, of detonate, as has happened overseas. |
| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | Neutral | |
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | Neutral | |
| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | Neutral | Only if the planning starts from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
| 31472 Dr David Briggs | Neutral | See answer to Q14 |
| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | Neutral | |
| 31480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | Neutral | |
| 31483 Debbie Hampson | Neutral | |
| 31484 Mr Gavin Brent Cook | Neutral | |
| 31520 Andrew Stirling | Neutral | |
| 31523 Ms karen steadman | Neutral | |
| 31529 Mr Steven King-Turner | Neutral | |
| 31551 Mrs Jo Kitchen | Neutral | |
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | Neutral | Nelson is low-lying. Any expansion there should consider natural hazards such as earthquake and seawater intrusion. |
| | | |

| 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett | Neutral | |
|----------------------------|---------|--|
| 31574 Mr David Bolton | Neutral | |
| 31579 Jane Tate | Neutral | |
| 31588 pene Greet | Neutral | Why is it likely to happen only very slowly? |
| 31604 Mr Peter Moot | Neutral | |
| 31608 Robbie Thomson | Neutral | How would it be prioritised? Incentives? Unfortunately development is usually determined by the housing demand, and private developers respond. We need more public land of the right sort made available, rather than being dictated to by developers. |
| 31614 Mr mark Morris | Neutral | |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | Neutral | Agree in the town but do not know the boundaries of Nelson |
| 31631 Mrs Joy Shackleton | Neutral | |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | Neutral | |
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | Neutral | I am not an expert and able to comment everything. Please listen to Joni Tomsett or Tim Neubauer. I think they represent my ideas. |
| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | Neutral | The importance of needing to take into consideration public transport, over-crowding, environment, and so on. Not just overdeveloping infrastructure that has no responsibility. Having green areas, public spaces |
| 31656 Mr brad malcolm | Neutral | |
| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | Neutral | |
| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | Neutral | |
| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | Neutral | |
| 31692 Mr Alasdair Gardiner | Neutral | |
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | Neutral | Summarised - no specific comments on this question, generally supports FDS. |
| 31744 Mrs Lorna CRANE | Neutral | |
| 31762 Mr Mark Hewetson | Neutral | |
| 31765 Mrs Lorna Ivy Cooper | Neutral | |
| 31774 Mrs Jane Sutherland | Neutral | Some intensification is ok but it is a lovely town and too much intensification may impact the vibe. |
| | | |

| agree 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley Strongly agree 31113 Mr Roy Elgar Strongly agree 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS Strongly agree 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS Strongly agree 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren Strongly agree 31129 Ms Chrissie Ward Strongly agree 31130 Trevor James Strongly agree 31131 Ms Sallie Griffiths Strongly agree 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert Strongly agree 31151 Ms Sallie Griffiths Strongly agree 31171 Ms Sallie Griffiths Strongly agree 31172 Ms Catherine Parry Strongly agree 31173 Ms Catherine Parry Strongly agree 31174 Ms Catherine Parry Strongly agree 31175 Mr Glen Parsons Strongly agree 31176 Ms Glen Parsons Strongly agree 31177 Ms Catherine Parry Strongly agree 31178 Ms Catherine Parry Strongly agree 31179 Ms Catherine Parry Strongly agree 31179 Ms Catherine Parry Strongly agree 31170 Ms Glen Parsons Strongly agree 31171 Ms Salpha Strongly agree | | | |
|--|---------------------------|----------|---|
| agree 31113 Mr Roy Elgar Strongly agree 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS Strongly agree 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren Strongly agree 31127 Ms Chrissie Ward Strongly agree 31128 Ms Sallie Griffiths Strongly agree 31129 Ms Catherine Parry Strongly agree 31121 Ms Catherine Parry Strongly agree 31121 Ms Catherine Parry Strongly agree 31125 Mr Glen Parsons Strongly agree 31126 Ms Judith Holmes Strongly agree 31127 Ms Latherine Strongly agree 31128 Ms Judith Holmes Strongly agree 31129 Ms Latherine Parry Strongly agree 31120 Ms Latherine Parry Strongly agree 31121 Ms Sallie Griffiths Strongly agree 31122 Mr Glen Parsons Strongly agree 31123 Ms Latherine Parry Strongly agree 31124 Ms Judith Holmes Strongly agree 31125 Mr Glen Parsons Strongly agree 31126 Ms Judith Holmes Strongly agree 31126 Ms Judith Holmes Strongly agree 31127 Ms Latherine Parry Strongly agree 31128 Ms Latherine Parry Strongly agree 31129 Ms Latherine Parry Strongly agree 31120 Ms Latherine Parry Strongly agree 31121 Ms Latherine Parry Strongly agree 31122 Ms Lee Eliott Strongly agree 31123 Ms Lee Eliott Strongly agree 31124 Ms Lee Eliott Strongly agree | 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | = - | |
| agree 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS Strongly agree 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren Strongly agree 31130 Trevor James Strongly agree 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward Strongly agree preserving productive and recreational resources for the future. 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert Strongly agree preserving productive and recreational resources for the future. 31171 Ms Sallie Griffiths Strongly agree 31185 Myfanway James Strongly agree 31197 Ms Catherine Parry Strongly agree 31197 Ms Gale Parsons Strongly agree 31198 Mr Glen Parsons Strongly agree 31125 Mr Glen Parsons Strongly agree 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies Strongly agree 31227 Ms Lee Eliott Strongly agree 31228 Ms Lee Eliott Str | 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | . | Intensification is a must in Nelson. I do not agree that this should happen slowly however. |
| agree 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren Strongly agree 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward Strongly agree 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward Strongly agree 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert Strongly agree 31141 Ms Sallie Griffiths Strongly agree 31141 Ms Sallie Griffiths Strongly agree 31142 Myanway James Strongly agree 31153 Myfanway James Strongly agree 31164 Ms Gatherine Parry Strongly agree 31175 Ms Catherine Parry Strongly agree 31176 Ms Catherine Parry Strongly agree 31177 Ms Latherine Parry Strongly agree 31178 Mr Glen Parsons Strongly agree 31179 Ms Latherine Parry Strongly agree 31170 Ms Latherine Parry Strongly agree 31171 Ms Latherine Parry Strongly agree 31172 Ms Latherine Parry Strongly agree 31173 Ms Latherine Parry Strongly agree 31174 Ms Latherine Parry Strongly agree 31175 Ms Latherine Parry Strongly agree 31176 Ms Judith Holmes Strongly agree 31177 Ms Latherine Parry Strongly agree 31178 Ms Latherine Parry Strongly agree 31179 Ms Latherine Parry Strongly agree 31170 Ms Latherine Parry Strongly agree 31170 Ms Latherine Parry Strongly agree | 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | = - | Intensification needs to speed up. We cannot meet climate and GHG goals without intensification |
| agree 31130 Trevor James Strongly agree 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward Strongly agree 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert Strongly agree 31171 Ms Sallie Griffiths Strongly agree 31185 Myfanway James Strongly agree 31197 Ms Catherine Parry Strongly agree 31215 Mr Glen Parsons Strongly agree 31216 Ms Judith Holmes Strongly agree 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies Strongly agree 31227 Ms Lee Eliott Strongly agree 31228 Ms Lee Eliott Strongly agree 31228 Mr Strongly agree 31228 Ms Lee Eliott Strongly agree 31248 Strongly agree 3125 Mr Sudith Holmes Strongly agree 3126 Mr Dylan Menzies Strongly agree Strongly agree 3127 Ms Lee Eliott Strongly agree Strongly agree 3128 Strongly agree 3129 Ms Lee Eliott Strongly agree | 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS | = - | |
| agree 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward Strongly agree 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert Strongly agree 31171 Ms Sallie Griffiths Strongly agree 31185 Myfanway James Strongly agree 31197 Ms Catherine Parry Strongly agree 31215 Mr Glen Parsons Strongly agree 31216 Ms Judith Holmes Strongly agree 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies Strongly agree 31227 Ms Lee Eliott Strongly agree | 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren | • . | |
| agree preserving productive and recreational resources for the future. 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert Strongly agree 31171 Ms Sallie Griffiths Strongly agree 31185 Myfanway James Strongly agree 31197 Ms Catherine Parry Strongly agree 31215 Mr Glen Parsons Strongly agree 31216 Ms Judith Holmes Strongly agree 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies Strongly agree 31227 Ms Lee Eliott Strongly agree | 31130 Trevor James | | |
| agree 31171 Ms Sallie Griffiths Strongly agree 31185 Myfanway James Strongly agree 31197 Ms Catherine Parry Strongly agree 31215 Mr Glen Parsons Strongly agree residential. 31216 Ms Judith Holmes Strongly agree 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies Strongly agree 31227 Ms Lee Eliott Strongly agree | 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward | | |
| agree 31185 Myfanway James Strongly agree 31197 Ms Catherine Parry Strongly agree 31215 Mr Glen Parsons Strongly agree Parry Makes towns interesting to be there day and night! Nelson is a ghost town at night. Mix commercial with residential. 31216 Ms Judith Holmes Strongly agree Strongly agree Parrows Strongly agree Strongly agree 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies Strongly agree Strongly agree | 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert | = - | |
| agree 31197 Ms Catherine Parry Strongly agree 31215 Mr Glen Parsons Strongly Makes towns interesting to be there day and night! Nelson is a ghost town at night. Mix commercial with agree residential. 31216 Ms Judith Holmes Strongly agree 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies Strongly agree 31227 Ms Lee Eliott Strongly agree | 31171 Ms Sallie Griffiths | • . | |
| agree 31215 Mr Glen Parsons Strongly agree 31216 Ms Judith Holmes Strongly agree 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies Strongly agree 31227 Ms Lee Eliott Strongly | 31185 Myfanway James | = - | |
| agree residential. 31216 Ms Judith Holmes Strongly agree 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies Strongly agree 31227 Ms Lee Eliott Strongly | 31197 Ms Catherine Parry | = - | |
| agree 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies Strongly agree 31227 Ms Lee Eliott Strongly | 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | | |
| agree 31227 Ms Lee Eliott Strongly | 31216 Ms Judith Holmes | . | Speed it up. |
| 0,1 | 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | | |
| | 31227 Ms Lee Eliott | = - | |

| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | Strongly agree | Turn car parks into affordable apartments |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31240 Michael Markert | Strongly agree | provide the infrastructure, consents, support of new ideas like the Eco Apartments Buxton Square and the intensification will develop a momentum and acceleration of that idea. It won't be slowly then. |
| 31247 Mr yuri aristarco | Strongly agree | You just need to speed up the process with all the tools a Council can use. No excuses no short views. You have to do it and if you don't just erase the word smart from the Nelson tagline. |
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | Strongly agree | The types of housing need to be varied in type and price, adopting best practice from abroad. Don't let tilt slab grey concrete vandals like Gibbons anywhere near any of it PLEASE |
| 31257 Mr Kent Inglis | Strongly agree | The amenities and infrastructure within proximity to the Nelson CBD, with make intensification the most cost effective solution for providing additional dwellings at the most cost effective price point. As the population ages, smaller dwellings in proximity to the city will encourage residents to move into this area (and 'free up' family homes in other locations/suburbs). |
| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | Strongly agree | |
| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | Strongly agree | |
| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley | Strongly agree | |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | Strongly agree | |
| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | Strongly agree | It makes sense to intensify nelson as that is where most of the work is |
| 31298 Mr Duncan Macnab | Strongly agree | |
| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | Strongly agree | Slow is fine |
| 31316 John Heslop | Strongly agree | Redevelopment high density of existing residential alternative development complex's needs to be a priority. |
| 31322 Mrs BARBARA AND TIM ROBSON | Strongly agree | And this needs to happen more quickly - which it will if planners accept that greenfield development is not an option |
| 31328 Ms Karen du Fresne | Strongly | But it has to be well-planned, and take into account sea level rise. Public transport will be a key to this |
| | | |

| | agree | working well, so that less space is taken up with car parks, as will the use of building materials that have low GHG impact. Once again an effective public education campaign is a key to this working well - something neither Council has shown any interest in to date! |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31339 Ms Karen Berge | Strongly agree | Yes. Intensification within Nelson central and Victory should be a priority. Housing that suits low income earners should be obligatory. The more growth can be encouraged close to people's work, schools and shopping the less stress there will be on our transport infrastructure. The inner city centre will also avoid the desertification so often seen in other cities. |
| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | Strongly agree | Council should develop plans to facilitate the intensification of the city. Areas around the CBD, Neale Park and Tahunanui could have plans created where 3-5 story buildings are favoured creating lively communities within existing neighbourhoods |
| 31350 Ms Janet Tavener | Strongly agree | There is little opportunity to spread in Nelson because of the surrounding hills so intensification is necessary. |
| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | Strongly agree | It needs to speed up! Especially if you want to pander to demands or government pushing. |
| 31356 Stephen Williams | Strongly agree | City based populations have the lowest carbon footprint. Most people need to work in cities and this will likely increase going forward. |
| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | Strongly agree | It's a lovely small city rather than a big town. I think medium rise apartments would enhance the scale an support sustainability for amenities and cultural activities |
| 31360 Ms Thuy Tran | Strongly agree | |
| 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | Strongly agree | I don't agree that it will or should happen slowly? We could do something with even just one of our central carparks! Intensification has happened quite quickly and successfully in Christchurch, Wellington and Auckland. |
| 31384 Mr Jace Hobbs | Strongly agree | climate chaos is happening fast and you councils are responding slowlack of duty of care |
| 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett | Strongly agree | |
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | Strongly agree | The rate if intensification needs to speed up. If you expect it to happen slowly, then that is what you will get. |
| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | Strongly agree | |
| | | |

| 31405 Mr Doug Hattersley | Strongly agree | |
|---|-------------------|--|
| 31406 Ms Floortje van Lierop | Strongly agree | See above comments, use buildings that are already there including empty retail spaces and make them joy to live in. |
| 31410 Mr Scott Smithline | Strongly agree | Why slowly if you're indeed committed? Plenty of inner city NCC land to repurpose & create new income streams for NCC. When you say 'slowly' (in a small town) I'm very disappointed |
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | Strongly agree | If done well it will help make Nelson a more vibrant city. |
| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors | Strongly agree | CBD areas are dull, offices seem to be empty as more work from home, intensify there |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | Strongly agree | |
| 31422 Mrs Marga Martens | Strongly agree | Agree, but it should be not be done as building on back sections. Development more led by council and creating shared green open space. Good examples all over the world available. |
| 31434 Mrs cushla Moorhead | Strongly agree | |
| 31441 Mr Chris Head | Strongly agree | Forward thinking cities around the world are using this method of urban development. We would be foolish to ignore this and continue with our 20th Century thinking. |
| 31457 Mr J Santa Barbara | Strongly agree | Intensification should be strongly prioritised and incentivised over greenfield expansion. |
| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | Strongly agree | Why does this have to happen slowly. The need is here and now. If transport arrangements were improved the need for parking , a constant complaint form commuters could be reduced. |
| 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon | Strongly agree | |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | Strongly agree | |
| 31491 Ms Annette Milligan | Strongly agree | I would prefer to see this happening with more speed Again, I find the use of the words 'slowly over time' somewhat terrifying what part of the status of climate emergency is not understood? |
| 31492 Anton, Benni, Shalom, AJ Bank, Bonnin, Shalom Davis | Strongly agree | |

| 31499 Ms Jane Fisher | Strongly agree | The sooner we have more apartment blocks in Nelson the better. There are many opportunities. Incentives to develop existing unused buildings for housing and guidance on green buildings should be given. |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | Strongly agree | Intensification needs to be encouraged by providing incentives to developers who are focused on low- emission building developments near the centres of Nelson and Richmond, and dis-incentives for proposed building developments that are outside current urban areas. |
| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | Strongly agree | Strongly agree. Prioritising the intensification close to amenities and services is necessary in providing for the region's ageing population to "age in place" (live at home into your older years). Older persons generally state a strong preference for living in their own home or non-institutional community settings. Private homeownership has been associated with better health outcomes for older people as it alleviates the financial pressures and anxiety associated with high accommodation costs and minimal security of occupancy. Subsequently there is a growing demand for smaller houses and properties. Additionally, adults living with a disability are more likely to be living alone or with a partner only. NMH considers that an increase in the availability of smaller, easy care properties close to amenities and services may go towards providing greater independence and more housing choice. However, in addition to encouraging smaller compact properties, housing also needs to be functional. Key factors include accessibility (ease of entering and navigating in and around the home) and adaptability (to cater for changing needs such as experiencing an injury or disability). |
| | | NMH supports the planned mixed use spine for Vanguard Street/St Vincent Street and Waimea Road as this area is well serviced by active transport links and it is close to essential services, schools and places of employment. NMH is pleased to see that Nelson City Council is taking a cautious approach through the Dynamic Adaptive Planning Pathways process to ensure that places that are susceptible to coastal inundation and flood risk are not built upon. |
| 31515 Geoffrey Vause | Strongly agree | One of the key rate of intensification limiters is the policy and rules of the Nelson Council and central government. Thus conjecture on the part of the council on this rate prediction becoming a self fulfilling question, particularly when this rate will be influenced by how much greenfield land the Councils make available for development. |
| | Characa alla | It simply needs to be increased! Bold & positive thinking needed! |
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | Strongly agree | it simply needs to be increased: Bold & positive trilliking needed: |

| | agree | strategy. |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | Strongly agree | I agree with intensification of Nelson and Richmond but slowly and considered development. I totally disagree with any further development of networks of small centres. See full submission. Summarised below (similar to NT2050 submission): recommends broadening of approach taken to intensification (away from backyard infill and towards qualitative approach that balances densities with amentiy and wider urban form). |
| 31549 Mr Ian McComb | Strongly agree | The district plan rules need to change to facilitate this as soon as possible, with adequate consideration to impacts on infrastructure. |
| 31553 Mr Wim van Dijk | Strongly agree | This is the way to go. Agree that progress will be very slow, since kiwi culture does not value apartment living. That could be a focus of marketing campaigns. |
| 31554 Wendy Barker | Strongly agree | For now, yes. see above under 14. |
| 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham | Strongly agree | See above |
| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | Strongly agree | Intensification can not happen fast enough. |
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins | Strongly agree | I strongly agree with this and believe that all housing development should have to provide carbon projections for it's occupants for the life of the building. |
| 31598 Mrs Nicola Worsfold | Strongly agree | |
| 31617 Ms steph jewell | Strongly agree | But why do you say very slowly? There's a housing shortage right now so it needs to be fast. Beautiful apartments over all those carparks please. The carparks of Nelson and Richmond are the sin of the 20th century and can be re addressed in an attractive way as seen on the front page of Nelson Mail of two or three saturdays ago. |
| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | Strongly agree | |
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | Strongly agree | Preferably well above sealevel in Nelson South Bishopdale. Library redevelopment - no thanks. |
| 31628 Mr Daniel Levy | Strongly agree | see above |
| 31633 Ms Jacquetta Bell QSM | Strongly | Inner-city development has numerous environmental benefits, including reduced car use and the reduced |
| | | |

| sustainable opportunities for repurposing under-used commercial buildings for residential, as demonstrated in popular formerly commercial areas in many of the world's cities – from Duned Barcelona. The FDS needs to do more to foster quality eco-developments of apartments and complexes will green space, shared facilities as is being done in forward thinking cities elsewhere (eg Dunedin's Street Village). If apartments are made attractive and affordable intensification will happen faster, as it needs to Strongly agree with prioritising intensification; disagree with accepting it can happen only slowly This intensification should only happen in areas above a 1.5m sea level rise, as the buildings shoundered years, and therefore not be built in the inundation zones. The intensification needs to happen much faster than projected in the consultation document. It is surely occur if possibilities for greenfield expansion are unavailable. We see a responsibility for councils in enabling and promoting intensification. There's considerable scope for accomplishing *constraining of greenfield land provision establishing rural-urban boundaries removing restrictive planning rules from urban areas simplifying and de-costing approval process for desirable developments switching the rating system from a capital value to a land value base adjusting development contributions assembling land parcels for comprehensive redevelopment and/or completing showcase deve We think the nature of the intensification should be subject to careful and well-informed planni leaving it to market forces is not good enough. We sound a note of caution about Neal Park. This land is mostly an old landfill, and it is imperat no dwellings are built over, or too near the landfill waste footprint as methane emissions from t can cause houses to subside, or explode, as has happened overseas. | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|----------|--|
| This intensification should only happen in areas above a 1.5m sea level rise, as the buildings should hundred years, and therefore not be built in the inundation zones. The intensification needs to happen much faster than projected in the consultation document. It surely occur if possibilities for greenfield expansion are unavailable. We see a responsibility for a councils in enabling and promoting intensification. There's considerable scope for accomplishing *constraining of greenfield land provision establishing rural-urban boundaries removing restrictive planning rules from urban areas simplifying and de-costing approval process for desirable developments switching the rating system from a capital value to a land value base adjusting development contributions assembling land parcels for comprehensive redevelopment and/or completing showcase deve We think the nature of the intensification should be subject to careful and well-informed planni leaving it to market forces is not good enough. We sound a note of caution about Neal Park. This land is mostly an old landfill, and it is imperat no dwellings are built over, or too near the landfill waste footprint as methane emissions from t can cause houses to subside, or explode, as has happened overseas. | | agree | demonstrated in popular formerly commercial areas in many of the world's cities – from Dunedin to Barcelona. The FDS needs to do more to foster quality eco-developments of apartments and complexes with shared green space, shared facilities as is being done in forward thinking cities elsewhere (eg Dunedin's High |
| | 31636 Joanna Santa Barbara | | The intensification needs to happen much faster than projected in the consultation document. This will surely occur if possibilities for greenfield expansion are unavailable. We see a responsibility for the councils in enabling and promoting intensification. There's considerable scope for accomplishing this: *constraining of greenfield land provision • establishing rural-urban boundaries • removing restrictive planning rules from urban areas • simplifying and de-costing approval process for desirable developments • switching the rating system from a capital value to a land value base • adjusting development contributions • assembling land parcels for comprehensive redevelopment and/or completing showcase developments. We think the nature of the intensification should be subject to careful and well-informed planning. Simp leaving it to market forces is not good enough. We sound a note of caution about Neal Park. This land is mostly an old landfill, and it is imperative that no dwellings are built over, or too near the landfill waste footprint as methane emissions from the refuse |
| 31637 Ms Frances Kemble Welch Strongly agree | 31637 Ms Frances Kemble Welch | | |
| 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin Strongly agree | 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin | | |
| 31650 Ms Eve Ward Strongly agree | 31650 Ms Eve Ward | | |
| 31657 Mrs Andrea Hay Strongly | 31657 Mrs Andrea Hay | Strongly | |

| | agree | |
|-------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | Strongly agree | Strongly agree Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. I think that the FDS is an opportunity to redefine intensification and ensure higher, smarter densities in the city centre. Leaving it to landowners to develop their back section is not enough. |
| 31673 Mike Drake | Strongly agree | We need to embrace the European model - going up. The centre of gravity is moving towards Richmond. By accommodating more people in Nelson this will pull the SG back. Again, What infrastructure better supports the Walking and Cycling Plan. |
| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | Strongly agree | Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. I think that the FDS is an opportunity to redefine intensification and ensure higher, smarter densities in the city centre. Leaving it to landowners to develop their back section is not enough. We need to push this space harder and incentivize inner city developments coupled with green sponge city design to make enjoyable civic areas to live and work! |
| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | Strongly agree | Applaud you for going to 3-6 stories in and around the Nelson CBD, bringing The Wood into the mix for intensification and going 3 stories elsewhere. However you have missed an opportunity to intensify the length of the transport corridors e.g. Waimea Rd and Annesbrook Drive between Nelson and Stoke, Waimea Rd between Stoke and Richmond to support future public transport (that we should be talking about here!!!). Also do not discount high rise on the hills, look to Asia as examples. |
| 31683 Richard Davies | Strongly agree | |
| 31688 Gerard McDonnell | Strongly agree | It is the priority |

| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | Strongly agree | But, the character of Nelson needs to be retained, and I don't agree that it needs to be done slowly. We need good quality, affordable, and carbon negative intensification. We also need to ensure community cohesion is prioritised by supporting such things as more funded community spaces such as community gardens, allotments, room for community enterprises to be established such as community resource recovery centres in the manner that Auckland Council is supporting the development of throughout Auckland. These bring employment, training, and positive social interaction into our centres. Support for existing community hubs also needs to be reinforced. |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | Strongly agree | This needs to be driven by local government and not left to developers on an ad hoc basis |
| 31704 Mr Paul Bucknall | Strongly agree | The pace is the issue. It has to be more than infill housing and dividing up large houses into flats as this will likely have the reverse impact and actually lower the number of people per hectare - even if dwellings per hectare increases. How can the density be maximised and the pace of change increased? Aren't parts of the intensification area also under threat from rising sea levels? |
| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | Strongly agree | I am endorsing the Nelson Tasman Climate Forum's view . It needs to happen faster. This will happen if possibilities for greenfield expansion are unavailable. |
| 31713 Mrs Debora Scholl Dos Santos | Strongly agree | I do think it can happen faster than expected if building consents were giving to build permanent tiny houses. |
| 31736 Ms Carol Curtis | Strongly agree | the FDS is an opportunity to redefine intensification and ensure higher, smarter densities in the city centre. Leaving it to landowners to develop their back section is not enough. |
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | Strongly agree | I agree but we also need very good planning controls and urban design to ensure that developments are done in a such a manner that they are wonderful places to live and respect their neighbourhood. There needs to be an exception for heritage areas such as behind the Cathedral (areas N19, N20 and N21) where intensification should be controlled to protect and preserve heritage values. Note - this is NOT just those "heritage areas" on the NRMP. Encouragement / incentives should be given to encourage the adaptation and reuse of commercial heritage buildings in the town centres to provide some residential accommodation. |
| 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert- Watene | Strongly agree | |
| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | Strongly agree | Please see attached for further detail (summarised) Concerned with homeless people and retirement villages should be for people to live in not the rich get richer. |
| 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | Strongly | |
| | | |

| | agree | |
|----------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31771 Colleen Shaw | Strongly agree | I propose it happen more quickly. |
| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson | Strongly disagree | This is likely to reduce the quality of life and character of the town. |
| 31145 Ms Maggie Sweetman | Strongly disagree | |
| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | Strongly disagree | I agree with intensification as long as it's no higher than 2 storeys; however If it's going to happen very slowly as you state, then why prioritise at the moment? Focus on climate change, climate change resilience. |
| 31242 Ms Suzie Ilina | Strongly disagree | |
| 31251 Ms Jacqui Tyrrell | Strongly disagree | The Maitai area, in particular, should be preserved as a recreational area rather than being zoned for housing. Any development here would be incredibly short-sighted. It is an area of beauty and serenity close to the city, and is a vital part of what makes Nelson City so liveable. Climate change threats mean that river flows are likely to exceed current expectations, and developing the area for housing would require vast expenditure on flood protection - which would ruin the river's current attractiveness. |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | Strongly disagree | The topography of much of Nelson does not suit intensification. |
| 31278 Wendy Ross | Strongly disagree | reasons as mentioned before |
| 31280 Jenny Knott | Strongly disagree | |
| 31296 Dr Elspeth Macdonald | Strongly disagree | What is the value of sunlight for housing? The concern is that proposed changes to the Resource Management Plan will mean these developments are allowable without notification or the right to object. That is, multistory developments approved 'as or right' without consultation, and within 1 m of a boundary of a section over 600m2. Quality of life is impacted by removal of sunshine on dwellings overshadowed by tall buildings. There is |

substantial evidence of the value of sunshine for mental health and wellbeing (including seasonal affective disorder SAD), as well as for energy costs (lack of passive heating). Not to mention the impacts on productivity of vegetable gardens.

However there are additional concerns for the Council and rate-payers. Recent NZ research shows how sunshine also affects housing values. Refer to Valuing Sunshine (Motu Economic and Public Policy Research, NZ, 2017) - supporting the initiative of Building Better Homes, Towns and Cities by Arthur Grimes and fellow researchers.

https://www.buildingbetter.nz/publications/thriving_regions/valuing_sunshine.pdf

This is a further tangible detrimental effect of the proposed housing intensification. Yes, there will be an effect on housing affordability - but not one ratepayers will thank you for especially if their house price reduces by 2.4% for every hour of sunshine they lose per day.

While the empirical research was conducted in Wellington, the findings that direct sunlight exposure is a valued attribute to residential properties buyers are relevant to New Zealand's cool-climate cities, including Nelson.

Developers who block neighbours' sunshine might need to pay compensation. I quote from The Herald (27 June, 2017) - Arthur Grimes (Motu Economic and Public Policy Research) stated "The more sun a house gets, the higher its value, according to a new study which suggests developers might need to compensate neighbours when they block sun." "Sunlight influences people's real estate decisions, but city intensification may reduce sunlight exposure for neighbouring properties, causing a negative externality." "At present the impact of a building that is designed in a way that will shade its neighbour is controlled by often inflexible regulations that specify building parameters," he said. "This research is designed to put a value on sunlight, so that the change can be priced, potentially enabling compensation for affected owners and better valuation of development sites."

31296 Dr Elspeth Macdonald

Strongly disagree

2nd submission with extra evidence-sources attached. "Daylight Robbery"- Take away the invaluable asset of sunshine for Nelson dwellings? Losses of sunlight will come from inappropriate development of intensified zones without checks and balances or notification and the right to object. Taller and larger residential buildings take away treasured sunlight of existing dwellings as illustrated in attached diagrams. See the impacts of shade as a result of height and proximity of adjacent buildings and the seasons. Without the need for resource consent, or the ability of neighbours/community to influence the development, Nelson residents risk losing the most valuable features of their homes - winter sun and warmth, sun from northfacing orientation, sunny outdoor areas, natural lighting into homes. Alison Tindale (planning officer, member of NZ Planning Inst., Nov 2021) warns "some properties will be affected

| | | more than others - single storey dwellings with windows close to property boundaries, dwellings could also be affected by new development along more than one boundary." Council needs to be aware that "Daylight is fundamental to the liveability and internal amenity of interiors, and a significant contributor to the quality of life of its occupants" (NZ Architect & Urban Designer, Graham McIndoe). Tindale explain "The amount of direct solar access a site, and in particular the interior of a home receives, has wideranging effects that extend far beyond the creation of a pleasant internal space. A reduction in passive solar heating often results in a drop in internal room temperatures, unless other heat sources are used with associated power costs. Some homes, particularly older homes with poor insulation, will feel colder and damper, and could experience more mould growth. It is also likely to reduce natural illumination levels within the home and increase the need for artificial lighting during daylight hours. Outside the home, reductions in direct sunlight can reduce the ability to dry clothes outside and grow food crops." Unregulated building intensification in residential streets of inner Nelson? Be careful what you wish for Nelson is wonderfully liveable city with a reputation for enjoying its high annual sunshine hours and quality of life that brings to its residents. The price of lost sun will be high. In addition to reduced market value of each house "the impact on people's lives from the lack of sunshine is being described as an impending disaster" |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | Strongly disagree | |
| 31358 George Harrison | Strongly disagree | |
| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | Strongly disagree | You propose that Tahunanui is rezoned from 8 mtrs to 6 story 18mtr plus. No consideration of residents living in the area, coastal sea rising and the existing 2004 Tahunanui enhancement plan. A blanket zone change is disgraceful. |
| 31415 Mrs Zanahe Ruth Galloway | Strongly disagree | The reality of Climate Change Emergency is calling for preparation not intensification. |
| 31464 Mr David Matulovich | Strongly disagree | Up not out, like you've been told before by Nelsonians. |
| 31522 Marilyn Davis | Strongly disagree | 2 Storey only |

| 31563 Mrs Loretta Anne Hogg | Strongly disagree | No - do not ruin Nelson., Richmond and Mapua have expanded extensively in the last 20 years and it's now a natural progression out of Nelson, where highways have been extended to cater to the traffic, and it has become naturally an extension of the greater region. Towns in their own right - with all the expansion that comes from the development of a new town, Garin college, and supermarkets. Nelson wasn't ruined in the process. |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31573 Mrs Susan Lea | Strongly disagree | This FDS is a huge mistake - Nelson should not be taking place in this strategy . The fabric of our city - A Proud Catheral City is at risk - There may be scope in the Retail area /eg New Street , Halifax (where shell garage was) for up to 3 story flats etc. Keep Nelson small and smart. |
| 31606 Mr Trent Shepard | Strongly disagree | |
| 31612 Mr Paul Davey | Strongly disagree | Not sure what you mean by prioritising intensification, if it means encouraging developers to go and build high rise buildings any where they can definitely no and what are they prioritised above, who misses out ,the poor people who can't afford to fight legal battles |
| 31613 Henry Davey Wraight | Strongly disagree | I strongly disagree with the proposed intensification of the Tahunanui area. There is no need to destroy the sea side community by building high rise buildings for the benefit of a few. The gentrification of a community where many low income families live isn't ok. |
| | | Nelson city has a great opportunity for Tahunanui to be a welcoming, fun, family community, but it seems to continually get over looked in the future developments of the city (eg, Southern link). |
| 31619 Ms Marama Handcock- Scott | Strongly disagree | I disagree with the proposal of 4-6 storeys that will be allowed in Tahuanui. Up to 3 storeys is high enough. We don't want the beachside turned into an urban jungle. Also building massive apartment blocks, where are all the people who currently live here going to move? Tahunanui is one of the more affordable areas to live but sounds like you want to build a seaside community for the wealthy.the price of those new apartments is ridiculous. Affordable housing YES. Gentrification NO. Build up to 6 storeys in the city centre sure. |
| | | The strategy also identifies Tahunaui as a moderately accesible area compared with other areas identified as highly accessible which are proposed for high intensification. So how is this justified? The southern link |

| | | provided the opportunity to make Tahunanui more accessible but you passed that up. So it's a no for 4-6 storey buildings in Tahunanui! |
|----------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31706 Paul Donald Galloway | Strongly disagree | Only in the centre of town to intensify housing so people can work and live without having to use their cars to go to work and making it more dynamic . |
| 31720 Ms Rainna Pretty | Strongly disagree | Strongly disagree to intensification - 4-6 storey buildings in The Wood. Developers don't have to provide off-street parking which will affect car parking availability on the street. 3x3 Townhouses can be built 1m from my boundary without consultation therefore no privacy, no view, no sunlight. |
| 31728 Mr John Molyneux | Strongly disagree | On greenfields sites maybe. But on others without community buy in absolutely not. Tahunanui is not mentioned in the intensification yet shown on the map. Why? Another intensification by stealth? This community has repeatedly over many years stated its desire to be the seaside village close to the beach, not a comedic copy of the gold coast. There is no collaboration or sharing of the planning with the community. No planning has occurred here for many years and leading planning consultants reports such as Boffa Miskell report ignored. At best Tahunanui should have a maximum of medium density housing in keeping with the existing neighbourhood. |
| 31752 Jill Pearson | Strongly disagree | Till future populations are truly estimated. |
| 31763 Susan Rogers | Strongly disagree | There cannot be a blanket answer to this as it depends where the intensification is proposed and whether it meets social and climate change needs! In the case of the Tahunanui slump one must strongly disagree with any proposal to intensify or allow infill. |
| 31777 Mr David Lucas | Strongly disagree | As an owner of two historic houses in Nelson, I strongly disagree with intensification in the form of high rise development allowed within the Nelson area. As a historic house owner, I am not allowed to develop my land but may neighbours are free to do so, which seems grossly unfair and puts our privacy at risk with no avenue to protect ourselves. At Nile Street, we have five boundary neighbours so the odds are high that one will want to build a three-storey development next to us. |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Strongly disagree | Nelson will always be a regional centre serving Nelson-Tasman rural area and export industries. Retail and restaurants bring tourists but the city itself is not a destination. |
| 31830 K.M. McDonald | Strongly disagree | I do not support this proposal. It mainly benefits developers and bankers and construction companies. People on low incomes will be further shut out from affordable housing. |
| | | |

| 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | Agree | |
|----------------------------|-------|---|
| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | Agree | Intesification is better than greenfields - better utilise the already occupied space that lose more productive land or green space |
| 31171 Ms Sallie Griffiths | Agree | |
| 31173 Mr Roderick Watson | Agree | |
| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | Agree | |
| 31192 Ms Rebecca Patchett | Agree | Stoke is a built up area that has amenities, more housing may not impact this area negatively. |
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | Agree | |
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | Agree | Stoke has been needing an injection of life and intensification for decades. This is an area that would welcome the investment, why not put it where it's actually wanted?? |
| 31227 Ms Lee Eliott | Agree | |
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | Agree | So long as there are good public transport and cycle links to Nelson. |
| 31240 Michael Markert | Agree | see 15 |
| 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan | Agree | Yes same answer as above |
| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | Agree | |
| 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman | Agree | |
| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | Agree | |
| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | Agree | |
| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley | Agree | |
| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | Agree | |
| 31285 Dr Hamish Holland | Agree | |
| 31286 Mr David Short | Agree | |
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | Agree | |
| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | Agree | |

| Agree with the level of intensification around Stoke - Infill & Infill with some 3 storey buildings. Agree Windle 313109 Mr & Mrs Rose & Phillip Windle 31316 John Heslop Agree 31322 Mrs BARBARA AND TIM ROBSON 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne Agree 31328 Ms Karen du Fresne Agree Same comments as above, though sea level rise isn't quite such an urgent issue here. 31334 Diane Sutherland Agree 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman Agree 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner Agree Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster Agree Endorse NelsonTasman2050 submission. Intensification should be residential and commercial. Stoke right now feels like a sprawling retirement suburb, not a destination. 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald Agree Where work has already started at Marsden Valley, Saxton etcdevelopments along the highway joinin Nelson, Stoke and Richmond makes sense. 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler Agree Good idea 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova Agree Good idea 31374 Mr Lutz Totzauer Agree 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann Agree 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann Agree 31390 Mr Rick Cosslett Agree 31300 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall Agree | | | |
|---|---|-------|---|
| Mindle 31316 John Heslop Agree 313122 Mrs BARBARA AND TIM ROBSON Agree 31322 Mrs BARBARA AND TIM Agree 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne Agree 31328 Ms Karen du Fresne Agree 313340 Mr Kerry Bateman Agree 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman Agree 31341 Cornelia Baumgartner Agree 31342 Cornelia Baumgartner Agree 31343 Diane Sutherland Agree 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner Agree 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster Agree 31346 Ms Margaret Brewster Agree 31347 Mr Seborah Knowler Agree Where work has already started at Marsden Valley, Saxton etcdevelopments along the highway joinin Nelson, Stoke and Richmond makes sense. 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler Agree Good idea 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova Agree Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification packs and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. 31379 Mr Lutz Totzauer Agree 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann Agree 31390 Mr Rick Cosslett Agree 31301 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall Agree | 31307 Elaine Marshall | Agree | |
| Agree ROBSON 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne Agree Same comments as above, though sea level rise isn't quite such an urgent issue here. 31332 Ms Karen du Fresne Agree Same comments as above, though sea level rise isn't quite such an urgent issue here. 31334 Diane Sutherland Agree 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman Agree Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster Agree Endorse NelsonTasman2050 submission. Intensification should be residential and commercial. Stoke right now feels like a sprawling retirement suburb, not a destination. 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald Agree Where work has already started at Marsden Valley, Saxton etcdevelopments along the highway joinin Nelson, Stoke and Richmond makes sense. 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler Agree Good idea Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infili intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer Agree 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann Agree 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett Agree 31300 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall Agree | 31309 Mr & Mrs Rose & Phillip Windle | Agree | |
| ROBSON 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne Agree 31328 Ms Karen du Fresne Agree Same comments as above, though sea level rise isn't quite such an urgent issue here. 31334 Diane Sutherland Agree 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman Agree 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman Agree 31341 Cornelia Baumgartner Agree Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster Agree 31349 Laurien Heijs Agree Endorse NelsonTasman2050 submission. Intensification should be residential and commercial. Stoke right now feels like a sprawling retirement suburb, not a destination. 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald Agree Where work has already started at Marsden Valley, Saxton etcdevelopments along the highway joinin Nelson, Stoke and Richmond makes sense. 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler Agree Good idea 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova Agree Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer Agree | 31316 John Heslop | Agree | |
| Same comments as above, though sea level rise isn't quite such an urgent issue here. Same comments as above, though sea level rise isn't quite such an urgent issue here. Same comments as above, though sea level rise isn't quite such an urgent issue here. Same comments as above, though sea level rise isn't quite such an urgent issue here. Same comments as above, though sea level rise isn't quite such an urgent issue here. Same comments as above, though sea level rise isn't quite such an urgent issue here. Same comments as above, though sea level rise isn't quite such an urgent issue here. Same comments as above, though sea level rise isn't quite such an urgent issue here. Same comments as above, though sea level rise isn't quite such an urgent issue here. Same comments as above, though sea level rise isn't quite such an urgent issue here. Salay Mr Kerry Bateman Agree Same comments as above, though sea level rise isn't quite such an urgent issue here. Agree Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. Salay Ms Margaret Brewster Agree Endorse NelsonTasman2050 submission. Intensification should be residential and commercial. Stoke right now feels like a sprawling retirement suburb, not a destination. Salay Mr Seborah Knowler Agree Grad plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. Salay Mr Dirk Bachmann Agree Salay Mr Rick Cosslett Agree Salay Mr Rick Cosslett Agree Salay Mr Seley Kuykendall | 31322 Mrs BARBARA AND TIM ROBSON | Agree | |
| Agree Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. Agree Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. Agree Endorse NelsonTasman2050 submission. Intensification should be residential and commercial. Stoke right now feels like a sprawling retirement suburb, not a destination. Mere Where work has already started at Marsden Valley, Saxton etcdevelopments along the highway joinin Nelson, Stoke and Richmond makes sense. Good idea Good idea Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. Agree | 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | Agree | |
| Agree Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. Agree Endorse NelsonTasman2050 submission. Intensification should be residential and commercial. Stoke right now feels like a sprawling retirement suburb, not a destination. Agree Where work has already started at Marsden Valley, Saxton etcdevelopments along the highway joinin Nelson, Stoke and Richmond makes sense. Agree Good idea Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. Agree Biasay Mr Dirk Bachmann Agree Agree Agree Agree Agree Agree Agree Agree Agree Agree Agr | 31328 Ms Karen du Fresne | Agree | Same comments as above, though sea level rise isn't quite such an urgent issue here. |
| Agree Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster Agree Endorse NelsonTasman2050 submission. Intensification should be residential and commercial. Stoke right now feels like a sprawling retirement suburb, not a destination. 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald Agree Where work has already started at Marsden Valley, Saxton etcdevelopments along the highway joinin Nelson, Stoke and Richmond makes sense. 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler Agree Good idea 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova Agree Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. 31379 Mr Lutz Totzauer Agree 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann Agree 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett Agree 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett Agree | 31334 Diane Sutherland | Agree | |
| provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster Agree 31349 Laurien Heijs Agree Endorse NelsonTasman2050 submission. Intensification should be residential and commercial. Stoke right now feels like a sprawling retirement suburb, not a destination. 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald Agree Where work has already started at Marsden Valley, Saxton etcdevelopments along the highway joinin Nelson, Stoke and Richmond makes sense. 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler Agree Good idea 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova Agree Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer Agree 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann Agree 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett Agree 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall Agree | 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman | Agree | |
| Agree Endorse NelsonTasman2050 submission. Intensification should be residential and commercial. Stoke right now feels like a sprawling retirement suburb, not a destination. 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald Agree Where work has already started at Marsden Valley, Saxton etcdevelopments along the highway joinin Nelson, Stoke and Richmond makes sense. 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler Agree Good idea 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova Agree Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer Agree 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann Agree 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett Agree 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall Agree | 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | Agree | provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see |
| now feels like a sprawling retirement suburb, not a destination. 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald Agree Where work has already started at Marsden Valley, Saxton etcdevelopments along the highway joinin Nelson, Stoke and Richmond makes sense. 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler Agree Good idea 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova Agree Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer Agree 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann Agree 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett Agree 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall Agree | 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | Agree | |
| Nelson, Stoke and Richmond makes sense. 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler Agree Good idea 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova Agree Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer Agree 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann Agree 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett Agree 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall Agree | 31349 Laurien Heijs | Agree | Endorse NelsonTasman2050 submission. Intensification should be residential and commercial. Stoke right now feels like a sprawling retirement suburb, not a destination. |
| Agree Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer Agree 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann Agree 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett Agree 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall Agree | 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | Agree | Where work has already started at Marsden Valley, Saxton etcdevelopments along the highway joining Nelson, Stoke and Richmond makes sense. |
| residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer Agree 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann Agree 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett Agree 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall Agree | 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | Agree | Good idea |
| 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann Agree 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett Agree 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall Agree | 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | Agree | residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure |
| 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett Agree 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall Agree | 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer | Agree | |
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall Agree | 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann | Agree | |
| | 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett | Agree | |
| 31403 Mr Richard Deck Agree Agree, so long as we do not create ghettos. | 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | Agree | |
| | 31403 Mr Richard Deck | Agree | Agree, so long as we do not create ghettos. |

| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle | Agree | Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. I would also like to see more mixed use in and near the centre of Stoke as well as a priority for comprehensive housing developments. |
|-----------------------------|-------|---|
| 31410 Mr Scott Smithline | Agree | Intensification around centre is far gentler to environment than spread |
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin | Agree | Yes, but again, it is about excellence rather than patchy infill. This is a flat area, which is ideal for higher buildings, as long as sun and views are maintained. Can local government promote an Urban Excellence concept, encouraging developers to look beyond traditional ways of working? Also, if we are to be living more intensively, we will need more greenspace, allotments, urban forests and playgrounds, as we will not have our own gardens. |
| 31416 Tim Leyland | Agree | Yes, if jobs are available and concurrently retain character with historic buildings and leafy streets. |
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | Agree | needs to be faster! And come before Greenfield development which has hugely less negative impact on community environment |
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | Agree | Again, not back section infill. Create new housing developments which offer a range of choices at affordable prices. |
| 31422 Mrs Marga Martens | Agree | |
| 31443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | Agree | |
| 31449 Mr John Chisholm | Agree | |
| 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon | Agree | |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | Agree | |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | Agree | |
| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | Agree | Yes, we have lived there previously and it is at the centre of everything. Intensification here would be ideal because access to Richmond and Nelson and surrounding areas is relatively easy and at this stage quick, though getting into and out of Nelson can take time due to traffic. The amenities and services available in Stoke are extensive - it is a very easy place to live and work. |
| 31481 Mrs Lucy Harrhy | Agree | |
| | | |

| 31487 Ms Heather Spence | Agree | I don't live there but it seems sensible to me. |
|---|-------|---|
| 31488 Annette Starink | Agree | |
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | Agree | Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. I would also like to see more mixed use in and near the centre of Stoke as well as a priority for comprehensive housing developments. |
| 31492 Anton, Benni, Shalom, AJ Bank, Bonnin, Shalom Davis | Agree | |
| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | Agree | Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions and achieving well-functioning urban environments as discussed in Q15. |
| 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | Agree | Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. I would also like to see more mixed use in and near the centre of Stoke as well as a priority for comprehensive housing developments. |
| 31496 Mrs Petra Dekker | Agree | Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. |
| 31508 Mr Roger Barlow | Agree | |
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | Agree | |
| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | Agree | Agree. Please refer to our answer for Q15 above. NMH support intensification in Stoke along the key transport lines. |
| | | |

| 31526 Elise Jenkin | Agree | Just as for Nelson in Q 15, we need to make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions rather than providing many other new alternatives on the edge of town. More mixed use in and around the centre of Stoke would be better, as well as a priority for comprehensive housing developments. |
|-------------------------------|-------|---|
| 31533 Wendy Trevett | Agree | |
| 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | Agree | See full submission. Summarised below (similar to NT2050 submission): singluar focus on growth, challenges underlying growth projections, insufficient consultation, misleading submission form (outcome questions), community feedback ignored, biased process, non-compliance with government directives. Recommends re-think of the draft. |
| 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery | Agree | |
| 31549 Mr Ian McComb | Agree | |
| 31553 Mr Wim van Dijk | Agree | Crossing Main Road and traffic backing up may become issues as the population density increases there |
| 31554 Wendy Barker | Agree | |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | Agree | Makes sense - schools, employment , health facilities; public transport , diverse communities |
| 31560 Ms Steph Watts | Agree | |
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | Agree | Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. I would like to see more mixed-use in and near the centre of Stoke as well as a priority for comprehensive housing developments. |
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | Agree | Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. |
| | | Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. |

| | | I would also like to see more mixed use in and near the centre of Stoke as well as a priority for comprehensive housing developments. |
|------------------------------------|-------|---|
| 31580 Jenny Long | Agree | I agree with intensification right at the centre of existing towns. |
| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | Agree | Build smaller multi level affordable property not million dollar penthouses |
| 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | Agree | However we need to come up with some creative planning, include plenty of parks, playgrounds etc perhaps even community gardens |
| 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | Agree | Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. I would like to see more mixed-use in and near the centre of Stoke as well as a priority for comprehensive housing developments. |
| 31593 Mr William Samuels | Agree | Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. |
| | | Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. |
| | | I would also like to see more mixed use in and near the centre of Stoke as well as a priority for comprehensive housing developments. |
| 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner | Agree | Same as Q15 + more mixed use in and near the centre of Stoke as well as a priority for comprehensive housing developments, innovative co-living communities. |
| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | Agree | Agree Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. I would also like to see more mixed use in and near the centre of Stoke as well as a priority for |

| | | comprehensive housing developments. |
|------------------------------|-------|---|
| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | Agree | |
| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | Agree | Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. I would also like to see more mixed use in and near the centre of Stoke as well as a priority for comprehensive housing developments. |
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | Agree | I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. I would also like to see more mixed use in and near the centre of Stoke as well as a priority for comprehensive housing developments. |
| 31608 Robbie Thomson | Agree | |
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | Agree | Yes, if the housing has affordable options, and the area is made is attractive with leafy green spaces between buildings and walkways etc |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | Agree | Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urbal living. I would like to see more mixed-use in and near the centre of Stoke as well as a priority for comprehensive housing developments. |
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | Agree | Agee if it is done the right way (see Q15) and not just building on back sections |
| 31617 Ms steph jewell | Agree | I haven't studied this so can't say but probably in favour. |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | Agree | C/o-NT2050 Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. |

| | | Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't |
|--------------------------------|-------|---|
| | | provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see |
| | | some really positive examples of higher density urban living. |
| | | I would also like to see more mixed use in and near the centre of Stoke as well |
| | | as a priority for comprehensive housing developments. |
| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | Agree | |
| 31636 Joanna Santa Barbara | Agree | |
| 31647 Mrs Rebecca Parish | Agree | |
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | Agree | Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. I would like to see more mixed-use in and near the centre of Stoke as well as a priority for comprehensive housing developments. |
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | Agree | Waka Kotahi support intensification of existing urban areas that already have social and economic infrastructure in place, supporting moving away from a reliance on private vehicle transport |
| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | Agree | |
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | Agree | Agree Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urbar living. I would like to see more mixed-use in and near the centre of Stoke as well as a priority for comprehensive housing developments. |
| 31667 barbara nicholas | Agree | |
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | Agree | Stoke has many excellent assets in close proximity to housing areas. The intensification area could be marginally increased. |
| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | Agree | Agree Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. I would like to see more mixed-use in and near the centre of Stoke as well as a priority for comprehensive housing developments. |

| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | Agree | Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urba living. I would like to see more mixed-use in and near the centre of Stoke as well as a priority for comprehensive housing developments. |
|-------------------------------|-------|---|
| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | Agree | Refer to prior comments |
| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | Agree | But the same comments as for question 15 relate to this question. |
| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | Agree | |
| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | Agree | Yes, but as for (15) we need to ensure that we enhance the community (parks, social spaces etc.). |
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | Agree | |
| 31703 Ms Paula Holden | Agree | |
| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | Agree | |
| 31718 Kathryn & Keith Quigley | Agree | |
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | Agree | This would benefit the existing settlement very much indeed. The population is significantly spread out from the centre thus leaving it dead and unattractive in the evenings. The more housing provided closer to the centre the more attractive and vibrant the town will become thus encouraging better economic growth. |
| 31722 Trevor Chang | Agree | |
| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | Agree | Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. I would also like to see more mixed use in and near the centre of Stoke as well as a priority for comprehensive housing developments. |
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | Agree | Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more |

| | | people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. I would also like to see more mixed use in and near the centre of Stoke as well as a priority for comprehensive housing developments. |
|--|----------|--|
| 31736 Ms Carol Curtis | Agree | I would also like to see more mixed use in and near the centre of Stoke as well as a priority for comprehensive housing developments. |
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | Agree | Great plan, but can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and we would start to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. I would also like to see more mixed use in and near the centre of Stoke as a priority for comprehensive housing developments. |
| 31775 Dr Thomas Carl | Agree | |
| 31783 Mr Peter Jones | Agree | A good outcome realising the potential of the area for young families with good transport options will result in a better community. |
| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | Agree | See Q15 |
| 31801 Joan Skurr | Agree | See the comments above, ?Haphengard? (please refer to attached) individual choices could lead to a les attractive result and not provide what is needed. |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | Agree | Net Enduring Restorative Outcomes and carrying capacity apply. |
| 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | Disagree | More is needed |
| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | Disagree | |
| 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | Disagree | |
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | Disagree | This is a centre of retirement villages and old people do not relish 'intensification'. |
| 31355 Mr Barney Hoskins | Disagree | Yes but not including Tahunanui to the levels of intensification as suggested. I do however support the intensification up to 3 stories and in some cases 3-4 story low rise residential intensification (including |
| | | |

| | | mixed use) in Tahunanui not any higher due to impacts previously discussed around access, safety and |
|---------------------------|---------------|---|
| | | community feel. Aesthetics also play into this as a desirable location for recreation. |
| 31435 Mr Alan Eggers | Disagree | I think for the Stoke CBD to survive then Intensification needs to be provoded. |
| 31485 Ms Robin Schiff | Disagree | Only if the planning starts from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless | Disagree | |
| 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | Disagree | |
| 31505 Cheryl Heten | Disagree | Low lying land - seal level. Building considerations not known at this stage. |
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers | Disagree | not near a centre, but may grow into one |
| 31522 Marilyn Davis | Disagree | 2 Storey only |
| 31525 Murray Davis | Disagree | |
| 31572 Mr David Todd | Disagree | |
| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | Disagree | Stoke does not need to be 'intensified', nowhere in this region does. Slow natural growth can be supported. Unnatural fast growth is unnecessary and should not be encouraged |
| 31606 Mr Trent Shepard | Disagree | |
| 31621 Dr Kath Walker | Disagree | |
| 31716 Mr Alan hart | Disagree | Stoke is already intensely occupied |
| 31741 Mr Robert Stevenson | Disagree | |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Disagree | Most of Stoke is already intensified with subdivided sections. The entire infrastructure needs rebuilding and not just stressed even more. |
| 31835 Mr Ian Wishart | Disagree | Please no to 6 storey buildings in the area around Andrew St & mid-Songer St. |
| 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward | Don't know | |
| | | |

| 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | Don't | |
|---------------------------------------|-------|---|
| | know | |
| 31219 Mrs kate windle | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 212FC Man Michael Deven | Dault | |
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31278 Wendy Ross | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31318 Mrs Isobel Mosley | Don't | |
| 31310 Wild isober Widsley | know | |
| | | |
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | Don't | what does 'the level of intensification proposed' mean? Yes, should intensify near existing amenities and |
| | know | jobs. |
| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | Don't | Don't know it yet |
| | know | |
| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | Don't | |
| 31374 DI IIIge Boit | know | |
| | | |
| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31406 Ms Floortje van Lierop | Don't | Havent looked into this specific spot |
| , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | know | |
| 24.44E Mars Zerraha Duth Callaurer | David | |
| 31415 Mrs Zanahe Ruth Galloway | | |
| | know | |
| 31431 Katerina Seligman | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31452 Mr David Bartle | Don't | |
| 22.32 IIII Baria Baria | know | |
| 24464 24 24 24 61 | | |
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31473 Mr Andrew Downs | Don't | |
| | know | |
| | | |

| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | Don't know | |
|---------------------------------|---------------|--|
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31521 Mrs Marie Waterhouse | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31641 Mr Stephen (Steve) Hayden | Don't | It's already a town, so develop that further without destroying productive countryside |
| | know | |
| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31693 Carolyn Rose | Don't | |
| | know | |
| | | |

| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | Don't know | |
|------------------------------|---------------|--|
| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | Don't know | Not answering any of these leading questions |
| 31739 Philippa Hellyer | Don't know | |
| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | Don't know | Please see attached: 16-20 Don't know enough, 16-20 However intensification needs to be for residents not for absent owners using area for investment purposes. |
| 31759 Mr Damian Campbell | Don't know | |
| 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | Don't know | |
| 31784 Ms Teresa James | Don't know | |
| 31185 Myfanway James | N/A | More intensification |
| 31346 Martin Hartman | N/A | Also, I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. |
| 31363 Mr Steve Cross | N/A | I reject the premise of this question |
| 31364 Mrs Christine Tuffnell | N/A | Best commented on by local people of that area |
| 31623 Ms Lucy Charlesworth | N/A | I am wary of answering this question as I cannot be sure of how my answer will be interpreted. So I will state - I do not agree with developing green spaces. These spaces need to be reserved and protected to allow for sustainable biodiversity and for future generations. Intensification within Nelson CBD needs to be a priority. I do not agrees with building on Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. I do not agree with housing development on green fields. There is a climate emergency. Remove these areas from the FDS. |
| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | Neutral | |
| 31114 Ms Jill Rogers | Neutral | |
| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | Neutral | |
| 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren | Neutral | |

| 31129 Mrs Gaynor Brooks | Neutral | |
|------------------------------------|---------|--|
| 31174 Ms Alison Westerby | Neutral | |
| 31186 Mr Gary Scott | Neutral | |
| 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | Neutral | Stoke is already too far out, intensify closer suburbs first. |
| 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | Neutral | See 02 |
| 31250 Mr Richard Wyles | Neutral | |
| 31257 Mr Kent Inglis | Neutral | |
| 31261 Mr John Weston | Neutral | Question 16 says as above comment ' As long as I don't have to live there' |
| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | Neutral | |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | Neutral | |
| 31280 Jenny Knott | Neutral | |
| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | Neutral | |
| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | Neutral | I quite like Stoke as it is. |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | Neutral | |
| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | Neutral | I would favour more intesification |
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | Neutral | |
| 31358 George Harrison | Neutral | |
| 31365 michael monti | Neutral | |
| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | Neutral | |
| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling | Neutral | Smaller housing options are needed. |
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | Neutral | |
| 31423 Mr Roger Frost | Neutral | |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas Hollyman | Neutral | |
| 31430 Muriel Moran | Neutral | I'm not in a position to comment as I'm not familiar with Stoke. |
| | | |

| 31434 Mrs cushla Moorhead | Neutral | |
|---------------------------------------|---------|---|
| | | |
| B1437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn Ball | Neutral | |
| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | Neutral | |
| 1459 Ms Ruth Newton | Neutral | No comments about Stoke. |
| 1469 Dr Jozef van Rens | Neutral | Only if the planning starts from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
| 1472 Dr David Briggs | Neutral | See answer to Q14 |
| 480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | Neutral | |
| 483 Debbie Hampson | Neutral | Tahunanui has already had it's sections subdividedis this an option for Stoke? |
| 484 Mr Gavin Brent Cook | Neutral | |
| 493 Ms Helen Lindsay | Neutral | |
| 520 Andrew Stirling | Neutral | |
| 523 Ms karen steadman | Neutral | |
| 529 Mr Steven King-Turner | Neutral | |
| 551 Mrs Jo Kitchen | Neutral | |
| 558 Mr Steve Jordan | Neutral | |
| 559 Dr Lou Gallagher | Neutral | |
| 574 Mr David Bolton | Neutral | |
| 579 Jane Tate | Neutral | |
| 587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz | Neutral | |
| 588 pene Greet | Neutral | |

| 31604 Mr Peter Moot | Neutral | |
|----------------------------|---------|--|
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | Neutral | Ruthless subdivision of sections is not the answer. Infrastructure has to be suitable to make developmen desirable for people to want to live there. Again, if the council wants to reduce motor traffic, focus on inner city development over this. |
| 31614 Mr mark Morris | Neutral | |
| 31628 Mr Daniel Levy | Neutral | |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | Neutral | |
| 31643 Inge Koevoet | Neutral | |
| 31644 Murray Poulter | Neutral | |
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | Neutral | I am not an expert and able to comment everything. Please listen to Joni Tomsett or Tim Neubauer. I think they represent my ideas. |
| 31651 Dr Patrick Conway | Neutral | |
| 31656 Mr brad malcolm | Neutral | |
| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | Neutral | |
| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | Neutral | |
| 31692 Mr Alasdair Gardiner | Neutral | |
| 31697 Robert King-Tenison | Neutral | |
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | Neutral | See attached submission. Summarised - no specific comments on this question, generally supports FDS. |
| 31721 Ms Jill Cullen | Neutral | |
| 31726 Mr John Jackson | Neutral | |
| 31744 Mrs Lorna CRANE | Neutral | |
| 31752 Jill Pearson | Neutral | |
| 31762 Mr Mark Hewetson | Neutral | |
| 31765 Mrs Lorna Ivy Cooper | Neutral | |
| 31769 Ms Jo Gould | Neutral | |
| 31774 Mrs Jane Sutherland | Neutral | |

| 31777 Mr David Lucas | Neutral | |
|----------------------------|------------------|--|
| 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | Stongly agree | Think Stoke may outpace Nelson for land development potential. There are opportunities here for potential town centre (bigger). Good transport links connecting Nelson and Tasman. Could potentially be an alternative town centre area to Nelson- if inundation occurs due to sea level rise and the subsequent issues that will affect nelson. |
| 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS | Stongly agree | |
| 31130 Trevor James | Stongly agree | |
| 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert | Stongly agree | |
| 31211 Mrs Alison Pickford | Stongly agree | See attached. Summarised - The areas should be developed in to recreational and sports grounds, the existing facilities would be very streteched indeed if the population doubles as predicted. Some reduction of traffic movements to facilities at tahunanui and saxton field may be gained. |
| 31216 Ms Judith Holmes | Stongly agree | Speed it up. |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | Stongly agree | |
| 31284 Mr Jarmo Saloranta | Stongly agree | |
| 31298 Mr Duncan Macnab | Stongly agree | |
| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | Stongly agree | With a futuristic well organised and suitable public transport service between Stoke and Nelson and Stoke and Richmond will go towards reducing the GHG as the employment, schools, further education and health services are all more easily accessible. |
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | Stongly agree | |
| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | Stongly agree | I stongly agree. Proposed building to 6 storeys. Excellent. Stoke is a retirement village, so it will be very suitable as long as the lifts work. The more people living in centres the better - makes a town very alive, and even more so when you shut the cars right out. Nelson has been SO slow to learn this, it's embarrassing. |

| 31356 Stephen Williams | Stongly agree | |
|--------------------------------|------------------|--|
| 31360 Ms Thuy Tran | Stongly agree | |
| 31405 Mr Doug Hattersley | Stongly agree | |
| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling | Stongly agree | It's central |
| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors | Stongly agree | |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | Stongly agree | |
| 31441 Mr Chris Head | Stongly agree | |
| 31457 Mr J Santa Barbara | Stongly agree | |
| 31491 Ms Annette Milligan | Stongly agree | |
| 31499 Ms Jane Fisher | Stongly agree | Perfect. Close to amenities, railway reserve and public transport. |
| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | Stongly agree | |
| 31515 Geoffrey Vause | Stongly agree | Any such intensification needs to be balanced with better living conditions. Residential infill intensification must be balanced by provision of parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. |
| 31516 Mr Peter Lole | Stongly agree | |
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | Stongly agree | A/A |
| 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett | Stongly agree | |
| | | |

| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | Stongly agree | |
|--------------------------------|------------------|--|
| 31598 Mrs Nicola Worsfold | Stongly agree | |
| 31622 Peter Butler | Stongly agree | |
| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | Stongly agree | |
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | Stongly agree | Already built up, has good transport connections and a massive Greenmeadows white elephant to utilise. |
| 31637 Ms Frances Kemble Welch | Stongly agree | |
| 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin | Stongly agree | |
| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | Stongly agree | |
| 31673 Mike Drake | Stongly agree | Yes. Going up. |
| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | Stongly agree | |
| 31683 Richard Davies | Stongly agree | |
| 31688 Gerard McDonnell | Stongly agree | Intensification with good planning is essential |
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | Stongly agree | This needs to be driven by local government and not left to developers on an ad hoc basis |
| 31704 Mr Paul Bucknall | Stongly agree | The pace is the issue. It has to be more than infill housing and dividing up large houses into flats as this will likely have the reverse impact and actually lower the number of people per hectare - even if dwellings per hectare increases. How can the density be maximised and the pace of change increased? |
| 31710 Ms Angela Fitchett | Stongly agree | Again, alongside good planning so the environment is enhanced ed by intensification. Parks, open spaces, trees, playgrounds for children of all ages will be needed to keep people happy in neighbourhoods as they |
| | | |

| | | develop into vibrant communities. Very hard to do in Greenfield developments dependent on cars for access to almost everything families need. |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | Stongly agree | As above regarding good urban design. |
| 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert- Watene | Stongly agree | |
| 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | Stongly agree | Yes, houses should be built of the hills |
| 31771 Colleen Shaw | Stongly agree | |
| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | Stongly agree | Please see attached - determined Agree from submission: Yes it looks fine. |
| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson | Strongly disagree | As for 15. |
| 31145 Ms Maggie Sweetman | Strongly disagree | |
| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | Strongly disagree | Must be kept to no higher than 2 storeys. We need row housing instead, and allowing for smaller houses in back sections. |
| 31247 Mr yuri aristarco | Strongly disagree | other productive land destroyed and lost forever, where is the sustainability here? |
| 31279 Mr Jeremy Thompson | Strongly disagree | See Answer 3 |
| 31347 Ms Paula Baldwin | Strongly disagree | NO - don't do it. There's a great living style in Stoke also - build around Strawbridge Square, including retirement villages, cycle ways, sports ground with flash (very expensive) building and you want to build a heap of tall buildings around it. Tall buildings are down the end of Nayland Road, around Echodale Place and Packham Cres, and the old juice site. If you have to build tall, put them near each other. It's just stupid intensification slowly will mean a property in Shelly Cres sells, and the new owner is given the Obto build a 3+ storey house in the middle of a single storey residential area that backs on to a cycle way. Ridiculous. |
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | Strongly disagree | |

| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | Strongly disagree | No to any 4 or 6 story buildings anywhere |
|------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31573 Mrs Susan Lea | - | This area is far too big - this will devalue all the area indicated We live in a beautiful part of the country with views to die for and we pay for it too !!! Why should only people on the top floor of a maybe 6 story appartment get a viewor a house pulled donw andnext door to you and without consent a 3 story appartment (s) is built 1 metre from you western or northern border - would you like it !!! There is a huge growth in Stoke up the Valleys for the lucky people who can afford a new home ,There could be some more appartments included amongst them. The established 1 story suburban streets are ok as they are - leave them alone |
| 31763 Susan Rogers | • . | Survey is flawed from the beginning. You need to redesign this entire line of questioning. It leads only to answers desired by the maker of the survey. |
| 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | Strongly disagree | |
| | | |

17 Do you agree with the level of intensification proposed in Richmond, right around the town centre and along McGlashen Avenue and Salisbury Road? Any comments?

| - | = | |
|-----------------------------|-------|---|
| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | Agree | It doesnt go as far as it could. I do believe the focus should be placed in intensification in Nelson. Nelson has much more potential to be a beautiful place to live (more so than Richmond). However, with all the development that has already happened in Richmond, intensification is needed here. |
| 31114 Ms Jill Rogers | Agree | |
| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | Agree | There are existing services in place to support this. |
| 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | Agree | |
| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | Agree | |
| 31171 Ms Sallie Griffiths | Agree | |
| 31173 Mr Roderick Watson | Agree | |
| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | Agree | |
| 31192 Ms Rebecca Patchett | Agree | There are amenities. Any changes may not have any detrimental impacts. |
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | Agree | |
| 31227 Ms Lee Eliott | Agree | |
| 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | Agree | consultation with the locals and development done tastefully. |
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | Agree | So long as there are good public transport and cycle links to Nelson. |
| 31240 Michael Markert | Agree | see 15 |
| 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan | Agree | As long as traffic management is thought about and possibly a bypass around Richmond would ease traffic that doesn't need to be there |
| 31257 Mr Kent Inglis | Agree | See #15 same reasons |
| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | Agree | |
| 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman | Agree | |
| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | Agree | |
| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | Agree | |
| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | Agree | |
| | | |

| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley | Agree | |
|---|-------|---|
| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | Agree | |
| 31284 Mr Jarmo Saloranta | Agree | |
| 31285 Dr Hamish Holland | Agree | |
| 31286 Mr David Short | Agree | |
| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | Agree | |
| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | Agree | With a futuristic well organised and suitable public transport service between Nelson -Stoke - Richmond - Hope will go towards reducing the GHG. Employment in city or rural / agri areas, schools, further education and health services are more easily accessible. |
| 31309 Mr & Mrs Rose & Phillip Windle | Agree | |
| 31322 Mrs BARBARA AND TIM ROBSON | Agree | |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | Agree | Yes, infrastructure is already in place. |
| 31328 Ms Karen du Fresne | Agree | Same comments as above. |
| 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman | Agree | |
| 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | Agree | |
| 31347 Ms Paula Baldwin | Agree | Yes, the Mall is there; commercial is there; and many plans/rumours about the Mall area being developed further into a multi-storey complex. This makes sense. |
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | Agree | |
| 31358 George Harrison | Agree | |
| 31360 Ms Thuy Tran | Agree | |
| 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | Agree | |
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | Agree | As above |
| | | |
| 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer | Agree | |

| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | Agree | |
|---------------------------------------|-------|---|
| 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett | Agree | |
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | Agree | |
| 31403 Mr Richard Deck | Agree | |
| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | Agree | |
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin | Agree | Yes, but again, it is about excellence rather than patchy infill. Can local government promote an Urban Excellence concept, encouraging developers to look beyond traditional ways of working? Also, if we are to be living more intensively, we will need more greenspace, allotments, urban forests and playgrounds, as we will not have our own gardens. |
| 31416 Tim Leyland | Agree | Yes, if jobs are available and concurrently retain character with historic buildings and leafy streets. |
| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors | Agree | |
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | Agree | needs to be faster! And come before Greenfield development which has hugely less negative impact on community environment |
| 31434 Mrs cushla Moorhead | Agree | |
| 31435 Mr Alan Eggers | Agree | I think the RIDA rules are OK though some matters need to be removed such as the 4m setback on one side which does not make sense for single storey development. |
| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn Ball | Agree | |
| 31449 Mr John Chisholm | Agree | |
| 31457 Mr J Santa Barbara | Agree | |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | Agree | |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | Agree | |
| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | Agree | The reasons being similar to intensification in Stoke - there are the amenities, services, schools etc available. Again roading needs some work. |
| 31481 Mrs Lucy Harrhy | Agree | |
| 31484 Mr Gavin Brent Cook | Agree | |
| 31488 Annette Starink | Agree | |

| 31492 | Anton, Benni, Shalom, AJ Bank, Bonnin, Shalom Davis | Agree | |
|-------|---|-------|---|
| 31508 | Mr Roger Barlow | Agree | |
| 31519 | Mr Jamie Eggers | Agree | yes seems logical |
| 31523 | Ms karen steadman | Agree | I agree as long as this doesn't mean there isn't money for development in the smaller towns. |
| 31529 | Mr Steven King-Turner | Agree | |
| 31533 | Wendy Trevett | Agree | |
| 31539 | Ms Rebecca Hamid | Agree | This needs to be monitored and staged. |
| 31542 | Mrs Melanie Drewery | Agree | |
| 31549 | Mr Ian McComb | Agree | |
| 31554 | Wendy Barker | Agree | Yes, it's already ruined. You need to provide cycle trails though and more public transport. |
| 31556 | Ms Esmé Palliser | Agree | Makes sense - schools, employment , health facilities; public transport , diverse communities |
| 31560 | Ms Steph Watts | Agree | |
| 31561 | Mrs Ann Jones | Agree | |
| 31582 | Mr Anthony Pearson | Agree | Infill where possible |
| 31587 | Mrs Yuriko Goetz | Agree | |
| 31599 | Ms Charlotte Stuart | Agree | |
| 31606 | Mr Trent Shepard | Agree | |
| 31608 | Robbie Thomson | Agree | |
| 31610 | Ms Mary Lancaster | Agree | Yes, if the housing has affordable options, and the area is made is attractive with leafy green spaces between buildings and walkways etc |
| 31617 | Ms steph jewell | Agree | as 16 |
| 31630 | Ms Stefanie Huber | Agree | |
| 31636 | Joanna Santa Barbara | Agree | |
| 31637 | Ms Frances Kemble Welch | Agree | |
| | | | |

| 31644 Murray Poulter | Agree | |
|-------------------------------|----------|---|
| 31647 Mrs Rebecca Parish | Agree | |
| 31656 Mr brad malcolm | Agree | |
| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | Agree | Refer to prior comments |
| 31688 Gerard McDonnell | Agree | |
| 31697 Robert King-Tenison | Agree | |
| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | Agree | |
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | Agree | |
| 31703 Ms Paula Holden | Agree | |
| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | Agree | |
| 31716 Mr Alan hart | Agree | Urban intensification should be accompanied by design guides and sensitivity to existing amenity |
| 31718 Kathryn & Keith Quigley | Agree | |
| 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | Agree | |
| 31774 Mrs Jane Sutherland | Agree | |
| 31775 Dr Thomas Carl | Agree | |
| 31777 Mr David Lucas | Agree | |
| 31783 Mr Peter Jones | Agree | Intensification is a natural outcome given the reading and access issues experienced in this area. |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | Agree | Net Enduring Restorative Outcomes and carrying capacity apply. |
| 31835 Mr Ian Wishart | Agree | As long as well done. please no future slums. |
| 31261 Mr John Weston | Disagree | Need to protect what productive land remains. |
| 31349 Laurien Heijs | Disagree | Endorse NelsonTasman2050 submission. |
| 31472 Dr David Briggs | Disagree | The development of Richmond to date has been an appalling example of planning. Huge, faceles residential areas, in flood-prone areas, without any local facilities, minimal green space, lousy public transport, poor walking facilities, no obvious educational or health facilities Do we really want more of that? |
| 31485 Ms Robin Schiff | Disagree | Only if the planning starts from the principles of |
| | | |

| | | -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing |
|------------------------------|----------|---|
| | | -reducing inequality and inequity |
| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless | Disagree | |
| 31522 Marilyn Davis | Disagree | 2 Storey only |
| 31572 Mr David Todd | Disagree | |
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | Disagree | We need more intensification in urban Richmond than what is proposed in the strategy |
| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | Disagree | It's going to be way too busy. McGlashen Avenue may be okay as it is still central town, but we would need more parking too. Salisbury Road can be crowded, especially during rush hours for school, and mornings for work too, it will just become overly crampt. |
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | Disagree | Proposed intensification of Richmond should include high intensity housing and business through central areas of Richmond. |
| 31736 Ms Carol Curtis | Disagree | There is more opportunity to allow more intensification in Richmond's centre, careful design solutions to the sea level, flooding, stormwater and sewer all need to be prioritised by the council to ensure this is resilient. |
| | | Also the bike lanes need to be developed better to be proper CYCLE WAYS, to encourage commuting, and to prioritise the bike pathway over the car traffic. |
| 31741 Mr Robert Stevenson | Disagree | |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Disagree | Apart from apartments what businesses would it attract. Its already got a mall, most businesses serve the rural community. |
| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | Disagree | Please see attached - determined Disagree from submission: A: No. You show no intensification of the Wensley Road areas yet these are eminently walkable an bikable to the town centre. Curiously right in the centre of Richmond you show low density residential infill. Rather than mixed use business and apartments that you should be showing there. |
| 31801 Joan Skurr | Disagree | Why is intensification limited to these areas? the whole of Richmond should be planned as a whole community. Housing needs, some close to amenities, require planning. |
| 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | Don't | |
| | | |

| | know | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|--|
| 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31186 Mr Gary Scott | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31219 Mrs kate windle | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31318 Mrs Isobel Mosley | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | Don't know | |
| 24225 44 2 | | |
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | Don't know | see comment above |
| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | Don't | |
| 31307 MIS JIII 300(11011 | know | |
| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | Don't | |
| 31374 DI IIIGE BOIL | know | |
| 31406 Ms Floortje van Lierop | Don't | Havent looked into this specific spot, but definitely against the type of building that has happened along |
| , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | know | Bateup Rd. Please see Magdalena Garbarczyk's excellent article on this type of buidling, and get experts |
| | | like her involved. |
| | | https://www.stuff.co.nz/business/property/300446371/the-silent-sprawl-thats-killing-off-our-quality-of- |
| | | life |
| 31431 Katerina Seligman | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | Don't | |
| | know | |

| 31473 Mr Andrew Downs | Don't |
|----------------------------|-------|
| | know |
| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | Don't |
| | know |
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | Don't |
| | know |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne | Don't |
| | know |
| 31521 Mrs Marie Waterhouse | Don't |
| | know |
| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard | Don't |
| | know |
| 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart | Don't |
| | know |
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins | Don't |
| | know |
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | Don't |
| | know |
| 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | Don't |
| | know |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | Don't |
| | know |
| 31641 Mr Stephen (Steve) | Don't |
| Hayden | know |
| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | Don't |
| | know |
| 31693 Carolyn Rose | Don't |
| | know |
| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | Don't |
| | know |

| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | Don't know | Not answering any of these leading questions |
|--|--------------------|--|
| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | Don't know | |
| 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | Don't know | |
| 31784 Ms Teresa James | Don't know | |
| 31185 Myfanway James | N/A | More intensification |
| 31363 Mr Steve Cross | N/A | I reject the premise of this question |
| 31364 Mrs Christine Tuffnell | N/A | Best commented on by local people of that area |
| 31623 Ms Lucy Charlesworth | N/A | I am wary of answering this question as I cannot be sure of how my answer will be interpreted. So I will state - I do not agree with developing green spaces. These spaces need to be reserved and protected to allow for sustainable biodiversity and for future generations. Intensification within Nelson CBD needs to be a priority. I do not agrees with building on Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. I do not agree with housing development on green fields. There is a climate emergency. Remove these areas from the FDS. |
| 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren | Neutral | |
| 31129 Mrs Gaynor Brooks | Neutral | |
| 31145 Ms Maggie Sweetman | Neutral | |
| 31174 Ms Alison Westerby | Neutral | |
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | Neutral | |
| 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | Neutral | Richmond is already too far out, intensify closer suburbs first. |
| 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | Neutral | See 03 |
| 31250 Mr Richard Wyles | Neutral | |
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | Neutral | As above |
| | | |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | Neutral | |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones 31278 Wendy Ross | Neutral Neutral | |

| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | Neutral | Many whanau need to transport children to Waimea intermediate and college - this is not a choice due to the current structure of our region's schools, so children are travelling on a daily basis from Tasman towns and outer rural areas. Until re-capitation happens in local primary schools or another college is created, easy and efficient accessways need to be preserved. Can this safely happen with intensification along Salisbury road? There is also a current need for the same whanau to commute to the central sports hubs in Stoke and Nelson. |
|------------------------------------|---------|---|
| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | Neutral | This is currently fairly pleasant too. |
| 31334 Diane Sutherland | Neutral | Again any intensification must be balanced with better living conditions - enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds and attractive streets. |
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | Neutral | |
| 31355 Mr Barney Hoskins | Neutral | |
| 31365 michael monti | Neutral | |
| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling | Neutral | There are a mixture of uses here at present which would have to be resolved |
| 31423 Mr Roger Frost | Neutral | |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas Hollyman | Neutral | |
| 31430 Muriel Moran | Neutral | I'm not in a position to comment as I'm not a resident of Richmond. |
| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | Neutral | |
| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | Neutral | No comment. |
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | Neutral | |
| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | Neutral | Only if the planning starts from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
| 31480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | Neutral | |
| | | |

| 31483 Debbie Hampson | Neutral | As above for Richmond. |
|----------------------------|---------|---|
| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | Neutral | |
| 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | Neutral | |
| 31505 Cheryl Heten | Neutral | Already started. |
| 31520 Andrew Stirling | Neutral | |
| 31551 Mrs Jo Kitchen | Neutral | |
| 31558 Mr Steve Jordan | Neutral | |
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | Neutral | |
| 31574 Mr David Bolton | Neutral | |
| 31579 Jane Tate | Neutral | |
| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | Neutral | As above Richmond does not need to be 'intensified', nowhere in this region does. Slow natural growth can be supported. Unnatural fast growth is unnecessary and should not be encouraged |
| 31588 pene Greet | Neutral | |
| 31604 Mr Peter Moot | Neutral | |
| 31628 Mr Daniel Levy | Neutral | |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | Neutral | |
| 31643 Inge Koevoet | Neutral | |
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | Neutral | I am not an expert and able to comment everything. Please listen to Joni Tomsett or Tim Neubauer. I think they represent my ideas. |
| 31651 Dr Patrick Conway | Neutral | |
| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | Neutral | |
| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | Neutral | |
| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | Neutral | |
| 31692 Mr Alasdair Gardiner | Neutral | |
| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | Neutral | There are more opportunities for intensification in the centre of Richmond (Queen St. for example). |
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | Neutral | See attached submission. Summarised - no specific comments on this question, generally supports FDS. |

| 31721 Ms Jill Cullen | Neutral | |
|----------------------------|------------------|--|
| 31722 Trevor Chang | Neutral | |
| 31726 Mr John Jackson | Neutral | |
| 31739 Philippa Hellyer | Neutral | |
| 31744 Mrs Lorna CRANE | Neutral | |
| 31752 Jill Pearson | Neutral | |
| 31762 Mr Mark Hewetson | Neutral | |
| 31765 Mrs Lorna Ivy Cooper | Neutral | |
| 31769 Ms Jo Gould | Neutral | |
| 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | Srongly agree | |
| 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS | Srongly agree | |
| 31130 Trevor James | Srongly agree | |
| 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert | Srongly agree | |
| 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | Srongly agree | Yes ideal places to build commercial on lower floors (cafe/ shops) and residential above. |
| 31216 Ms Judith Holmes | Srongly agree | Intensify, intensify. |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | Srongly agree | To make public and active transport possible for work, school and shopping, intensification is the best option |
| 31298 Mr Duncan Macnab | Srongly agree | |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | Srongly agree | Please see attached - summarised below: intensification favoured. new housing developments e.g. Berryfield Drive are creating urban sprawl. smaller houses need to be offered. No to greenfield expansion south to Hope or hills abouve Hope. No business sprawl along SH6 either. |

| 31316 John Heslop | Srongly agree | |
|----------------------------|------------------|---|
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | Srongly agree | |
| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | Srongly agree | This time I strongly agree. Time Richmond went up properly, but again, car-use needs to radically change I notice that Nelson is full of bikes these days, and drivers are getting used to it, whereas Richmond carpark has 500 cars and 4 bikes! What is wrong with Richmond people? Are they all climate deniers? |
| 31356 Stephen Williams | Srongly agree | |
| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | Srongly agree | It's a very good service centre and keeping it concentrated increases the range of offerings |
| 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann | Srongly agree | |
| 31405 Mr Doug Hattersley | Srongly agree | |
| 31410 Mr Scott Smithline | Srongly agree | See 16 |
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | Srongly agree | If done well it will help Richmond become a more vibrant town. |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | Srongly agree | |
| 31441 Mr Chris Head | Srongly agree | |
| 31452 Mr David Bartle | Srongly agree | Existing business space, schools, parks, shopping and entertainment are already available. intensification would help establish Richmond as a second city |
| 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon | Srongly agree | |
| 31487 Ms Heather Spence | Srongly agree | I don't live there but it seems sensible to me. |
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | Srongly agree | We need more intensification here. Why is the area along Queen Street only identified for "residential infill"? Shouldn't we allow for the highest intensity here? I would be better to have comprehensive mixed |
| | | |

| | | use redevelopment along Queen Street. Also, can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. |
|--------------------------------|------------------|--|
| 31491 Ms Annette Milligan | Srongly agree | |
| 31499 Ms Jane Fisher | Srongly agree | see above. |
| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | Srongly agree | |
| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | Srongly agree | Strongly agree. Please refer to our answer for Q15 above. |
| 31515 Geoffrey Vause | Srongly agree | Same reasoning as above |
| 31516 Mr Peter Lole | Srongly agree | |
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | Srongly agree | A/A |
| 31553 Mr Wim van Dijk | Srongly agree | More people living near the commercial centre of Richmond will lead to additional pedestrians. The section of Queen Street from Oxford roundabout to Gladstone Road should be pedestrian only. |
| 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett | Srongly agree | We need more intensification here. Why is the area along Queen Street only identified for "residential infill"? Shouldn't we allow for the highest intensity here? I would like to see comprehensive mixed use redevelopment along Queen Street. Also, can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. |

| 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham | Srongly agree | See 14 |
|---------------------------|------------------|--|
| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | Srongly agree | |
| 31580 Jenny Long | Srongly agree | I strongly agree with multi-storey apartments being built right in the town centre, e.g. above shops. |
| 31598 Mrs Nicola Worsfold | Srongly agree | |
| 31614 Mr mark Morris | Srongly agree | We believe intensive residential development areas ie RIDA such what is proposed for Salisbury road are vital for providing affordable housing for Richmond. SEE ATTACHMENT in support of T-112 Residentia Intensification Future Development Area on the church property at 123 Salisbury Road, Richmond. |
| 31622 Peter Butler | Srongly agree | |
| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | Srongly agree | |
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | Srongly agree | Residents should not live on a godforsaken postage stamp sized section near Hope. Promote quality infill. |
| 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin | Srongly agree | |
| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | Srongly agree | |
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | Srongly agree | Waka Kotahi support intensification of existing urban areas that already have social and economic infrastructure in place, supporting moving away from a reliance on private vehicle transport. There are capacity issues on the transport network around Richmond and through to Nelson. Intensification of this area, close to the schools and employment could allow for increased uptake of active mode transport. |
| 31667 barbara nicholas | Srongly agree | |
| 31673 Mike Drake | Srongly agree | Fine. Intensify where there are already services, infrastructure and jobs. There needs to be excellent free public transport linking Richmond, Stoke and Nelson. Just think the degreee of traffic reduction. Start applying lateral thinking. |
| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | Srongly | |
| | | |

| Srongly agree | |
|----------------------|--|
| Srongly agree | This needs to be driven by local government and not left to developers on an ad hoc basis |
| Srongly agree | The pace is the issue. It has to be more than infill housing and dividing up large houses into flats as this will likely have the reverse impact and actually lower the number of people per hectare - even if dwellings per hectare increases. How can the density be maximised and the pace of change increased? The traffic in the area is already - how can this be mitigated? |
| Srongly agree | |
| Srongly agree | |
| Srongly agree | |
| Strongly disagree | The Richmond development has already devalued the township, it appears to be overcrowded, the roads always congested. |
| Strongly disagree | Must be kept to no higher than 2 storeys. We need row housing instead, and allowing for smaller houses in back sections. |
| Strongly disagree | other productive land destroyed and lost forever, where is the sustainability here? |
| Strongly disagree | See answer 3 |
| Strongly disagree | More intensification is needed, balanced with better living conditions as above. |
| Strongly disagree | More intensification is needed, balanced with better living conditions as above. |
| Strongly disagree | More intensification needed here. Why is the area along Queen Street only identified for "residential infill"? Shouldn't we allow for the highest intensity here? I would like to see comprehensive mixed use redevelopment along Queen Street. Also, can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill |
| | Srongly agree Srongly agree Srongly agree Srongly agree Srongly agree Strongly disagree Strongly |

| | | intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urbailiving. |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle | Strongly disagree | We need more intensification here. Why is the area along Queen Street only identified for "residential infill"? Shouldn't we allow for the highest intensity here? The carparks that make up the majority of Richmond are ripe for redevelopment. How about a multistorey carpark, then creating comprehensive mixed use redevelopment along Queen Street and throughout the carpark areas. All businesses on Queer Street, when they are due to be refurbished, should be adding offices / residential spaces above. I would love for people to be able to live in the centre of Richmond so it feels alive, like towns in Europe. There should be bike parking spaces everywhere, and good connections to public transport so there isn't such a high demand for cars. Also, can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill |
| | | intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. |
| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling | Strongly disagree | People need parks and playgrounds. It's not a good idea to pack more people into back sections |
| 31415 Mrs Zanahe Ruth Galloway | Strongly disagree | Better to create new towns and revive small rural ones that need the growth to survive and thrive. |
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | Strongly disagree | This proposal does not provide options for intensive redevelopment along Queen Street right in the heart of Richmond where there is so much empty unproductive space. Give people an opportunity to choose good quality urban living rather than more housing spreading along the roads leading out of Richmond. |
| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | Strongly disagree | We need more intensification here. Why is the area along Queen Street only identified for "residential infill"? Shouldn't we require higher intensity here? I would like to see comprehensive mixed use redevelopment along Queen Street. The failing of the intensification purpose is already visible in Richmond, for example on the corner of Wensley Rd and Queens Street where a multi-story development was marketed but a cheap 1-level construction was built. |
| 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | Strongly disagree | We need more intensification here. Why is the area along Queen Street only identified for "residential infill"? Shouldn't we allow for the highest intensity here? I would like to see comprehensive mixed use |
| | | |

| | | redevelopment along Queen Street. Also, can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urbar living. |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31496 Mrs Petra Dekker | Strongly disagree | We need more intensification here. Why is the area along Queen Street only identified for "residential infill"? |
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | Strongly disagree | I would like to see comprehensive mixed use redevelopment along Queen Street |
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | Strongly disagree | We need more intensification here. The area along Queen Street should not be only identified for "residential infill" I would like to see comprehensive mixed use redevelopment along Queen Street. If all these other new alternatives on the edge of town were not provided we could start to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living, more centrally. |
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | Strongly disagree | We need more intensification here. Why is the area along Queen Street only identified for "residential infill"? Shouldn't we allow for the highest intensity here? I would like to see comprehensive mixed-use redevelopment along Queen Street. |
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | Strongly disagree | We need more intensification here. Why is the area along Queen Street only identified for "residential infill"? Shouldn't we allow for the highest intensity here? I would like to see comprehensive mixed use redevelopment along Queen Street. |
| | | Also, can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. |
| | | I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. |
| 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | Strongly disagree | It would be much better to have a mixed use development - similar to European cities. |

| 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | Strongly disagree | We need more intensification here. Why is the area along Queen Street only identified for "residential infill"? Shouldn't we allow for the highest intensity here? I would like to see comprehensive mixed-use redevelopment along Queen Street. |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31593 Mr William Samuels | Strongly disagree | We need more intensification here. Why is the area along Queen Street only identified for "residential infill"? Shouldn't we allow for the highest intensity here? I would like to see comprehensive mixed use redevelopment along Queen Street. |
| | | Also, can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. |
| | | I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urbar living. |
| 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner | Strongly disagree | It seems strange that there are more infills rather than centre intensificationthis is an unclear message to me. Other than that see Q15 for packing in more people into backyards |
| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | Strongly disagree | Strongly disagree We need more intensification here. Why is the area along Queen Street only identified for "residential infill"? Shouldn't we allow for the highest intensity here? I would like to see comprehensive mixed use redevelopment along Queen Street. Also, can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urbal living. |
| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | Strongly disagree | We need more intensification here. Why is the area along Queen Street only identified for "residential infill"? Shouldn't we allow for the highest intensity here? I would like to see comprehensive mixed use redevelopment along Queen Street. Also, can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. |

| | | I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. |
|---------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | Strongly disagree | We need more intensification here. Why is the area along Queen Street only identified for "residential infill"? Shouldn't we allow for the highest intensity here? I would like to see comprehensive mixed use redevelopment along Queen Street. And less big open carparks. This is a prime opportunity for the Council to put their money where their mouth is and develop something fabulous. I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see |
| | | some really positive examples of higher density urban living. |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | Strongly disagree | We need more intensification here. Why is the area along Queen Street only identified for "residential infill"? Shouldn't we allow for the highest intensity here? I would like to see comprehensive mixed-use redevelopment along Queen Street. |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | Strongly disagree | C/o-NT2050 We need more intensification here. Why is the area along Queen Street only identified for "residential infill"? Shouldn't we allow for the highest intensity here? I would like to see comprehensive mixed use redevelopment along Queen Street. Also, can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. |
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | Strongly disagree | We need more intensification here. Why is the area along Queen Street only identified for "residential infill"? Shouldn't we allow for the highest intensity here? I would like to see comprehensive mixed-use redevelopment along Queen Street. |
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | Strongly disagree | Strongly disagree We need more intensification here. Why is the area along Queen Street only identified for "residential infill"? Shouldn't we allow for the highest intensity here? I would like to see comprehensive mixed-use |

| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | Strongly disagree | Strongly disagree We need more intensification here. Why is the area along Queen Street only identified for "residential infill"? Shouldn't we allow for the highest intensity here? I would like to see comprehensive mixed-use redevelopment along Queen Street. |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | Strongly disagree | We need more intensification here. Why is the area along Queen Street only identified for "residential infill"? Shouldn't we allow for the highest intensity here? I would like to see comprehensive mixed-use redevelopment along Queen Street!!!! |
| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | Strongly disagree | The intensification should be greater than is planned. |
| 31710 Ms Angela Fitchett | Strongly disagree | Better to have the highest level of intensification here surely? |
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | Strongly disagree | The proposal doesn't provide enough intensification. Back section development is a rod in the back to the potential that this area could become. Good quality multistorey intensification is more appropriate this close to the town centre. |
| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | Strongly disagree | We need more intensification here. Why is the area along Queen Street only identified for "residential infill"? Shouldn't we allow for the highest intensity here? I would like to see comprehensive mixed use redevelopment along Queen Street. Also, can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. |
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | Strongly disagree | We need more intensification here. Why is the area along Queen Street only identified for "residential infill"? Shouldn't we allow for the highest intensity here? I would like to see comprehensive mixed use redevelopment along Queen Street. Also, can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open |

| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | Strongly disagree | Why around town centre? See Q15 |
|--|----------------------|---|
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | Strongly disagree | We need more intensification here. Why is the area along Queen Street only identified for "residential infill"? Shouldn't we allow for the highest intensity here? I would like to see comprehensive mixed use redevelopment along Queen Street. Also, can we make sure that intensification is balanced with better living conditions? E.g. residential infill intensification just seems to pack more people into back sections instead of making sure that there are enough parks and open spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker, and start to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living, if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town |
| 31763 Susan Rogers | Strongly disagree | Survey is flawed from the beginning. You need to redesign this entire line of questioning. It leads only to answers desired by the maker of the survey. |
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | Strongly disagree | There needs to be more intensification across a wider area. |
| | | spaces, playgrounds or attractive streets. I think we would get more people to live centrally a lot quicker if we didn't provide all these other new alternatives on the edge of town and started to see some really positive examples of higher density urban living. |

| · · · | | ensification proposed around the centre of Brightwater? Any comments? |
|---|-------|--|
| 31171 Ms Sallie Griffiths | Agree | |
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | Agree | |
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | Agree | |
| 31240 Michael Markert | Agree | see 15 |
| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | Agree | |
| 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman | Agree | |
| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | Agree | |
| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | Agree | |
| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | Agree | |
| 31284 Mr Jarmo Saloranta | Agree | |
| 31286 Mr David Short | Agree | |
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | Agree | Heavy transport vehicles accessing Waimea West need to be bypassed first. Safe cycleway/walkway access to the proposed rural residential development needs to be prioritised a there is barely a verge in places beyond the Wai-iti bridge. |
| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | Agree | |
| 31309 Mr & Mrs Rose & Phillip Windle | Agree | |
| 31316 John Heslop | Agree | Needs to be some thought as to the allowance for commercial development growth to serve the community centrally located. |
| 31322 Mrs BARBARA AND TIM ROBSON | Agree | |
| 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | Agree | |
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | Agree | |
| 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer | Agree | |
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | Agree | |

| 31403 Mr Richard Deck | Agree | |
|---|-------|---|
| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | Agree | |
| 31415 Mrs Zanahe Ruth Galloway | Agree | this is where an increase of population is needed to make this town thrive and not increase the frustration from traffic noise pollution in cities like Nelson and Richmond adverse to any pleasant biking option especially at the backward speed of 50km/hour! |
| 31416 Tim Leyland | Agree | Yes, if jobs are available and concurrently retain character with historic buildings and leafy streets. |
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | Agree | needs to be faster! And come before Greenfield development which has hugely less negative impact on community environment |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | Agree | |
| 31435 Mr Alan Eggers | Agree | Generally OK though you do need to allow more development on some of smaller outlying settlements such as Spring Grove. |
| 31449 Mr John Chisholm | Agree | |
| 31457 Mr J Santa Barbara | Agree | |
| 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon | Agree | |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | Agree | |
| 31481 Mrs Lucy Harrhy | Agree | |
| 31488 Annette Starink | Agree | |
| 31492 Anton, Benni, Shalom, AJ Bank, Bonnin, Shalom Davis | Agree | |
| 31508 Mr Roger Barlow | Agree | |
| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | Agree | |
| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | Agree | Agree in terms of the proposals for residential and commercial land around Brightwater. Consideration also should be given to expanding cycling routes from Brightwater through Hope to Richmond. Whilst the Great Taste Trail provides cycling opportunities for recreational users, those wishing to commute by bicycle may wish for a more direct route and this should be considered within transport infrastructure plans. |
| 31516 Mr Peter Lole | Agree | |

| 31520 Andrew Stirling | Agree | |
|-------------------------------|-------|---|
| 31533 Wendy Trevett | Agree | |
| 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery | Agree | |
| 31549 Mr Ian McComb | Agree | |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | Agree | With strengthened infrastructure |
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | Agree | Brightwater is a beautiful town centre and an easy location to access for most of Tasman. Intensification there should include mixed housing and multi-story buildings with garden space for community gardens. Set aside the green space first. |
| 31560 Ms Steph Watts | Agree | |
| 31563 Mrs Loretta Anne Hogg | Agree | Yes build in Brightwater. |
| 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz | Agree | |
| 31598 Mrs Nicola Worsfold | Agree | |
| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | Agree | |
| 31608 Robbie Thomson | Agree | |
| 31617 Ms steph jewell | Agree | as 16 |
| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | Agree | |
| 31636 Joanna Santa Barbara | Agree | |
| 31637 Ms Frances Kemble Welch | Agree | |
| 31647 Mrs Rebecca Parish | Agree | |
| 31651 Dr Patrick Conway | Agree | |
| 31667 barbara nicholas | Agree | |
| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | Agree | With the same priviso as noted above - the scale and type of growth is consistent with and enhances the communities in which it is being developed, and does not transform the look and feel of already vibrant communities. |
| 31688 Gerard McDonnell | Agree | |
| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | Agree | But only in the existing centre, not in greenfield sites. |

| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | Agree | |
|--------------------------------------|----------|--|
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | Agree | |
| 31704 Mr Paul Bucknall | Agree | |
| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | Agree | |
| 31716 Mr Alan hart | Agree | Urban intensification should be accompanied by design guides and sensitivity to existing amenity (resticting too many multistory buildings) |
| 31718 Kathryn & Keith Quigley | Agree | |
| 31741 Mr Robert Stevenson | Agree | |
| 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert- Watene | Agree | |
| 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | Agree | |
| 31771 Colleen Shaw | Agree | |
| 31774 Mrs Jane Sutherland | Agree | |
| 31783 Mr Peter Jones | Agree | A natural outcome |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | Agree | Net Enduring Restorative Outcomes and carrying capacity apply. |
| 31835 Mr Ian Wishart | Agree | |
| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | Disagree | |
| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | Disagree | See comments above re productive land |
| 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | Disagree | Leave it small. |
| 31261 Mr John Weston | Disagree | need to protect what productive land remains. |
| 31334 Diane Sutherland | Disagree | Doubt that there is enough employment in the area for this. |
| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | Disagree | No too much greenfield |
| 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | Disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village center. |
| | | |

| | | We need to look at providing space for eco-friendly TINY HOUSE developments so young couples can afford to live here and own a home. |
|------------------------------|----------|--|
| 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | Disagree | Brightwater should keep its rural aspect, for reasons listed above. The transport system and the needs of the environment, do not support people driving into Nelson for work. |
| 31346 Martin Hartman | Disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village center. |
| | | We need to look at providing space for eco-friendly TINY HOUSE developments so young couples can afford to live here and own a home. |
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | Disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. |
| 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann | Disagree | I do not think there are enough jobs there to rectify this. Brightwater should not just be a commuter town. |
| 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett | Disagree | Stay within built areas. |
| 31400 Miss Heather Wallace | Disagree | Stay within built up areas. same for question 18 to 20. |
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle | Disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which ca be achieved by intensification in and near the village centre. |
| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling | Disagree | Where are these extra people going to get jobs? They'd have to drive a longvway. |
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin | Disagree | Increasing the size of satellite centres is simply going to add to the commuter traffic. |
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | Disagree | Need to make sure the number of houses are in keeping with the rural nature of the town and are concentrated around the main township. |
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | Disagree | This will become more suburbs full of people commuting to Richmond or Nelson every day. |
| 31485 Ms Robin Schiff | Disagree | Only if the planning starts from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification |
| | | |

| | | -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
|----------------------------|----------|--|
| 31487 Ms Heather Spence | Disagree | I would agree only once there's maximum intensification in Nelson, Richmond, Stoke. And on;y if intensification means going up not out. |
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | Disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which ca be achieved by intensification in and near the village center. |
| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | Disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to justify the need to grow the population. There is a risk that Brightwater will turn into a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village center, including the provision of mixed use. |
| 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | Disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village center. |
| 31496 Mrs Petra Dekker | Disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise, it will only run the risk of becoming a commuter suburb. |
| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless | Disagree | |
| 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | Disagree | |
| 31505 Cheryl Heten | Disagree | |
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | Disagree | I doubt that there is enough employment in Brightwater. it just creates commuting. |
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | Disagree | Brightwater could become a commuter suburb if there is not enough employment to grow the population. There might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village centre. |
| 31554 Wendy Barker | Disagree | Enough there already |
| | | |

| becomes a commuter suburb. It hink there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensiting and near the village center. 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer 31581 Mr Tony Bielby 31581 Mr Tony Bielby 31582 As above Brightwater does definitely not need to be 'intensified' it is rural and should remain so. Note in this region does. Slow natural growth can be supported. Unnatural fast growth is unnecessary and should not be encouraged. In Brightwater low level expansion is acceptable to support local natural growth 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson 31589 Mr Lee Woodman 31592 Mr Lee Woodman 31593 Mr William Samuels 31593 Mr William Samuels 31594 Ms Annemarie 31594 Ms Annemarie 31595 Mr Raymond Brasem 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem 31597 Disagree 31598 Mr Raymond Brasem 31598 Disagree 31599 Disagree 31599 Disagree 31599 Disagree 31599 Disagree 31599 Disagree 31590 Annemarie 31590 Disagree 31591 Hink there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village centre. 31594 Ms Annemarie 31595 Mr Raymond Brasem 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem 31597 Disagree 31598 Pisagree 31598 Pisagree 31598 Pisagree 31598 Pisagree 31599 Disagree 31599 Pisagree 31599 Disagree 31599 Disagree 31599 Pisagree 31599 Disagree 31599 Disagree 31599 Disagree 31599 Pisagree 31599 Disagree 31599 Disagree 31599 Pisagree 31599 Disagree 31599 Pisagree 31599 Disagree 31599 Disagree 31599 Disagre | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|----------|---|
| Population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. | 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | Disagree | I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification |
| achieved by intensification in and near the village center. 31581 Mr Tony Bielby Disagree As above Brightwater does definitely not need to be 'intensified' it is rural and should remain so. No in this region does. Slow natural growth can be supported. Unnatural fast growth is unnecessary are should not be encouraged. In Brightwater low level expansion is acceptable to support local natural growth 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson Disagree I am concerned that it may become a commuter suburb adding more traffic and GHG 31592 Mr Lee Woodman Disagree I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, who he achieved by intensification in and near the village centre. 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner Disagree Does not seem to go hand in hand with growth – jobs, businesses etc Disagree I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensifination and near the village center. 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem Disagree I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensifination and near the village center. I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensifination and near the village center. | 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | Disagree | |
| in this region does. Slow natural growth can be supported. Unnatural fast growth is unnecessary ar should not be encouraged. In Brightwater low level expansion is acceptable to support local natura growth 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson Disagree I am concerned that it may become a commuter suburb adding more traffic and GHG 31592 Mr Lee Woodman Disagree I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it on becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, whole achieved by intensification in and near the village centre. 31593 Mr William Samuels Disagree I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it on becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensifin and near the village center. Disagree Braunsteiner Disagree Does not seem to go hand in hand with growth – jobs, businesses etc I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensifing and near the village center. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensifing and near the village center. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensifing and near the village center. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensifing and near the village center. I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensifing and near the village center. | | | |
| Disagree I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only be achieved by intensification in and near the village centre. Disagree I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only be achieved by intensification in and near the village centre. Disagree I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensifing and near the village center. Disagree Does not seem to go hand in hand with growth – jobs, businesses etc Disagree I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensifing and near the village center. Disagree I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensifing and near the village center. | 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | Disagree | As above Brightwater does definitely not need to be 'intensified' it is rural and should remain so. Nowher in this region does. Slow natural growth can be supported. Unnatural fast growth is unnecessary and should not be encouraged. In Brightwater low level expansion is acceptable to support local natural growth |
| becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, who be achieved by intensification in and near the village centre. 1 I bisagree I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it on becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensifing and near the village center. Disagree Braunsteiner Disagree I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it on becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensifing and near the village center. The most sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensifing and near the village center. The most sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be | 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | Disagree | I am concerned that it may become a commuter suburb adding more traffic and GHG |
| becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensi in and near the village center. 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner Disagree Does not seem to go hand in hand with growth – jobs, businesses etc I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensi in and near the village center. Disagree I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be | 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | Disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which ca be achieved by intensification in and near the village centre. |
| in and near the village center. 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner Disagree Does not seem to go hand in hand with growth – jobs, businesses etc Disagree I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensi in and near the village center. Disagree I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be | 31593 Mr William Samuels | Disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. |
| Braunsteiner Disagree I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensi in and near the village center. Disagree I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be | | | I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village center. |
| becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensi in and near the village center. Disagree I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be | | Disagree | Does not seem to go hand in hand with growth – jobs, businesses etc |
| population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be | 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | Disagree | I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification |
| deficed by interisinguition in that feel the vinage center. | 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | Disagree | population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. |

| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | Disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb (and that does not become acceptable just because you put on a bus connection to Nelson). |
|--------------------------------|----------|--|
| | | I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village center. |
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | Disagree | Brightwater is a village and unless there are increased employment options, intensification there will just lead to more commuting and increased emissions |
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | Disagree | Do we need to build more commuter suburbs?. If there was enough industry in the area to support increased housing, that would help.or different, smaller, more intense types of housing around the suburb centre, to make it more of a community. |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | Disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village centre. |
| 31643 Inge Koevoet | Disagree | |
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | Disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village centre. |
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | Disagree | Disagree I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village centre. |
| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | Disagree | Disagree I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village centre. |
| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | Disagree | There will be less demand for intensification options in Brightwater and Wakefield. Better to over provide in Richmond and Nelson. |
| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | Disagree | This does not feel like intensification but a continuation of the Richmond sprawl. |
| 31710 Ms Angela Fitchett | Disagree | Have to be careful Brightwater does not become a commuter suburb. Not good for carbon reduction or |
| | | |

| | | community development. |
|--|---------------|--|
| 31722 Trevor Chang | Disagree | If due to a natural disaster whereby the dam is damaged, there is a chance that Brightwater could suffer severe inundation. |
| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | Disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village center. |
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | Disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village center. |
| 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | Disagree | |
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | Disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which ca be achieved by intensification in and near the village centre. |
| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | Disagree | Is there enough employment? |
| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | Disagree | Please see attached - determined Disagree from submission: A: No, Increasing the number of people living in rural towns is counter to our climate change imperatives of settlement patterns largely eliminating car commuting. We don't think many people living in Brightwater will be employed in Brightwater. Public Transport from Brightwater and Wakefield into Richmond and Nelson will most unlikely be quicker and more convenient than a car, 10 minute frequencies necessary for this, just aren't going to happen in these satellite towns. People are going to be using the least energy and space efficient means to get to their workplaces, the hospital, their pilates classes - extra residents in these far flung settlements are going to mean more cars on the road and more congestion, more energy expended in 2 tonne metal boxes, daily car dependence. This is last centuries thinking. |
| 31801 Joan Skurr | Disagree | The people who live in Brightwater should, ideally, be able to find suitable employment there. Expanding housing without providing employment locally leads to commuting - to be avoided. |
| 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | Don't know | |

| 31114 Ms Jill Rogers | Don't | |
|------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| | know | |
| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31216 Ms Judith Holmes | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31219 Mrs kate windle | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | Don't know | |
| 24225 2 11 11 11 11 | | |
| 31285 Dr Hamish Holland | Don't know | |
| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | Don't | |
| 31299 Wis Gillian Gallacher | know | |
| 31318 Mrs Isobel Mosley | Don't | |
| 31316 IVII's ISOBEL IVIOSIEY | know | |
| 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | Don't | |
| 5152 Film Brian Flawthorne | know | |
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | Don't | see comment above |
| 0 | know | |
| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | Don't | No view |
| · | know | |
| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | Don't | |
| | know | |
| | | |

| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | Don't know |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 31406 Ms Floortje van Lierop | Don't See above know |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas Hollyman | Don't know |
| 31431 Katerina Seligman | Don't know |
| 31434 Mrs cushla Moorhead | Don't know |
| 31473 Mr Andrew Downs | Don't know |
| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | Don't know |
| 31483 Debbie Hampson | Don't know |
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | Don't know |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne | Don't know |
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers | Don't know |
| 31521 Mrs Marie Waterhouse | Don't know |
| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard | Don't know |
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | Don't know |
| 31572 Mr David Todd | Don't |

| 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart | Don't know | |
|---------------------------------|---------------|--|
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins | Don't know | |
| 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | Don't know | |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | Don't know | |
| 31641 Mr Stephen (Steve) Hayden | Don't know | |
| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | Don't know | |
| 31693 Carolyn Rose | Don't know | |
| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | Don't know | |
| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | Don't know | Not answering any of these leading questions |
| 31736 Ms Carol Curtis | Don't know | |
| 31739 Philippa Hellyer | Don't know | |
| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | Don't know | |
| 31759 Mr Damian Campbell | Don't know | |
| 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | Don't know | |
| 31784 Ms Teresa James | Don't know | |
| | | |

| 31185 Myfanway James | N/A | More intensification |
|------------------------------|---------|--|
| 31363 Mr Steve Cross | N/A | I reject the premise of this question |
| 31364 Mrs Christine Tuffnell | N/A | Best commented on by local people of that area |
| 31438 Aleisha Hosie | N/A | Yes, with the already earmarked areas for residential it would be nice to see more commercial areas as stated above. With the potential rezoning behind Lord Rutherford memorial it would be nice to see a small space for a shopping hub. For basic supplies. |
| 31623 Ms Lucy Charlesworth | N/A | I am wary of answering this question as I cannot be sure of how my answer will be interpreted. So I will state - I do not agree with developing green spaces. These spaces need to be reserved and protected to allow for sustainable biodiversity and for future generations. Intensification within Nelson CBD needs to be a priority. I do not agrees with building on Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. I do not agree with housing development on green fields. There is a climate emergency. Remove these areas from the FDS. |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | N/A | Jobs and a clear hub need developing. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. |
| | | C/o-NT2050 There might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village center. |
| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | Neutral | |
| 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS | Neutral | |
| 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | Neutral | |
| 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren | Neutral | |
| 31129 Mrs Gaynor Brooks | Neutral | |
| 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert | Neutral | |
| 31145 Ms Maggie Sweetman | Neutral | |
| 31173 Mr Roderick Watson | Neutral | |
| 31174 Ms Alison Westerby | Neutral | |
| 31186 Mr Gary Scott | Neutral | |
| 31192 Ms Rebecca Patchett | Neutral | |
| | Neutral | |

| 31250 Mr Richard Wyles | Neutral | |
|---------------------------|---------|--|
| 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan | Neutral | |
| 31257 Mr Kent Inglis | Neutral | |
| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley | Neutral | |
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | Neutral | This might greatly upset the delicate balance of rural living in that area. |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | Neutral | |
| 31278 Wendy Ross | Neutral | There is a lot of farmland to be kept there so my opinion would be that all these areas need to be carefully realised so that future people will want to live there in a fresh and well planned community. With important conditions of any future planning there. |
| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | Neutral | |
| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | Neutral | |
| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | Neutral | :) |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | Neutral | Summary of attachment: I do not object to intensification and infill in Brightwater township. 2 storeys is sufficient. |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | Neutral | I would agree only if it fits with the requirements of the local community. |
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | Neutral | |
| 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman | Neutral | |
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | Neutral | |
| 31347 Ms Paula Baldwin | Neutral | Yes its a small amount of intensification on the edges. |
| 31349 Laurien Heijs | Neutral | Need to be convinced there are sufficient employment opportunities to keep this from becoming a commuter town if further intensified. |
| 31355 Mr Barney Hoskins | Neutral | |
| 31356 Stephen Williams | Neutral | |
| 31358 George Harrison | Neutral | |
| 31365 michael monti | Neutral | |
| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | Neutral | |
| | | |

| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling | Neutral | It's central but there's need to prevent it becoming another commuter suburb |
|---------------------------------------|---------|---|
| 31423 Mr Roger Frost | Neutral | I am concerned that this will generate much more private vehicle use, even though it may be needed to support better public transport. |
| 31430 Muriel Moran | Neutral | I'm not in a position to comment as I'm not familiar with Brightwater but see earlier comments re satellit development |
| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn Ball | Neutral | |
| 31443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | Neutral | |
| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | Neutral | |
| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | Neutral | No comment |
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | Neutral | |
| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | Neutral | Only if the planning starts from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | Neutral | |
| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | Neutral | I believe this is something that only those who work and live in Brightwater can comment on. |
| 31480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | Neutral | |
| 31484 Mr Gavin Brent Cook | Neutral | |
| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | Neutral | |
| 31515 Geoffrey Vause | Neutral | Such intensification will need to be supported by increasing local employment opportunities otherwise the carbon footprint of brightwater will be significantly adversely impacted |
| 31523 Ms karen steadman | Neutral | |
| 31529 Mr Steven King-Turner | Neutral | |
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | Neutral | Some needed but I'm not sure how much. |

| 31551 Mrs Jo Kitchen | Neutral | |
|------------------------------|---------|---|
| 31558 Mr Steve Jordan | Neutral | |
| 31574 Mr David Bolton | Neutral | |
| 31579 Jane Tate | Neutral | |
| 31580 Jenny Long | Neutral | I only agree with intensification around the centres of satellite towns if convenient public transport and safe cycling infrastructure is made a priority. Otherwise we're just committing ourselves to increased commuter traffic. |
| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | Neutral | |
| 31588 pene Greet | Neutral | |
| 31604 Mr Peter Moot | Neutral | |
| 31606 Mr Trent Shepard | Neutral | |
| 31614 Mr mark Morris | Neutral | |
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | Neutral | Intensification in the village centre would create a more vibrant and diverse community |
| 31622 Peter Butler | Neutral | |
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | Neutral | Bit of a dormitory suburb. Sure - if there is local employment. |
| 31628 Mr Daniel Levy | Neutral | |
| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | Neutral | |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | Neutral | |
| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | Neutral | |
| 31644 Murray Poulter | Neutral | |
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | Neutral | I am not an expert and able to comment everything. Please listen to Joni Tomsett or Tim Neubauer. I think they represent my ideas. |
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | Neutral | |
| 31656 Mr brad malcolm | Neutral | |
| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | Neutral | |
| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | Neutral | |
| | | |

| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | Neutral | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31692 Mr Alasdair Gardiner | Neutral | |
| 31697 Robert King-Tenison | Neutral | |
| 31703 Ms Paula Holden | Neutral | |
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | Neutral | See attached submission. Summarised - generally supports T171 and T105 for light industry/industry. |
| 31726 Mr John Jackson | Neutral | |
| 31744 Mrs Lorna CRANE | Neutral | |
| 31752 Jill Pearson | Neutral | |
| 31765 Mrs Lorna Ivy Cooper | Neutral | |
| 31769 Ms Jo Gould | Neutral | |
| 31775 Dr Thomas Carl | Neutral | |
| 31777 Mr David Lucas | Neutral | |
| 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | Strongly agree | Agree T-104 intensification- however this will conflict with neighboring rural land. Suggest that there is further residential or rural residential expansion adjoining this site to prevent a conflict of |
| 31130 Trevor James | Strongly agree | |
| 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | Strongly agree | |
| 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | Strongly agree | Brightwater is already too far out, intensify closer suburbs first. |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | Strongly agree | To make public and active transport possible for work, school and shopping, intensification is the best option |
| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | Strongly agree | Same. |
| 31360 Ms Thuy Tran | Strongly agree | |
| 31405 Mr Doug Hattersley | Strongly agree | |
| | | |

| 31441 Mr Chris Head | Strongly agree | |
|----------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31491 Ms Annette Milligan | Strongly agree | |
| 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham | Strongly agree | See 14 |
| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | Strongly agree | |
| 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin | Strongly agree | |
| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | Strongly agree | |
| 31683 Richard Davies | Strongly agree | |
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | Strongly agree | |
| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | Strongly disagree | Must be kept to no higher than 2 storeys. We need row housing instead, and allowing for smaller houses in back sections. |
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | Strongly disagree | This will increase traffic to Nelson. |
| 31247 Mr yuri aristarco | Strongly disagree | other productive land destroyed and lost forever, where is the sustainability here? |
| 31279 Mr Jeremy Thompson | Strongly disagree | See answer 3 |
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | Strongly disagree | |
| 31410 Mr Scott Smithline | Strongly disagree | Feel some places should be protected from too much intensification |
| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors | Strongly disagree | Brightwater is a small village, its special character needs to be protected. |
| | | |

| 31452 Mr David Bartle | Strongly disagree | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31472 Dr David Briggs | Strongly disagree | See response to Q14. |
| 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | Strongly disagree | See full submission. Summarised below (similar to NT2050 submission): singluar focus on growth, challenges underlying growth projections, insufficient consultation, misleading submission form (outcome questions), community feedback ignored, biased process, non-compliance with government directives. Recommends re-think of the draft. |
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | Strongly disagree | No Brightwater should not be intensified except minor (2-3 story buildings) within existing central streets that are already developed with low level housing. There should be no more greenfield development there as the land is productive and this would create more traffic congestion and associated pollution. |
| 31673 Mike Drake | Strongly disagree | Where are the jobs in Brightwater? Any intensification here will just increase the commuter traffic. The main goals of the FDS is protect food growing land and reduce vehicle traffic. |
| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | Strongly disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population!!!! Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb! I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village centre. |
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | Strongly disagree | Growth should be restricted to areas that have already been identified for growth |
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | Strongly disagree | |
| 31763 Susan Rogers | Strongly disagree | Survey is flawed from the beginning. You need to redesign this entire line of questioning. It leads only to answers desired by the maker of the survey. |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Strongly disagree | Only if it is away from SH6 with limited access. Otherwise a bypass will be required for residents health and wellbeing. |
| | | |

| 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS | Agree | |
|---|-------|--|
| 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | Agree | |
| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | Agree | |
| | | 200.15 |
| 31240 Michael Markert | Agree | see 15 |
| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | Agree | |
| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | Agree | |
| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | Agree | Yes, but more infrastructure required. |
| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | Agree | |
| 31286 Mr David Short | Agree | |
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | Agree | Serious consideration should be given to improving the safety along the state highway which cuts through the centre of the township. |
| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | Agree | |
| 31309 Mr & Mrs Rose & Phillip Windle | Agree | |
| 31316 John Heslop | Agree | Yes high density is required now. |
| 31322 Mrs BARBARA AND TIM ROBSON | Agree | |
| 31360 Ms Thuy Tran | Agree | |
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | Agree | |
| 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer | Agree | |
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | Agree | |
| 31416 Tim Leyland | Agree | Yes, if jobs are available and concurrently retain character with historic buildings and leafy streets. |
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | Agree | needs to be faster! And come before Greenfield development which has hugely less negative impact on community environment |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | Agree | |

| 31435 Mr Alan Eggers | Agree | |
|---|-------|--|
| 31441 Mr Chris Head | Agree | I don't know if the proposed Pigeon Valley expansion fits with the Outcomes (it's a long way out of Wakefield and access to transport options into Richmond/Stoke/Nelson). |
| 31449 Mr John Chisholm | Agree | |
| 31452 Mr David Bartle | Agree | This would simply further expand Wakefield as a dormitory town and is inconsistent with core objectives to reduce carbon emissions |
| 31457 Mr J Santa Barbara | Agree | |
| 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon | Agree | |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | Agree | |
| 31488 Annette Starink | Agree | |
| 31492 Anton, Benni, Shalom, AJ Bank, Bonnin, Shalom Davis | Agree | |
| 31508 Mr Roger Barlow | Agree | |
| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | Agree | |
| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | Agree | Agree. NMH also supports the extension of public transport services to Wakfefield and the proposed improvements to the cycling network. |
| 31516 Mr Peter Lole | Agree | |
| 31529 Mr Steven King-Turner | Agree | But not Pigeon Valley South Branch as no infrastructure (water/sewer) roads are narrow and not suitable for large traffic volumes. The creek to the north side of south branch makes access to the land difficult. |
| 31533 Wendy Trevett | Agree | |
| 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery | Agree | |
| 31549 Mr Ian McComb | Agree | with consideration for improved public transport and employment, services |
| 31551 Mrs Jo Kitchen | Agree | I would like to see my property included in the proposal being surrounded at present by identified areas it makes sense to include this small parcel of land also. |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | Agree | With strengthened infrastructure |
| 31560 Ms Steph Watts | Agree | |
| | | |

| 31563 Mrs Loretta Anne Hogg | Agree | Yes build in Wakefield |
|-------------------------------|-------|--|
| 31574 Mr David Bolton | Agree | |
| 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz | Agree | |
| 31589 Mrs Renee Edwards | Agree | Agree with the proposal for Wakefield overall yes. It would be wonderful to see more opportunity for extra amenities/services in Wakefield as well - to create more jobs for those who prefer to spend time nearer to home (and less time travelling by car), but also to encourage visitors to enjoy the area (much like the experiences now provided at Mapua). This could be cafes/a boutique wine bar/boutique retail/fitness services/gym space/accommodations etc. Pigeon Valley would also be a great addition to the Great Taste Trail, the Totara trees up the valley are extremely scenic! Safe access to the village by a dedicated trail would be appreciated too - many already walk/bike up the valley, but often feels unsafe sharing the road with vehicles. |
| 31591 Mr Ben Edwards | Agree | Agree with the proposal for Wakefield, the village has huge potential to become more of a visitors destination as well, more homes and opportunity for business here will help this. |
| 31598 Mrs Nicola Worsfold | Agree | |
| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | Agree | |
| 31608 Robbie Thomson | Agree | |
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | Agree | Yes, if there is enough employment in Wakefield to cope with the increased numbers, the housing has affordable options, and the area is made attractive with leafy green spaces between buildings and walkways etc |
| 31617 Ms steph jewell | Agree | as 16 |
| 31620 Mr Paul Baigent | Agree | |
| 31622 Peter Butler | Agree | |
| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | Agree | |
| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | Agree | |
| 31636 Joanna Santa Barbara | Agree | |
| 31637 Ms Frances Kemble Welch | Agree | |
| 31647 Mrs Rebecca Parish | Agree | |
| | | |

| 31667 barbara nicholas | Agree | |
|---------------------------|-------|--|
| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | Agree | With the same priviso as noted above - the scale and type of growth is consistent with and enhances the communities in which it is being developed, and does not transform the look and feel of already vibrant communities. |
| 31688 Gerard McDonnell | Agree | |
| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | Agree | But only in the existing centre, not in greenfield sites. |
| 31697 Robert King-Tenison | Agree | |
| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | Agree | |
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | Agree | |
| 31704 Mr Paul Bucknall | Agree | |
| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | Agree | |
| 31735 Mrs Ashleigh Calder | Agree | Agree with the proposal for Wakefield overall yes. It would be wonderful to see more opportunity for extra amenities/services in Wakefield as well - to create more jobs for those who prefer to spend time nearer to home (and less time travelling by car), but also to encourage visitors to enjoy the area (much like the experiences now provided at Mapua). This could be cafes/a boutique wine bar/boutique retail/fitness services/gym space/accommodations etc. Pigeon Valley would also be a great addition to the Great Taste Trail, the Totara trees up the valley are extremely scenic! Safe access to the village by a dedicated trail would be appreciated too - many already walk/bike up the valley, but often feels unsafe sharing the road with vehicles. |
| 31738 Mrs Ngaire Calder | Agree | Agree with the proposal for Wakefield overall yes. It would be wonderful to see more opportunity for extra amenities/services in Wakefield as well - to create more jobs for those who prefer to spend time nearer to home (and less time travelling by car), but also to encourage visitors to enjoy the area (much like the experiences now provided at Mapua). This could be cafes/a boutique wine bar/boutique retail/fitness services/gym space/accommodations etc. Pigeon Valley would also be a great addition to the Great Taste Trail, the Totara trees up the valley are extremely scenic! Safe access to the village by a dedicated trail would be appreciated too - many already walk/bike up the valley, but often feels unsafe sharing the road with vehicles. |
| 31740 Mr Kevin Calder | Agree | Agree with the proposal for Wakefield overall yes. It would be wonderful to see more opportunity for extra amenities/services in Wakefield as well - to create more jobs for those who prefer to spend time nearer to home (and less time travelling by car), but also to encourage visitors to enjoy the area (much like the experiences now provided at Mapua). This |
| | | |

| | | could be cafes/a boutique wine bar/boutique retail/fitness services/gym space/accommodations etc. Pigeon Valley would also be a great addition to the Great Taste Trail, the Totara trees up the valley are extremely scenic! Safe access to the village by a dedicated trail would be appreciated too - many already walk/bike up the valley, but often feels unsafe sharing the road with vehicles. |
|---|----------------|--|
| 31741 Mr Robert Stevenson 31743 Mr Zak Lyttle | Agree Agree | Agree with the proposal for Wakefield overall yes. It would be wonderful to see more opportunity for extra amenities/services in Wakefield as well - to create more jobs for those who prefer to spend time nearer to home (and less time travelling by car), but also to encourage visitors to enjoy the area (much like the experiences now provided at Mapua). This could be cafes/a boutique wine bar/boutique retail/fitness services/gym space/accommodations etc. Pigeon Valley would also be a great addition to the Great Taste Trail, the Totara trees up the valley are extremely scenic! Safe access to the village by a dedicated trail would be appreciated too - many already walk/bike up the valley, but often feels unsafe sharing the road with vehicles. |
| 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | Agree | |
| 31758 Mr Brayden Calder | Agree | Agree with the proposal for Wakefield overall yes. It would be wonderful to see more opportunity for extra amenities/services in Wakefield as well - to create more jobs for those who prefer to spend time nearer to home (and less time travelling by car), but also to encourage visitors to enjoy the area (much like the experiences now provided at Mapua). This could be cafes/a boutique wine bar/boutique retail/fitness services/gym space/accommodations etc. Pigeon Valley would also be a great addition to the Great Taste Trail, the Totara trees up the valley are extremely scenic! Safe access to the village by a dedicated trail would be appreciated too - many already walk/bike up the valley, but often feels unsafe sharing the road with vehicles. |
| 31774 Mrs Jane Sutherland | Agree | |
| 31783 Mr Peter Jones | Agree | None |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Agree | Wakefield should be developed on the foothills away from SH6. Probably already should have a bypass. |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | Agree | Net Enduring Restorative Outcomes and carrying capacity apply. |
| 31835 Mr Ian Wishart | Agree | |
| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | Disagree | |
| 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | Disagree | Leave it small. |
| 31257 Mr Kent Inglis | Disagree | Distance from services and infrastructure |
| | | |

| 31261 Mr John Weston | Disagree | Need to protect what productive land remains. |
|------------------------------|----------|---|
| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | Disagree | Best left as is. |
| 31334 Diane Sutherland | Disagree | Doubt that there is enough employment in the area for this. |
| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | Disagree | No too much greenfield |
| 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | Disagree | Wakefield should stay rural, for the reasons outlined above. If people are living in apartments, there is all the more need for quiet green places to restore their souls. |
| 31346 Martin Hartman | Disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Wakefield to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village center. We need to look at providing space for eco-friendly TINY HOUSE developments so young couples can |
| 31356 Stephen Williams | Disagroo | afford to live here and own a home. |
| · | Disagree | |
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | Disagree | |
| 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann | Disagree | I do not think there are enough jobs there to rectify this. Wakefield should not just be a commuter town. |
| 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett | Disagree | Stay within built up areas. |
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle | Disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Wakefield to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village centre. |
| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling | Disagree | Again, there's not enough work in Wakefield |
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin | Disagree | Increasing the size of satellite centres is simply going to add to the commuter traffic. |
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | Disagree | This will be more of the same - suburbs full of commuters and their families driving to Richmond and Nelson for everything they need. |
| 31484 Mr Gavin Brent Cook | Disagree | |
| 31485 Ms Robin Schiff | Disagree | Only if the planning starts from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport |
| | | |

| | | -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
|-------------------------------|----------|--|
| 31487 Ms Heather Spence | Disagree | Would agree only if intensification means going up not out. |
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | Disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Wakefield to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village center. |
| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | Disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Wakefield to grow the population. There is a risk that Brightwater will turn into a commuter suburb I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village center. |
| 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | Disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Wakefield to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village center. |
| 31496 Mrs Petra Dekker | Disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Wakefield to grow the population. Otherwise, it only becomes a commuter suburb. |
| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless | Disagree | |
| 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | Disagree | |
| 31505 Cheryl Heten | Disagree | |
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | Disagree | I doubt that there is enough employment in Wakefield. it just creates commuting. |
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | Disagree | My comments are the same for Q19 |
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | Disagree | Wakefield is at the outer limit of what should be developed along the SH6 corridor. Its environment & village / rural character should be preserved as much as possible. |
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | Disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Wakefield to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village center. |
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | Disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Wakefield to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. |
| | | |

| | | I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village center. |
|------------------------------------|----------|--|
| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | Disagree | As above Wakefield does definitely not need to be 'intensified' it is rural and should remain so. Nowhere in this region does. Slow natural growth can be supported. Unnatural fast growth is unnecessary and should not be encouraged. In Wakefield low level expansion is acceptable to support local natural growth |
| 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | Disagree | I am concerned that it may become a commuter suburb adding more traffic and GHG |
| 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | Disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Wakefield to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which ca be achieved by intensification in and near the village centre. |
| 31593 Mr William Samuels | Disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Wakefield to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. |
| | | I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village center. |
| 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner | Disagree | As per Q18. |
| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | Disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Wakefield to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village center. |
| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | Disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Wakefield to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village center. |
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | Disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Wakefield to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb (and that does not become acceptable just because you put on a bus connection to Nelson). |
| | | I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village center. |
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | Disagree | Do we need to build more commuter suburbs?. If there was enough industry in the area to support |
| | | |

| | | increased housing, that would help.or different, smaller, more intense types of housing around the suburb centre, to make it more of a community. |
|--------------------------------|----------|--|
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | Disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Wakefield to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village centre. |
| 31643 Inge Koevoet | Disagree | |
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | Disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Wakefield to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village centre. |
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | Disagree | Disagree I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Wakefield to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village centre. |
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | Disagree | No for same reason as 18 |
| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | Disagree | Disagree I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Wakefield to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village centre. |
| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | Disagree | There will be less demand for intensification options in Brightwater and Wakefield. Better to over provide in Richmond and Nelson. |
| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | Disagree | This does not feel like intensification but a continuation of the Richmond sprawl. This is likely to increase the number of people commuting to Richmond. |
| 31710 Ms Angela Fitchett | Disagree | See 18 |
| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | Disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Brightwater to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village center. |
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | Disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Wakefield to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. |
| | | |

| | | I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village center. |
|--|---------------|--|
| 31763 Susan Rogers | Disagree | Survey is flawed from the beginning. You need to redesign this entire line of questioning. It leads only to answers desired by the maker of the survey. |
| 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | Disagree | |
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | Disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Wakefield to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which ca be achieved by intensification in and near the village centre. |
| 31775 Dr Thomas Carl | Disagree | |
| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | Disagree | See Q18 |
| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | Disagree | Please see attached - determined Disagree from submission: No for the same reasons as Brightwater given above. |
| 31801 Joan Skurr | Disagree | A survey carried out on housing needs showed that different types of housing are needed. These should be encouraged close to the centre of Wakefield and further employment opportunities to present commuting. |
| 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | Don't know | |
| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson | Don't know | |
| 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward | Don't know | |
| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | Don't know | |
| 31216 Ms Judith Holmes | Don't know | |
| 31219 Mrs kate windle | Don't know | |
| 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | Don't know | dont lose it's distinct character. |
| | | |

| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | Don't know | |
|------------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| 31285 Dr Hamish Holland | Don't know | |
| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | Don't know | |
| 31318 Mrs Isobel Mosley | Don't know | |
| 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | Don't know | |
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | Don't know | see comment above |
| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | Don't know | |
| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | Don't know | |
| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | Don't know | |
| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | Don't know | |
| 31406 Ms Floortje van Lierop | Don't know | See above |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas Hollyman | Don't know | |
| 31431 Katerina Seligman | Don't know | |
| 31434 Mrs cushla Moorhead | Don't know | |
| 31473 Mr Andrew Downs | Don't know | |
| | | |

| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | Don't know |
|----------------------------|---------------|
| 31483 Debbie Hampson | Don't know |
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | Don't know |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne | Don't know |
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers | Don't know |
| 31521 Mrs Marie Waterhouse | Don't know |
| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard | Don't know |
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | Don't know |
| 31572 Mr David Todd | Don't know |
| 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham | Don't know |
| 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart | Don't know |
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins | Don't know |
| 31606 Mr Trent Shepard | Don't know |
| 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | Don't know |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | Don't know |
| | |

| 31641 Mr Stephen (Steve) Hayder | Don't | |
|---------------------------------|---------------|--|
| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | Don't know | |
| 31693 Carolyn Rose | Don't know | |
| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | Don't know | |
| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | Don't know | Not answering any of these leading questions |
| 31736 Ms Carol Curtis | Don't know | |
| 31739 Philippa Hellyer | Don't know | |
| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | Don't know | |
| 31759 Mr Damian Campbell | Don't know | |
| 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | Don't know | |
| 31784 Ms Teresa James | Don't know | |
| 31185 Myfanway James | N/A | More intensification |
| 31237 Mr David Powdrell | N/A | - |
| 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | N/A | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Wakefield to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village center. |
| | | We need to look at providing space for eco-friendly TINY HOUSE developments so young couples can afford to live here and own a home. |
| | | |

| 31363 Mr Steve Cross | N/A | I reject the premise of this question |
|------------------------------|---------|--|
| 31364 Mrs Christine Tuffnell | N/A | Best commented on by local people of that area |
| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | N/A | As above with question 18. |
| 31623 Ms Lucy Charlesworth | N/A | I am wary of answering this question as I cannot be sure of how my answer will be interpreted. So I will state - I do not agree with developing green spaces. These spaces need to be reserved and protected to allow for sustainable biodiversity and for future generations. Intensification within Nelson CBD needs to be a priority. I do not agrees with building on Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. I do not agree with housing development on green fields. There is a climate emergency. Remove these areas from the FDS. |
| 31716 Mr Alan hart | N/A | Urban intensification should be accompanied by design guides and sensitivity to existing amenity (resticting too many multistory buildings) |
| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | Neutral | |
| 31114 Ms Jill Rogers | Neutral | |
| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | Neutral | |
| 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren | Neutral | |
| 31129 Mrs Gaynor Brooks | Neutral | |
| 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert | Neutral | |
| 31173 Mr Roderick Watson | Neutral | |
| 31174 Ms Alison Westerby | Neutral | |
| 31186 Mr Gary Scott | Neutral | |
| 31192 Ms Rebecca Patchett | Neutral | |
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | Neutral | |
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | Neutral | |
| 31227 Ms Lee Eliott | Neutral | |
| 31250 Mr Richard Wyles | Neutral | |
| 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan | Neutral | |
| 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman | Neutral | A radical change in the buildings and architecture of the centre of a township leads to the loss of a sens |

| | | of community. It can take decades to return to equilibrium. The older buildings in the centre of Wakefield need to be repaired to maintain the character of the township. Development around that centre is a good idea as long as it is in keeping with the character of the township. |
|---------------------------|---------|---|
| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley | Neutral | |
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | Neutral | As above |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | Neutral | |
| 31278 Wendy Ross | Neutral | as above |
| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | Neutral | |
| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | Neutral | |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | Neutral | Summary of attachment: I do not object to intensification in Wakefield. 2 storeys is sufficient. |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | Neutral | I would agree only if it fits with the requirements of the local community. |
| 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman | Neutral | |
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | Neutral | |
| 31347 Ms Paula Baldwin | Neutral | Yes its a small amount of intensification on the edges. |
| 31349 Laurien Heijs | Neutral | Need to be convinced there are sufficient employment opportunities to keep this from becoming a commuter town if further intensified. Any further development should also include commercial development, to create jobs for the community there. |
| 31355 Mr Barney Hoskins | Neutral | |
| 31358 George Harrison | Neutral | |
| 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | Neutral | |
| 31365 michael monti | Neutral | |
| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | Neutral | |
| 31403 Mr Richard Deck | Neutral | |
| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling | Neutral | It's central but there's need to prevent it becoming another commuter suburb |
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | Neutral | |
| 31423 Mr Roger Frost | Neutral | I am concerned that this will generate much more private vehicle use, even though it may be needed to |
| | | |

| | | support better public transport. |
|---------------------------------------|---------|---|
| 31430 Muriel Moran | Neutral | I'm not in a position to comment as I'm not familiar with Wakefield but see earlier comments re satellit development. |
| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn Ball | Neutral | |
| 31443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | Neutral | |
| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | Neutral | |
| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | Neutral | No comment |
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | Neutral | |
| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | Neutral | Only if the planning starts from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
| 31472 Dr David Briggs | Neutral | See response to Q14. |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | Neutral | |
| 31480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | Neutral | |
| 31481 Mrs Lucy Harrhy | Neutral | |
| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | Neutral | |
| 31515 Geoffrey Vause | Neutral | Same as for Brightwater |
| 31520 Andrew Stirling | Neutral | |
| 31523 Ms karen steadman | Neutral | |
| 31558 Mr Steve Jordan | Neutral | |
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | Neutral | Wakefield has a good portion of the protected trees. Any development there should be done AROUND the old beautiful trees. |
| | | |

| 31580 Jenny Long | Neutral | I only agree with intensification around the centres of satellite towns if convenient public transport and safe cycling infrastructure is made a priority. Otherwise we're just committing ourselves to increased commuter traffic. |
|------------------------------|---------|---|
| 31588 pene Greet | Neutral | |
| 31604 Mr Peter Moot | Neutral | |
| 31614 Mr mark Morris | Neutral | |
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | Neutral | Intensification in the village centre would create a more vibrant and diverse community |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | Neutral | Jobs and a clear hub need developing. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. |
| | | C/o-NT2050 There might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village center. |
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | Neutral | Appalling development put forward by Wayne that will not contribute to the town. Intensification not laz sprawl thanks. |
| 31628 Mr Daniel Levy | Neutral | |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | Neutral | |
| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | Neutral | |
| 31644 Murray Poulter | Neutral | |
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | Neutral | I am not an expert and able to comment everything. Please listen to Joni Tomsett or Tim Neubauer. I think they represent my ideas. |
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | Neutral | Waka Kotahi support intensification of existing urban areas that already have social and economic infrastructure in place, supporting moving away from a reliance on private vehicle transport. |
| 31656 Mr brad malcolm | Neutral | |
| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | Neutral | |
| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | Neutral | |
| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | Neutral | |
| 31692 Mr Alasdair Gardiner | Neutral | |

| 31703 Ms Paula Holden | Neutral | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|--|
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | Neutral | See attached submission. Summarised - no specific comments on this question, generally supports FDS |
| 31718 Kathryn & Keith Quigley | Neutral | |
| 31722 Trevor Chang | Neutral | |
| 31726 Mr John Jackson | Neutral | |
| 31744 Mrs Lorna CRANE | Neutral | |
| 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert- Watene | Neutral | |
| 31752 Jill Pearson | Neutral | |
| 31765 Mrs Lorna Ivy Cooper | Neutral | |
| 31769 Ms Jo Gould | Neutral | |
| 31771 Colleen Shaw | Neutral | |
| 31777 Mr David Lucas | Neutral | |
| 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | Strongly agree | |
| 31130 Trevor James | Strongly agree | |
| 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | Strongly agree | |
| 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | Strongly agree | |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | Strongly agree | To make public and active transport possible for work, school and shopping, intensification is the best option |
| 31284 Mr Jarmo Saloranta | Strongly agree | |
| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | Strongly agree | Same. |
| 31405 Mr Doug Hattersley | Strongly | |

| | agree | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31415 Mrs Zanahe Ruth Galloway | Strongly agree | this is where an increase of population is needed to make this town thrive and not increase the frustratio from traffic noise pollution in cities like Nelson and Richmond adverse to any pleasant biking option especially at the backward speed of 50km/hour! |
| 31491 Ms Annette Milligan | Strongly agree | |
| 31537 Mrs Juliana Trolove | Strongly agree | Wakefield is an area that is away from sea level rising. Is already a developed housing area and has amenities. It is a well-supported area which could happily increase in size without disturbing the greater agricultural areas. Up the valleys and expansion near the town is sensible and an easy option without losing potential agri land. There are services already and schools to support this increase in population. I strongly agree with this area for expansion. |
| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | Strongly agree | |
| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | Strongly agree | This is an area with great potential and land available but it needs good public transport connections to Richmond and Nelson |
| 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin | Strongly agree | |
| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | Strongly agree | |
| 31683 Richard Davies | Strongly agree | |
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | Strongly agree | |
| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | Strongly disagree | Must be kept to no higher than 2 storeys. We need row housing instead, and allowing for smaller houses in back sections. |
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | Strongly disagree | This will increase traffic to Nelson. |
| 31247 Mr yuri aristarco | Strongly disagree | other productive land destroyed and lost forever, where is the sustainability here? |
| 31279 Mr Jeremy Thompson | Strongly disagree | See answer 3 |
| | | |

| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | Strongly disagree | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31410 Mr Scott Smithline | Strongly disagree | See 18 |
| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors | Strongly disagree | Wakefield is a small village, its special character needs to be protected. |
| 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | Strongly disagree | See full submission. Summarised below (similar to NT2050 submission): singluar focus on growth, challenges underlying growth projections, insufficient consultation, misleading submission form (outcome questions), community feedback ignored, biased process, non-compliance with government directives. Recommends re-think of the draft. |
| 31554 Wendy Barker | Strongly disagree | Too much invasion of countryside |
| 31673 Mike Drake | Strongly disagree | See Q18. |
| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | Strongly disagree | I'm not sure if there is enough employment in Wakefield to grow the population. Otherwise it only becomes a commuter suburb. I think there might be a need for smaller housing options though, which can be achieved by intensification in and near the village centre. |
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | Strongly disagree | Growth should be restricted to areas that have already been identified for growth |
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | Strongly disagree | Ths encourages Wakefield to become a commuter suburb. Focus on the larger population in the larger centre. This model then builds on the value that this will bring to those towns. Leave the villages as villages, please avoid the precedent. |
| | | |

20 Do you agree with the level of intensification proposed in Motueka? (greenfield intensification and brownfield intensification) Any comments?

| 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | Agree | |
|---|-------|---|
| 31165 Mr Vincent Dickie | Agree | If it makes housing more affordable, yes. |
| 31186 Mr Gary Scott | Agree | |
| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | Agree | |
| 31192 Ms Rebecca Patchett | Agree | Motueka has the potential to be a vibrant town, more people and more businesses may revive Motueka and there may be less reason to travel to Richmond or Nelson. |
| 31240 Michael Markert | Agree | see 15, too much space for car parks wasted, concentrate car parking and make room for apartment blocks in Mot. |
| 31257 Mr Kent Inglis | Agree | Motueka has seen strong growth and this is likely to continue if capacity is provided in terms of rezoning to allow greenfield and brownfield intensification |
| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | Agree | |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | Agree | To make public and active transport possible for work, school and shopping, intensification is the best option. However, Motueka is surrounded by highly productive land and also has potential for flooding so any development will have to protect productivity and be resilient to hazards. |
| 31286 Mr David Short | Agree | |
| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | Agree | |
| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | Agree | Agree BUT I feel we should only be working on the brownfield land. The greenfield /green land / bare land should be protected and areas for restoration for planting , environmental protection and/or public green space |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | Agree | Please see attached - summarised below: No objection to the proposed developments. |
| 31309 Mr & Mrs Rose & Phillip Windle | Agree | |
| 31316 John Heslop | Agree | |
| 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | Agree | If kept off productive land |
| | | |

| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | Agree | Yes, infrastructure is already in place. |
|---|-------|---|
| 31360 Ms Thuy Tran | Agree | |
| 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer | Agree | |
| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | Agree | |
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | Agree | |
| 31403 Mr Richard Deck | Agree | Just need to remember that this area was a floodplain at one time. |
| 31415 Mrs Zanahe Ruth Galloway | Agree | this is where an increase of population is needed to make this town thrive and not increase the frustration from traffic noise pollution in cities like Nelson and Richmond adverse to any pleasant biking option especially at the excessive speed of 50km/hour! |
| 31416 Tim Leyland | Agree | Yes, if jobs are available and concurrently retain character with historic buildings and leafy streets. |
| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors | Agree | But it needs to be done very well, and with minimal urban sprawl |
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | Agree | needs to be faster! And come before Greenfield development which has hugely less negative impact on community environment |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | Agree | $In tensification \ Yes \ to \ brown field \ development, \ no \ further \ green field \ in tensification \ on \ productive \ soils \ .$ |
| 31434 Mrs cushla Moorhead | Agree | Some intensification in the centre of Motueka but not expansion to Greenfield areas. |
| 31435 Mr Alan Eggers | Agree | |
| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn Ball | Agree | |
| 31441 Mr Chris Head | Agree | |
| 31449 Mr John Chisholm | Agree | |
| 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon | Agree | |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | Agree | But no greenfield area intensification, only brownfield. |
| 31488 Annette Starink | Agree | |
| 31492 Anton, Benni, Shalom, AJ Bank, Bonnin, Shalom Davis | Agree | NOTE: We agree with the proposed level of intensification with brownfield but not greenfield |
| 31516 Mr Peter Lole | Agree | Absolute minimum of greenfield development though. |

| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | Agree | Brownfield Yes & I think some greenfield could occur with radical planning for the future that involves a bypass & new bridge. |
|-----------------------------|-------|---|
| 31533 Wendy Trevett | Agree | |
| 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery | Agree | |
| 31549 Mr Ian McComb | Agree | Climate change is an obvious risk as are existing water supply issues. |
| 31554 Wendy Barker | Agree | Some |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | Agree | Brownfield not Greenfield development. so many of the Motueka community are employed in the agricultural land surrounding the town |
| 31563 Mrs Loretta Anne Hogg | Agree | Yes build in Motueka - But - Do not remove all the productive land. |
| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | Agree | Brownfield only |
| 31598 Mrs Nicola Worsfold | Agree | |
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | Agree | Yes, if the housing has affordable options, and the area is made attractive with leafy green spaces between buildings and walkways etc. However Motueka is low lying so I am not sure about the risks of sea level rise. |
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | Agree | Motueka needs more housing. |
| 31622 Peter Butler | Agree | |
| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | Agree | |
| 31647 Mrs Rebecca Parish | Agree | |
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | Agree | Waka Kotahi support intensification of existing urban areas that already have social and economic infrastructure in place, supporting moving away from a reliance on private vehicle transport. A town of this size is less likely to mean people commute long distances for employment e.g. Richmond and Nelson. |
| 31667 barbara nicholas | Agree | |
| 31683 Richard Davies | Agree | Not greenfield intensification. Productive fertile land must be protected from building. |
| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | Agree | With the same priviso as noted above - the scale and type of growth is consistent with and enhances the communities in which it is being developed, and does not transform the look and feel of already vibrant |
| | | communities. |
| 31688 Gerard McDonnell | Agree | Brownfield intensification should be prioritised |

| 31704 Mr Paul Bucknall | Agree | |
|-------------------------------|----------|---|
| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | Agree | Agree with brownfield intensification. Disagree with greenfield intensification. |
| 31718 Kathryn & Keith Quigley | Agree | |
| 31741 Mr Robert Stevenson | Agree | |
| 31759 Mr Damian Campbell | Agree | |
| 31774 Mrs Jane Sutherland | Agree | |
| 31783 Mr Peter Jones | Agree | Yes Motueka needs this. |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Agree | Motueka could be expanded but road to Nelson would need four laning the whole way. Not enough population for public transport. |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | Agree | No greenfields. Net Enduring Restorative Outcomes and carrying capacity apply. |
| 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | Disagree | Motueka is to far out from Nelson - any growth will create more traffic and more GHGs and environmental impacts. That is counter to NCC's objectives. |
| 31114 Ms Jill Rogers | Disagree | Again there are two questions here - 1. Greenfield intensification - do not agree - see comments on growing food locally and the need for water for that - 2. Brownfield " - yes agree - much needed infill with apartments and mixed housing. |
| 31130 Trevor James | Disagree | |
| 31227 Ms Lee Eliott | Disagree | |
| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | Disagree | I think Motueka needs more radical thought. It is a question of what can be done in the face of sea level change. Is there going to be protection or retreat? Where could Motueka grow but still retain a sense of compact rural community. |
| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | Disagree | |
| 31318 Mrs Isobel Mosley | Disagree | Not clear what you mean by intensification vs greenfield in relation to Motueka, however, there needs to be more land immediately around Motueka freed up for housing development. See below |
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | Disagree | Probably I disagree, as I want more intensification than you will provide, including terraced housing, multi- story housing and then communal parks and allotments. |
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | Disagree | |
| | | |

| 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | Disagree | The only intensifying that should happen in greenfields is horticultural intensification. More beetroot! More broccoli! |
|-----------------------------|----------|---|
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | Disagree | |
| 31443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | Disagree | Intensification should be within existing urban boundaries |
| 31481 Mrs Lucy Harrhy | Disagree | |
| 31485 Ms Robin Schiff | Disagree | Only if the planning starts from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
| 31491 Ms Annette Milligan | Disagree | Again - I am very. very wary of further greenfields developments which inevitably have a destructive environmental effect and result in an increase in the factors which increase the rate of climate change. We have a climate emergency - I literally don't know what else to say which brings new light to this most critical issue |
| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless | Disagree | |
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers | Disagree | issue with the ground need to be considered |
| 31560 Ms Steph Watts | Disagree | |
| 31579 Jane Tate | Disagree | I do not agree with greenfield intensification. If this land is high quality (or even medium quality), it should be left for food production. |
| 31580 Jenny Long | Disagree | I strongly disagree with greenfield development. I only agree with brownfield intensification if convenient public transport and safe cycling infrastructure i made a priority. Otherwise we're just committing ourselves to increased commuter traffic. |
| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | Disagree | As above Motueka does definitely not need to be 'intensified' it is semi-rural and should remain so. Nowhere in this region does. Slow natural growth can be supported. In a way maybe more so than Wakefield or Brightwater, Motueka can grow because people who want to live there want to live in a town. Unnatural fast growth is unnecessary and should not be encouraged. Low level expansion is acceptable to support local natural growth |
| 31588 pene Greet | Disagree | |
| 31606 Mr Trent Shepard | Disagree | If it's just pasture being built on, that's not a problem for me. Removal of orchards and cropland to build |
| | | |

| | | homes does bother me. |
|-----------------------------|---------------|--|
| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | Disagree | This is largely a flood prone area. |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | Disagree | |
| 31644 Murray Poulter | Disagree | |
| 31656 Mr brad malcolm | Disagree | |
| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | Disagree | I don't agree with greenfield intensification, unless it is close to the centre and used to support the relocation of residential and commercial buildings that are in danger from rising sea level and storm waters. Motueka has a lot of employment needs and needs good quality homes to support that. |
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | Disagree | Depends on if high-value farm ground or not. Braeburn area proposal seems discongruous with Planning concept of intensifying around established towns. |
| 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | Disagree | |
| 31771 Colleen Shaw | Disagree | |
| 31775 Dr Thomas Carl | Disagree | |
| 31777 Mr David Lucas | Disagree | |
| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | Disagree | Please see attached: - determined disagree from submission: A: No we disagree with the rural residential Greenfield's development - this is not intensification as most commonly known, it will result in more car dependency, more traffic congestion and more climate change emissions. The intensification should be within the existing urban boundaries. |
| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | Don't know | |
| 31219 Mrs kate windle | Don't know | |
| 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | Don't know | |
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | Don't know | |
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | Don't know | |

| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | Don't | |
|------------------------------|-------|---|
| | know | |
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31355 Mr Barney Hoskins | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31406 Ms Floortje van Lierop | Don't | See above |
| | know | |
| 31410 Mr Scott Smithline | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas | Don't | |
| Hollyman | know | |
| 31430 Muriel Moran | Don't | I have seen subdivision and intensification within Motueka that has been successful and encourage those |
| | know | opportunities. |
| | | Sea level rise is a future problem if we go above 1.5 degrees warming. |
| | | I have expressed my opinion on using productive green fields. I don't know what brown fields are. |
| | | Travelling on the road to Nelson early (7am) in the morning encounters a stream of traffic both ways. |
| | | Many contractors coming towards me and trucks in both direction and cars, presumably workers in both directions. Motueka is also a satellite town to Nelson and Richmond. |
| | | Having sufficient work opportunities in Motueka needs considering in relation to future growth. |
| | | Traving sufficient work opportunities in Motacka needs considering in relation to rature growth. |
| 31431 Katerina Seligman | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31452 Mr David Bartle | Don't | |
| ST.SE WII BUVIU BUILLE | know | |
| 31473 Mr Andrew Downs | Don't | |
| 51475 WII Allulew Dowlls | Don't | |

| | know |
|---------------------------------|---|
| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | Don't |
| | know |
| 31483 Debbie Hampson | Don't |
| | know |
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | Don't |
| | know |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne | Don't |
| | know |
| 31508 Mr Roger Barlow | Don't |
| | know |
| 31521 Mrs Marie Waterhouse | Don't |
| | know |
| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard | Don't |
| | know |
| | Don't |
| | know |
| 31572 Mr David Todd | Don't |
| | know |
| | Don't |
| | know |
| | Don't I believe there are more opportunities for mixed housing developments in Motueka which would be |
| | know beneficial to people wanting to walk or cycle to work within Motueka |
| | Don't |
| | know |
| | Don't |
| | know |
| 31641 Mr Stephen (Steve) Hayden | |
| | know |
| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | Don't |

| | know | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|---|
| 31693 Carolyn Rose | Don't know | |
| 31697 Robert King-Tenison | Don't know | |
| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | Don't know | Not answering any of these leading questions |
| 31736 Ms Carol Curtis | Don't know | |
| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | Don't know | |
| 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | Don't know | |
| 31784 Ms Teresa James | Don't know | |
| 31185 Myfanway James | N/A | Limit greenfields development unless it is intensive. |
| 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman | N/A | The recent development of areas that are barely above sea level - like the library are a folly. There should be managed retreat from much of Motueka. Sooner rather than later, as scientists are warning that sealevel change is accelerating. |
| 31322 Mrs BARBARA AND TIM ROBSON | N/A | Agree with brownfield but not greenfield intensification |
| 31363 Mr Steve Cross | N/A | I reject the premise of this question |
| 31364 Mrs Christine Tuffnell | N/A | Best commented on by local people of that area |
| 31384 Mr Jace Hobbs | N/A | Motueke will be under water from storm driven high tides in the period of this plan, yet you ignore the ipcc guidance on this for a rosey BAU plan. |
| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | N/A | As with the last couple of questions. |
| 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett | N/A | Motueka has a housing shortage and is an employment centre. There should be more intensification here. The greenfield land of Motueka-South should be used much more efficiently to provide an alternative to areas of the town that may flood in the future. Any development here needs to be really well connected |
| | | |

| | | to the existing town centre. It needs some serious planning before developers should be allowed to blitz this area (in the traditional way). I think TDC needs to be more proactive in the development of this area with the community and creative thinkers and not leave it entirely to private developers. |
|----------------------------|---------|---|
| 31623 Ms Lucy Charlesworth | N/A | I am wary of answering these questions as I cannot be sure of how they will be interpreted. So I will state I do not agree with developing green spaces. These spaces need to be reserved and protected to allow for sustainable biodiversity and for future generations. Intensification within Nelson CBD needs to be a priority. I do not agrees with building on Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. I do not agree with housing development on green fields. There is a climate emergency. Remove these areas from the FDS. |
| 31673 Mike Drake | N/A | Only intensification by going up, not out. Again, we need to protect our soil, not cover it with concrete and tarmac. |
| 31716 Mr Alan hart | N/A | Motueka is susceptible to sea level rise so a precautionary approach should be taken to expansion rather than intensification. Urban intensification should be accompanied by design guides and sensitivity to existing amenity (resticting too many multistory buildings) |
| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | Neutral | |
| 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS | Neutral | STRONGLY AFGREE BROWNFIELD INTENSIFICATION BUT STRONGLY DISAGREE GREENFIELD INTENSIFICATION. |
| 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren | Neutral | |
| 31129 Mrs Gaynor Brooks | Neutral | |
| 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward | Neutral | What Motueka needs most is a bypass around the town centre. |
| 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert | Neutral | |
| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | Neutral | |
| 31173 Mr Roderick Watson | Neutral | |
| 31174 Ms Alison Westerby | Neutral | |
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | Neutral | |
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | Neutral | |
| 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | Neutral | Mot is already pretty crowded. It you went up a couple of stories rather than out, that would probably be OK. |
| 31250 Mr Richard Wyles | Neutral | |
| | | |

| 31252 Mr Trevor Howie | Neutral | |
|----------------------------|---------|--|
| 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan | Neutral | Cultural, flood risk and very productive land means there's not many options and infrastructure would be costly |
| 31261 Mr John Weston | Neutral | Only if absolutely necessary. Protection of greenfield is paramount + sea level rise protection. |
| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | Neutral | |
| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley | Neutral | |
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | Neutral | As above |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | Neutral | |
| 31278 Wendy Ross | Neutral | as above |
| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | Neutral | |
| 31284 Mr Jarmo Saloranta | Neutral | |
| 31285 Dr Hamish Holland | Neutral | |
| 31334 Diane Sutherland | Neutral | Motueka has a housing shortage and is an employment centre. There should be more intensification here. But it does need some serious planning where TDC is more more proactive in the development of this area with the community and creative thinkers NOT leaving it to private developers. |
| 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman | Neutral | |
| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | Neutral | |
| 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | Neutral | More intensification and good creative planning is needed. Also, we need to look at providing space for eco-friendly TINY HOUSE developments so young couples can afford to live here and own a home. |
| 31346 Martin Hartman | Neutral | More intensification and good creative planning is needed. Also, we need to look at providing space for eco-friendly TINY HOUSE developments so young couples can afford to live here and own a home. |
| 31349 Laurien Heijs | Neutral | Endorse NelsonTasman2050 submission. |
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | Neutral | |

| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | Neutral | Motueka has lots of low use land very close to the centre behind the main street. It doesn't need any green field expansion, it can also go UP. Quite a lot of Motueka is threatened by the sea, over decades, as is Takaka and Mapua. It would be wise for TDC to consider starting alternative commercial hubs that are higher, but this is not always possible. Whitianga is in serious trouble with this problem, and some of TDC's towns will also be before long. |
|------------------------------|---------|---|
| 31356 Stephen Williams | Neutral | |
| 31358 George Harrison | Neutral | |
| 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | Neutral | |
| 31365 michael monti | Neutral | |
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | Neutral | |
| 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann | Neutral | There is more intensification needed. However, this should be done properly. |
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle | Neutral | Motueka has a housing shortage and is an employment centre. There should be more intensification here. The greenfield land of Motueka-South should be used much more efficiently to provide an alternative to areas of the town that may flood in the future. Any development here needs to be really well connected to the existing town centre via cycle and walkways. It needs some serious planning before developers should be allowed to blitz this area (in the traditional way). I think TDC needs to be more proactive in the development of this area with the community and creative thinkers and not leave it entirely to private developers. |
| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling | Neutral | Greenfield sites should not be considered with out a cost-benefit analysis due to the highly vulnerable nature of Motueka ato sea level rise |
| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling | Neutral | Motueka has a small home shortage and a medium sized home shortage. But people need to be avle to easily get into town. Also, Motueka is very low lying and will be vulnerable to sea level rise. |
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin | Neutral | Motueka is large enough to become something more than a satellite centre, so development will be required here. However, again, please do not simply leave it to developers to control. They are not experts in urban planning or in innovative architecture. Local government could take the lead to help encourage excellence in design. |
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | Neutral | |
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | Neutral | Motueka needs more housing but intensify it in and around the town centre. |
| 31423 Mr Roger Frost | Neutral | |
| | | |

| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | Neutral | No comment |
|------------------------------|---------|---|
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | Neutral | |
| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | Neutral | Only if the planning starts from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
| 31472 Dr David Briggs | Neutral | See response to Q14. Motueka is becoming an increasingly badly designed urban sprawl. None of the outlying areas have local facilities, and all traffic is channeled along the main street. Accessible green space is all but non-existent. If Motueka is to grow, it requires some proper planning to design a much less centralised town - i.e. it needs hubs and spokes and a much more integrated transport network. |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | Neutral | No intensification of greenfield areas. |
| 31480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | Neutral | |
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | Neutral | Motueka has a housing shortage and is an employment centre. There should be more intensification here. The greenfield land of Motueka-South should be used much more efficiently to provide an alternative to areas of the town that may flood in the future. Any development here needs to be really well connected to the existing town centre. It needs some serious planning before developers should be allowed to blitz this area (in the traditional way). I think TDC needs to be more proactive in the development of this area with the community and creative thinkers and not leave it entirely to private developers. |
| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | Neutral | I agree with intensification in the Motueka South area but would like to see more detail on the design. |
| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | Neutral | Motueka has a housing shortage and is an employment centre. There should be more intensification here. Greenfield land of Motueka South should be used much more efficiently. |
| 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | Neutral | Motueka has a housing shortage and is an employment centre. There should be more intensification here. The greenfield land of Motueka-South should be used much more efficiently to provide an alternative to areas of the town that may flood in the future. Any development here needs to be really well connected to the existing town centre. It needs some serious planning before developers should be allowed to blitz this area (in the traditional way). I think TDC needs to be more proactive in the development of this area with the community and creative thinkers and not leave it entirely to private developers. |

| 31496 Mrs Petra Dekker | Neutral | Motueka has a housing shortage and is an employment centre. There should be more 'smarter' intensification here. |
|--------------------------------|---------|---|
| 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | Neutral | |
| 31505 Cheryl Heten | Neutral | |
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | Neutral | Motueka needs more allround year jobs. There are a lot of unnecessary double driveways and parking lots. The center needs to be restructured. Another bridge and another road needs to take pressure of High Street. |
| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | Neutral | Agree with brownfield intensification, but disagree with greenfield intensification. |
| 31520 Andrew Stirling | Neutral | |
| 31523 Ms karen steadman | Neutral | |
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | Neutral | Motueka has a housing shortage and is an employment centre. There should be more intensification here The greenfield land of Motueka-South should be used much more efficiently to provide an alternative to areas of the town that may flood in the future. Any development here needs to be really well connected to the existing town centre. It needs some serious planning before developers should be allowed to blitz this area (in the traditional way). TDC needs to be more proactive in the development of this area with the community and creative thinkers. It should not be left entirely to private developers. |
| 31529 Mr Steven King-Turner | Neutral | |
| 31551 Mrs Jo Kitchen | Neutral | |
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | Neutral | So long as the intensification keeps the town centre accessible and walkable. Let's make sure we don't dump the ugly buildings in Motueka - it's a beautiful place with a delightfully rich community and strong Maori culture. |
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | Neutral | Concern at greenfield usage at expense of FOOD production. Needs consideration / comments from those close to those industries |
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | Neutral | Motueka has a housing shortage and is an employment centre. There should be more intensification here The greenfield land of Motueka-South should be used much more efficiently to provide an alternative to areas of the town that may flood in the future. Any development here needs to be really well connected to the existing town centre. I think TDC needs to be more proactive in the development of this area with the community and creative thinkers and not leave it entirely to private developers. |
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | Neutral | Motueka has a housing shortage and is an employment centre. There should be more intensification here. |

| | | The greenfield land of Motueka-South should be used much more efficiently to provide an alternative to areas of the town that may flood in the future. Any development here needs to be really well connected to the existing town centre. It needs some serious planning before developers should be allowed to blitz this area (in the traditional way). I think TDC needs to be more proactive in the development of this area with the community and creative thinkers and not leave it entirely to private developers. |
|------------------------------------|---------|--|
| 31574 Mr David Bolton | Neutral | |
| 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz | Neutral | |
| 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | Neutral | Motueka has a housing shortage and is an employment centre. There should be more intensification here The greenfield land of Motueka-South should be used much more efficiently to provide an alternative to areas of the town that may flood in the future. Any development here needs to be really well connected to the existing town centre. I think TDC needs to be more proactive in the development of this area with the community and creative thinkers and not leave it entirely to private developers. |
| 31593 Mr William Samuels | Neutral | Motueka has a housing shortage and is an employment centre. There should be more intensification here. The greenfield land of Motueka-South should be used much more efficiently to provide an alternative to areas of the town that may flood in the future. Any development here needs to be really well connected to the existing town centre. It needs some serious planning before developers should be allowed to blitz this area (in the traditional way). I think TDC needs to be more proactive in the development of this area with the community and creative thinkers and not leave it entirely to private developers. |
| 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner | Neutral | There should be more intensification here + serious planning before developers should be allowed to blitz this area (in the traditional way). I think TDC needs to be more proactive in the development of this area with the community and creative thinkers and not leave it entirely to private developers. |
| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | Neutral | Motueka has a housing shortage and is an employment centre. There should be more intensification here The greenfield land of Motueka-South should be used much more efficiently to provide an alternative to areas of the town that may flood in the future. Any development here needs to be really well connected to the existing town centre. It needs some serious planning before developers should be allowed to blitz this area (in the traditional way). I think TDC needs to be more proactive in the development of this area with the community and creative thinkers and not leave it entirely to private developers. |
| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | Neutral | |
| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | Neutral | Motueka has a housing shortage and is an employment centre. There should be |
| | | |

| | | more intensification here. The greenfield land of Motueka-South should be used much more efficiently to provide an alternative to areas of the town that may flood in the future. Any development here needs to be really well connected to the existing town centre. It needs some serious planning before developers should be allowed to blitz this area (in the traditional way). I think TDC needs to be more proactive in the development of this area with the community and creative thinkers and not leave it entirely to private developers. |
|------------------------------|---------|--|
| 31604 Mr Peter Moot | Neutral | |
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | Neutral | Motueka has a housing shortage and is an employment centre. There should be more intensification here. The greenfield land of Motueka-South should be used much more efficiently to provide an alternative to areas of the town that may flood in the future. Any development here needs to be really well connected to the existing town centre. It needs some serious planning before developers should be allowed to do their usual damage. I think TDC needs to be more proactive (and maybe prescriptive?) in the development of this area with the community and creative thinkers and not leave it entirely to private developers. |
| 31608 Robbie Thomson | Neutral | |
| 31614 Mr mark Morris | Neutral | |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | Neutral | Motueka has a housing shortage and is an employment centre. There should be more intensification here The greenfield land of Motueka-South should be used much more efficiently to provide an alternative to areas of the town that may flood in the future. Any development here needs to be really well connected to the existing town centre. I think TDC needs to be more proactive in the development of this area with the community and creative thinkers and not leave it entirely to private developers. |
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | Neutral | Well planned developments including affordable housing and town centre intensification as well as managing flood risks aree important |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | Neutral | C/o- NT2050 Motueka has a housing shortage and is an employment centre. There should be more intensification here. The greenfield land of Motueka-South should be used much more efficiently to provide an alternative to areas of the town that may flood in the future. Any development here needs to be really well connected to the existing town centre. It needs some serious planning before developers should be allowed to blitz this |

| | | area (in the traditional way). I think TDC needs to be more proactive in the development of this area with the community and creative thinkers and not leave it entirely to private developers. |
|--------------------------------|---------|--|
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | Neutral | Floodprone - intensify, but with relocatable buildings. Recognised housing issues need addressing. |
| 31628 Mr Daniel Levy | Neutral | |
| 31636 Joanna Santa Barbara | Neutral | Any building should only be in areas 1.5m above sea level, so they are not flooded in the next 100 years. Agree with brownfield intensification. Disagree with greenfield intensification. |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | Neutral | |
| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | Neutral | |
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | Neutral | I am not an expert and able to comment everything. Please listen to Joni Tomsett or Tim Neubauer. I think they represent my ideas. |
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | Neutral | Motueka has a housing shortage and is an employment centre. There should be more intensification here The greenfield land of Motueka-South should be used much more efficiently to provide an alternative to areas of the town that may flood in the future. Any development here needs to be really well connected to the existing town centre. I think TDC needs to be more proactive in the development of this area with the community and creative thinkers and not leave it entirely to private developers. |
| 31651 Dr Patrick Conway | Neutral | |
| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | Neutral | |
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | Neutral | Neutral Motueka has a housing shortage and is an employment centre. There should be more intensification here The greenfield land of Motueka-South should be used much more efficiently to provide an alternative to areas of the town that may flood in the future. Any development here needs to be really well connected to the existing town centre. I think TDC needs to be more proactive in the development of this area with the community and creative thinkers and not leave it entirely to private developers. |
| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | Neutral | Neutral Motueka has a housing shortage and is an employment centre. There should be more intensification here The greenfield land of Motueka-South should be used much more efficiently to provide an alternative to areas of the town that may flood in the future. Any development here needs to be really well connected to the existing town centre. I think TDC needs to be more proactive in the development of this area with the community and creative thinkers and not leave it entirely to private developers. |

| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | Neutral | |
|----------------------------|---------|---|
| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | Neutral | Motueka has a housing shortage and is an employment centre. There should be more intensification here The greenfield land of Motueka-South should be used much more efficiently to provide an alternative to areas of the town that may flood in the future. Any development here needs to be really well connected to the existing town centre. I think TDC needs to be more proactive in the development of this area with the community and creative thinkers and not leave it entirely to private developers. |
| 31681 Seev Oren | Neutral | Agree with Tasman village being a Greenfield for Motueka |
| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | Neutral | |
| 31692 Mr Alasdair Gardiner | Neutral | |
| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | Neutral | It makes sense to intensify the town centre. |
| 31703 Ms Paula Holden | Neutral | |
| 31709 Ofer Ronen | Neutral | Agree for Tasman village being a greenfield for Motueka. |
| 31710 Ms Angela Fitchett | Neutral | Concentrate on and prioritise intensification. Private developers will tend to take the easy route to profit and, if allowed, eat up productive land. |
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | Neutral | See attached submission. Summarised - no specific comments on this question, generally supports FDS. |
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | Neutral | |
| 31722 Trevor Chang | Neutral | |
| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | Neutral | Motueka has a housing shortage and is an employment centre. There should be more intensification here. The greenfield land of Motueka-South should be used much more efficiently to provide an alternative to areas of the town that may flood in the future. Any development here needs to be really well connected to the existing town centre. It needs some serious planning before developers should be allowed to blitz this area (in the traditional way). I think TDC needs to be more proactive in the development of this area with the community and creative thinkers and not leave it entirely to private developers. |
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | Neutral | Motueka has a housing shortage and is an employment centre. There should be more intensification here. The greenfield land of Motueka-South should be used much more efficiently to |

| | | provide an alternative to areas of the town that may flood in the future. Any development here needs to be really well connected to the existing town centre. It needs some serious planning before developers should be allowed to blitz this area (in the traditional way). I think TDC needs to be more proactive in the development of this area with the community and creative thinkers and not leave it entirely to private developers. |
|--|----------------|---|
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | Neutral | There needs more provision of a variety of housing. Any greenfield development should be a mix of housing types and sizes, and carefully located to avoid flooding. |
| 31744 Mrs Lorna CRANE | Neutral | |
| 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert- Watene | Neutral | |
| 31752 Jill Pearson | Neutral | |
| 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | Neutral | |
| 31762 Mr Mark Hewetson | Neutral | |
| 31765 Mrs Lorna Ivy Cooper | Neutral | |
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | Neutral | Motueka has a housing shortage and is an employment centre. There should be more intensification here The greenfield land of Motueka-South should be used much more efficiently tprovide an alternative to areas of the town that may flood in the future. Any development here needs to be really well connected to the existing town centre. It needs some serious planning before developers should be allowed to blitz this area (in the traditional way). I think TDC needs to be more proactive in the development of this area with the community and creative thinkers and not leave it entirely to private developers. |
| 31769 Ms Jo Gould | Neutral | |
| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | Neutral | Motueka needs more intensification connected to town centre. TDC should work with community and not leave it to private developers. |
| 31787 Lilac Meir | Neutral | Agree to the level of intensification being Tasman Village as part of greenfield for Motueka. |
| 31801 Joan Skurr | Neutral | Intensifying should fit into an overall plan prepared by planners and based on meeting the needs of the population. |
| 31835 Mr Ian Wishart | Neutral | Motueka too close to sea level to allow much growth at all. |
| 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | Strongly agree | |

| 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | Strongly agree | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | Strongly agree | |
| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | Strongly agree | It's got a charm but it needs more scale |
| 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett | Strongly agree | Stay within built up areas. |
| 31405 Mr Doug Hattersley | Strongly agree | |
| 31457 Mr J Santa Barbara | Strongly agree | T-017 is well suited for rural residential (or more intensive) development. |
| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | Strongly agree | We wish to have a area on our existing owned farm 14 Waiwhero Road. Valuation Roll Number 19280-19506 |
| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | Strongly agree | Strongly Agree. NMH agrees with the approach taken given the technical difficulty with greenfield expansion in terms of coastal inundation, flood risk and the proximity to highly productive land. In terms of intensification, consideration also needs to be given to improving the stormwater network so surface flooding risks are minimised. NMH supports the extension of public transport services to Motueka and the proposed improvements to the cycling network. |
| 31515 Geoffrey Vause | Strongly agree | More intensification is needed in Motueka particularly given that is a town with significant employment opportunity. Greenfield development south of Motueka will probably be needed given the flood hazard in much of Motueka. This will require a significant input from TDC planners to assure appropriate safety of developer activity. High quality urban planning will be essential. |
| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | Strongly agree | |
| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | Strongly agree | |
| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | Strongly disagree | As mentioned above, I strongly oppose the development of the block of land T136 set out in the draft FDS Significant upgrades will be required to both roading and services to develop this property. There are absolutely no services, no water, no sewerage in that block. It will be an incredibly expensive undertaking |
| | | |

| Strongly disagree Strongly disagree Strongly disagree Strongly disagree Strongly disagree | and I believe there are better options available to the council. As the FDS states, this block is not required to meet the needs of housing requirements for the region and it will exceed the council's requirements. There is no public transport in the area and the development of this site will increase GHG emissions. Same argument Motueka's greenfield areas must be preserved. The roading use plus high street pressure already appears to be rising quickly. People want to live in small towns which are inherently DIFFERENT from large towns and cities. Expanding small towns destroys their true nature. Must be kept to no higher than 2 storeys. We need row housing instead, and allowing for smaller houses in back sections. And NO development in greenfield or brownfield areas, or lowOlying areas. other productive land destroyed and lost forever, where is the sustainability here? |
|--|--|
| disagree Strongly disagree Strongly disagree Strongly disagree Strongly | Motueka's greenfield areas must be preserved. The roading use plus high street pressure already appears to be rising quickly. People want to live in small towns which are inherently DIFFERENT from large towns and cities. Expanding small towns destroys their true nature. Must be kept to no higher than 2 storeys. We need row housing instead, and allowing for smaller houses in back sections. And NO development in greenfield or brownfield areas, or lowOlying areas. |
| disagree Strongly disagree Strongly disagree Strongly | to be rising quickly. People want to live in small towns which are inherently DIFFERENT from large towns and cities. Expanding small towns destroys their true nature. Must be kept to no higher than 2 storeys. We need row housing instead, and allowing for smaller houses in back sections. And NO development in greenfield or brownfield areas, or lowOlying areas. |
| disagree Strongly disagree Strongly | small towns destroys their true nature. Must be kept to no higher than 2 storeys. We need row housing instead, and allowing for smaller houses in back sections. And NO development in greenfield or brownfield areas, or lowOlying areas. |
| disagree Strongly | in back sections. And NO development in greenfield or brownfield areas, or lowOlying areas. |
| • . | other productive land destroyed and lost forever, where is the sustainability here? |
| | |
| Strongly disagree | See answer 3 |
| Strongly disagree | No more buildings please. |
| Strongly disagree | Motueka is surrounded by productive horticultural land, and there are large areas near the town centre that are already threatened by sea level rise (and salt water pollution of their bore water supply) |
| Strongly disagree | Motueka has been largely left out of this planning process. It is fed by populations on State Hwy 60 and 62 and small rural areas are crying out for more room to grow, ie, subdivisions. Most of this land is already divided into smaller unproductive sites because it is Rural Zone 2 land and is too small of sections already to be productive. (people could make a living out of small parcels in the tobacco-growing days). The Motueka Valley has hardly had a mention in this planning process. |
| Strongly disagree | No changes until there is by-pass road via Wildman Road/Queen Victoria Street through to River Road and onto SH60. Council/NZTA have got to get the traffic flow out of the CBD. |
| Strongly disagree | |
| Strongly disagree | See full submission. Summarised below (similar to NT2050 submission): singluar focus on growth, challenges underlying growth projections, insufficient consultation, misleading submission form (outcome questions), community feedback ignored, biased process, non-compliance with government directives. Recommends re-think of the draft. |
| | Strongly disagree Strongly |

| 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham | Strongly disagree | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31617 Ms steph jewell | Strongly disagree | I disagree with greenfield development around Motueka. So much room to go Up, but greenfield land once lost is lost and with that, some of our future. OK with brownfield. |
| 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | Strongly disagree | Coastal area which will increase risks from climate change |
| 31637 Ms Frances Kemble Welch | Strongly disagree | |
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | Strongly disagree | No more greenfield development at this stage. Focus on developing a more populated town square type plan for the already developed central streets |
| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | Strongly disagree | There is strong rental demand in Motueka for affordable housing. We need more intensification along High Street and surrounds - apartments etc. |
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | Strongly disagree | There should be far greater intensification, providing TDC is going to develop suitable coastal and floodwater protection |
| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | Strongly disagree | Not horticultural land |
| 31726 Mr John Jackson | Strongly disagree | Current transport infrastructure does not support this. |
| 31763 Susan Rogers | Strongly disagree | Survey is flawed from the beginning. You need to redesign this entire line of questioning. It leads only to answers desired by the maker of the survey. |
| | | |

21 Do you agree with the level of intensification proposed in Māpua (intensifying rural residential area to residential density)? Any comments?

| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | Agree | There are existing services in place to support this. |
|---|-------|---|
| 31122 Mr Johan Thomas Wahlgren | Agree | Infrastructure already in place so use it. |
| 31186 Mr Gary Scott | Agree | |
| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | Agree | As long as efficient public transport is part of the plan |
| 31257 Mr Kent Inglis | Agree | As long as the 'character' of Mapua is not dramatically altered. It is a 'seaside village', however SOME 3 level development would not be out of place. |
| 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman | Agree | Certainly there should be intensification on the hills behind Mapua. |
| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | Agree | |
| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | Agree | |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | Agree | Mapua already has the start of a connected network of active transport options and with growth could support public transport to Richmond. There is already an urban feel to Mapua that can be enhanced . |
| 31286 Mr David Short | Agree | |
| 31309 Mr & Mrs Rose & Phillip Windle | Agree | |
| 31318 Mrs Isobel Mosley | Agree | |
| 31322 Mrs BARBARA AND TIM ROBSON | Agree | |
| 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | Agree | |
| 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | Agree | |
| 31395 Ms Gretchen Holland | Agree | |
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | Agree | |
| 31415 Mrs Zanahe Ruth Galloway | Agree | this is where an increase of population is needed to make this town thrive and not increase the frustratio from traffic noise pollution in cities like Nelson and Richmond adverse to any pleasant biking option especially at the backward speed of 50km/hour! |

| 31416 Tim Leyland | Agree | Yes, if jobs are available and concurrently retain character with historic buildings and leafy streets. |
|---|-------|---|
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | Agree | |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | Agree | |
| 31435 Mr Alan Eggers | Agree | |
| 31449 Mr John Chisholm | Agree | |
| 31457 Mr J Santa Barbara | Agree | |
| 31492 Anton, Benni, Shalom, AJ Bank, Bonnin, Shalom Davis | Agree | |
| 31516 Mr Peter Lole | Agree | |
| 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery | Agree | But not with a dead zone on my land! New development should not be allowed to seriously disadvantage current residents. Also I do not agree to increasing Māpua's residential capacity without increased business/ commercial area to provide for residents. And improved infrastructure to cater for the increased pressure on a system which is not quite up to scratch already. SEE ATTACHED – Summarised: support for T125 to be included in FDS (landowner) and questions why Tasman Village has been progressed and not their land. |
| 31549 Mr Ian McComb | Agree | Logical to intensify in this area which has infrastructure capacity. |
| 31563 Mrs Loretta Anne Hogg | Agree | Yes develop Mapua - everything within context. |
| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | Agree | But avoid large plot sizes and include affordable housing covenants |
| 31608 Robbie Thomson | Agree | |
| 31617 Ms steph jewell | Agree | as 16 |
| 31622 Peter Butler | Agree | |
| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | Agree | |
| 31636 Joanna Santa Barbara | Agree | Agree. However, any building should only be in areas 1.5m above sea level, so they are not flooded in the next 100 years. Mapua town centre is low lying, and currently relying on protection from coastal rock walls on private land. Any intensification here is not recommended. |
| 31637 Ms Frances Kemble Welch | Agree | |
| | | |

| 31647 Mrs Rebecca Parish | Agree | |
|---------------------------|-------|---|
| 31656 Mr brad malcolm | Agree | |
| 31667 barbara nicholas | Agree | Really important that developments around Mapua provide for protection of the old wetland area in Seaton Valley. This protection needs to include: no building permitted on that area; and drainage and infrastructure development above the valley floor that does not further undermine the potential for future restoration of that wetland. I note that national moves to protect and restore wetlands and the recognition of the many ecosystem services wetlands provide. The Seaton valley wetland area has massive potential to provide flood protection as well as a social amenity and it is important that future option is not cut off by earlier development decisions, |
| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | Agree | |
| 31683 Richard Davies | Agree | |
| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | Agree | |
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | Agree | |
| 31703 Ms Paula Holden | Agree | |
| 31704 Mr Paul Bucknall | Agree | Whilst I agree with some of the concerns raised locally about the development in Māpua being out of step with the employment in the village, it's easy for the people that already own land and homes here to support the gatekeeping of further development, even though it ignores one of the most significant issues of our time. Nimbyism should not be a barrier to fair provision of land for development, especially if it seeks to use the land in a more efficient way with less partitioning into small lifestyle blocks that neither increase the provision of homes, nor protect the productive soils. The areas suggested to change from rural residential to residential seem logical and appropriate to me. The plan change process would provide ample opportunity to discuss the impacts and make appropriate decisions. |
| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | Agree | |
| 31722 Trevor Chang | Agree | |
| 31741 Mr Robert Stevenson | Agree | |
| 31759 Mr Damian Campbell | Agree | |
| 31771 Colleen Shaw | Agree | |
| 31774 Mrs Jane Sutherland | Agree | |
| 31783 Mr Peter Jones | Agree | Coastal erosion and inundation issues need to be addressed. |

| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson | Disagree | Mapua has already grown rapidly changing it's character. More housing will only make this worse. |
|-----------------------------|----------|--|
| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | Disagree | |
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | Disagree | |
| 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | Disagree | |
| 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan | Disagree | More cars on the roads(emissions) for people travelling to work, expensive roading upgrades, reliance on water mains |
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | Disagree | Thsi si an area of natural beauty which is already being spoilt by overdevelopment. |
| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | Disagree | |
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | Disagree | Significant service upgrades are still needed. |
| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | Disagree | |
| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | Disagree | Māpua is a perfect example of a rapidly growing area in the last few decades that is totally dependent on individuals needing to drive a cara GHG nightmare Employment in city or rural / agri areas, schools, further education and health services are NOT accessible by public transport and the time factor for commuting is not the way of the future. |
| 31304 Mr Andrew Talijancich | Disagree | It is apparent from the draft Mapua growth plan change that TDC is proposing to fast track urban intensification proposals for Mapua, seeking to utilize land that is zoned Rural Residential (T-033), or deferred Rural Residential Serviced (T-042), as well as land that is zoned deferred Residential (deferred until 2031 pursuant to schedule 17.14A of the TRMP). |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | Disagree | Please see attached - summarised below: Object to greenfield development along Seaton Valley Road to promote compact urban form and reduce GHG emissions. |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | Disagree | Mapua has had enough intensification already. |
| 31328 Ms Karen du Fresne | Disagree | Mapua has a history of major problems with water reticulation amongst other things, and the coastal area is very susceptible to sea level rise. It has minimal services, and public transport options barely exist. Increased intensification here will just mean more private car use as people travel to work and to access services. |
| 31384 Mr Jace Hobbs | Disagree | Adaptation of coastal flooding in the area during this time is the prime consideration. |
| 31439 Mr Bruce Gilkison | Disagree | Māpua town centre is low lying, and currently relying on protection from coastal rock walls on private land. Any intensification here is not recommended. |
| | | |

| 31485 Ms Robin Schiff | Disagree | Only if the planning starts from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
|------------------------------|----------|---|
| 31488 Annette Starink | Disagree | |
| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless | Disagree | |
| 31505 Cheryl Heten | Disagree | |
| 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz | Disagree | |
| 31595 Gary Clark | Disagree | There is other land in Mapua (Rural 1) that would be easier to get the lot yield and easier in terms of a smaller number of landowners who want this change. Subdividing rural residential land will be less effective and have inefficiencies due to relatively small parcels, access and lot yield. There is a need for more commercial land which is a common view of the Mapua community. |
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | Disagree | Mapua is a village and unless there are increased employment options, intensification there will just lead to more commuting and increased emissions |
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | Disagree | Do we need to build more commuter suburbs?. If there was enough industry in the area to support increased housing, that would help.or different, smaller, more intense types of housing around the subur centre, to make it more of a community. |
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | Disagree | Mapua does not need sprawling developments. Smaller housing options near the centre of town will improve affordability and options for small families and older people |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | Disagree | |
| 31644 Murray Poulter | Disagree | |
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | Disagree | Do not support |
| 31673 Mike Drake | Disagree | See Q20. Unless there is free public transport linking Mapua with Richmond etc., then we will be just creating commuter traffic. |
| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | Disagree | This does not feel like intensification but a continuation of the Richmond sprawl. This is likely to increase the number of people commuting to Richmond and Nelson. |
| | | |

| 31718 Kathryn & Keith Quigley | Disagree | |
|-------------------------------|---------------|--|
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | Disagree | This should only occur to provide different sized and type of housing. No more stand alone houses are needed. There are already too many commuters living in the area. There needs to be a very tight boundary. And the proliferation of rural residential subdivisions also needs to cease. |
| 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | Disagree | Addtional intensitation should be added to Mapua |
| 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | Disagree | |
| 31775 Dr Thomas Carl | Disagree | |
| 31777 Mr David Lucas | Disagree | |
| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | Disagree | Please see attached - Determined Disagree from submission: No for the same reasons as Brightwater given above. |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | Disagree | This is a quasi and unacceptable greenfields move in principle. Net Enduring Restorative Outcomes and carrying capacity apply. |
| 31815 Peter Wilks | Disagree | Mapua needs to be kept as a peaceful seaside village. Too many houses will ruin the place. Mapua badh needs a decent supermarket. |
| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | Don't know | |
| 31219 Mrs kate windle | Don't know | |
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | Don't know | |
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | Don't know | comments as above |
| 31355 Mr Barney Hoskins | Don't know | |
| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | Don't know | |
| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | Don't know | |
| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | Don't | |

| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | Don't know | |
|------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|
| 31406 Ms Floortje van Lierop | Don't know | See above |
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | Don't know | |
| 31430 Muriel Moran | Don't know | Same reasons as for Motueka. |
| 31431 Katerina Seligman | Don't know | |
| 31452 Mr David Bartle | Don't know | |
| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | Don't know | |
| 31483 Debbie Hampson | Don't know | |
| 31508 Mr Roger Barlow | Don't know | |
| 31520 Andrew Stirling | Don't know | |
| 31521 Mrs Marie Waterhouse | Don't know | |
| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard | Don't know | |
| 31572 Mr David Todd | Don't know | |
| 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart | Don't know | |
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins | Don't know | |
| | | |

| 31606 Mr Trent Shepard | Don't | |
|------------------------------|----------|--|
| | know | |
| 31651 Dr Patrick Conway | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31693 Carolyn Rose | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | Don't | |
| <u>-</u> | know | |
| 31697 Robert King-Tenison | Don't | |
| - | know | |
| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | Don't | Not answering any of these leading questions |
| | know | |
| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | Don't | |
| · | know | |
| 31784 Ms Teresa James | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31185 Myfanway James | N/A | Limit greenfields development unless it is intensive. |
| 31363 Mr Steve Cross | N/A | I reject the premise of this question |
| 31364 Mrs Christine Tuffnell | N/A | Best commented on by local people of that area |
| 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett | N/A | We don't need any more sprawling suburbs. |
| 31623 Ms Lucy Charlesworth | N/A | I am wary of answering these questions as I cannot be sure of how they will be interpreted. So I will state |
| | | I do not agree with developing green spaces. These spaces need to be reserved and protected to allow for |
| | | sustainable biodiversity and for future generations. Intensification within Nelson CBD needs to be a priority. I do not agrees with building on Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. I do not agree with housing |
| | | development on green fields. There is a climate emergency. Remove these areas from the FDS. |
| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | Neutral | actually. Tellion and the loss and the loss and the loss areas from the loss. |
| 31112 IVII AIVIII Daltiey | iveutial | |

| 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | Neutral | |
|----------------------------|---------|--|
| 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren | Neutral | |
| 31129 Mrs Gaynor Brooks | Neutral | |
| 31130 Trevor James | Neutral | |
| 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward | Neutral | |
| 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert | Neutral | |
| 31173 Mr Roderick Watson | Neutral | |
| 31174 Ms Alison Westerby | Neutral | |
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | Neutral | |
| 31227 Ms Lee Eliott | Neutral | |
| 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | Neutral | Same answer as above. |
| 31240 Michael Markert | Neutral | |
| 31250 Mr Richard Wyles | Neutral | |
| 31261 Mr John Weston | Neutral | My same agreement applies - (Same comment for questions 21-28) |
| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | Neutral | |
| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley | Neutral | |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | Neutral | |
| 31278 Wendy Ross | Neutral | as above |
| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | Neutral | |
| 31284 Mr Jarmo Saloranta | Neutral | |
| 31285 Dr Hamish Holland | Neutral | |
| 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman | Neutral | |
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | Neutral | |
| 31347 Ms Paula Baldwin | Neutral | |
| 31358 George Harrison | Neutral | |
| | | |

| 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | Neutral | |
|------------------------------------|---------|---|
| 31365 michael monti | Neutral | |
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | Neutral | |
| 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer | Neutral | |
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | Neutral | |
| 31423 Mr Roger Frost | Neutral | I am concerned that this will generate much more private vehicle use, even though it may be needed to support better public transport. |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas Hollyman | Neutral | |
| 31434 Mrs cushla Moorhead | Neutral | |
| 31441 Mr Chris Head | Neutral | What is the purpose of residential expansion in Mapua? I know it's seen as a desirable place to live, but it doesn't support a large employment base, meaning the majority of Mapua residents would be commuting to work. How does the TDC plan to allow for this while moving away from large-scale private vehicle travel? |
| 31443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | Neutral | |
| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | Neutral | |
| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | Neutral | No comment |
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | Neutral | |
| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | Neutral | Only if the planning starts from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | Neutral | |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | Neutral | |
| 31480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | Neutral | |
| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | Neutral | |
| | | |

| 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | Neutral | |
|---------------------------------|---------|--|
| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | Neutral | Should not encourage further rural residential developments around Mapua. |
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers | Neutral | |
| 31529 Mr Steven King-Turner | Neutral | |
| 31551 Mrs Jo Kitchen | Neutral | |
| 31558 Mr Steve Jordan | Neutral | |
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | Neutral | Disagree with the lack of greenspace and the resistance to acknowledging the need for a wildlife corridor from the sea up Seaton Valley. SEE ATTACHED Agree we need more housing, but these giant 4-bedroom houses on acres of lawn are the worst thing for the birds - mowing is ruining their opportunity to forage for bugs and seeds. Keep the new housing areas dense and assign green space in equal or greater proportion of land. |
| 31560 Ms Steph Watts | Neutral | If there is allowance for tiny homes and/ sustainably built homes on sections rather than the current trend for enormous houses. Do away with covenents on minimum sizes for homes and have covenents that allow for a % cover of trees and vegetation on each section to absorb carbon, catch rain and attract wildlife. |
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | Neutral | Residents of Mapua Village have chosen a certain lifestyle that infrastructure appears to support. Do they really want higher intensification having chosen to move to a more remote area for health and well being reasons |
| 31574 Mr David Bolton | Neutral | |
| 31579 Jane Tate | Neutral | |
| 31580 Jenny Long | Neutral | I only agree with brownfield intensification if convenient public transport and safe cycling infrastructure is made a priority. Otherwise we're just committing ourselves to increased commuter traffic. |
| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | Neutral | |
| 31604 Mr Peter Moot | Neutral | |
| 31614 Mr mark Morris | Neutral | |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | Neutral | |
| 31641 Mr Stephen (Steve) Hayden | Neutral | I believe that there will be significant local opposition to these proposals in T-166, T-167 and T168. There will probably be less opposition to the proposals for development of T-136 at Braeburn Road. |
| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | Neutral | |

| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | Neutral | I am not an expert and able to comment everything. Please listen to Joni Tomsett or Tim Neubauer. I think they represent my ideas. |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|--|
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | Neutral | If the demand is there and cannot be met with intensification, Waka Kotahi would support residential development as close as possible to Māpua amenities so that active mode transport is more viable, however acknowledge that there are significant climate change resilience issues to the east of the main road that restricts growth. |
| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | Neutral | |
| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | Neutral | |
| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | Neutral | |
| 31692 Mr Alasdair Gardiner | Neutral | Any new Developments must have public transport as a priority. Also alternative modes of transport ie cycling and walking should be mandatory. Must have more green spaces to encourage more natural habitats for animals and birds |
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | Neutral | See attached submission. Summarised - no specific comments on this question, generally supports FDS. |
| 31742 Mr tim manning | Neutral | If additional housing is required, it should be provided within or adjacent to existing settlements and should cater for a variety of different lifestyles and living requirements. Infrastructure improvements will be required, not limited to roads, schools, drains etc but also social, wellbeing and recreational facilities and amenties of a scale and type that will support the increased population and the types of people comprising that population. |
| 31744 Mrs Lorna CRANE | Neutral | |
| 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert- Watene | Neutral | |
| 31752 Jill Pearson | Neutral | |
| 31765 Mrs Lorna Ivy Cooper | Neutral | |
| 31769 Ms Jo Gould | Neutral | |
| 31821 Jackie McNae | Neutral | The Submitters support the identification of their land T033 as a growth area in Seaton Valley, rezoning their current rural residential landholding to residential with provision for Compact Density Development. |
| 31835 Mr Ian Wishart | Neutral | It is inevitable Mapua is a future hot spot & I care little for it so do whatever you like. |
| 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | Strongly agree | Think some rural residential areas on the hill could be expanded to residential density- Pomona Road area. |
| | | |

| 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | Strongly agree | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | Strongly agree | |
| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | Strongly agree | |
| 31316 John Heslop | Strongly agree | |
| 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | Strongly agree | Māpua does not have enough jobs. Residents are already commuting long distances to work. Why should we make a bad situation worse? Māpua does not need any more new residents until there is enough employment for everybody. The type of intensification proposed here is largely converting rural residential into standard low-density housing. Even calling this "intensification" is ludicrous. We don't need any more sprawling suburbs. What is missing for Māpua (and many other rural towns) are smaller housing options to cater for local needs. Currently members of the local community that want or need to downscale are forced out of their local community. There is already greenfield capacity available in Māpua and the rules for these areas should be changed so that a variety of housing requires a significant percentage of smaller housing options. The same applied for existing residential areas in and near the |
| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | Strongly agree | town centre. As new residents i would be delighted to see more residents. I think the balance between maintaining the serenity and allowing for more people to enjoy it about right - another 700 houses isn't going to turn it into auckland, i think it will be easily absorbed over the time frame and add to the energy and vibrancy |
| 31403 Mr Richard Deck | Strongly agree | The dubition of the cost, absorbed over the time frame and dud to the energy and visitation |
| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | Strongly agree | Strongly Agree. NMH supports the approach taken to intensify the rural residential area to residential noting that infrastructure upgrades will be required. NMH supports improvements to the public transport network which include connections to Motueka and Richmond. |
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | Strongly agree | Māpua does not have enough jobs. Residents are already commuting long distances to work. The intensification proposed will make a bad situation worse. Māpua does not need any more new residents until there is enough employment for everybody. The type of intensification proposed here is largely converting rural residential into standard low-density housing. |

| | | We don't need any more sprawling suburbs. Smaller housing options are required to cater for local needs Currently members of the local community that want or need to downscale are forced out of their local community. There is already greenfield capacity available in Māpua and the rules for these areas should be changed so that a variety of housing requires a significant percentage of smaller housing options. the same applied for existing residential areas in and near the town. |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | Strongly agree | |
| 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin | Strongly agree | Hi We would like to see 120-140 Seaton Valley Road, (and potentially the land on the other side of the road also) included in the land to be rezoned residential. From our perspective this land is of no use from a farming or productive rural perspective. Given the lay of the land we suggest that the Western and Northern boundaries of 140 Seaton Valley are the natural delineation between residential and rural residential. As option B, if our preferred plan as above was not deemed an option by council, we then suggest that this land is rezoned Rural Residential Serviced which offers a minimum lot size of 2000m. This allows for the country feel and yet allows landowners who choose to, to maximise use of land that otherwise would not offer any return and not help towards meeting the housing needs of a growing region. We note that the hill block on the ex Senior Land is zoned Deferred Rural Residential Serviced. With the proposal now to rezone this as Residential, this land at 120 -140 Seaton Valley and opposite could help meet that need to offer Deferred Rural Residential Serviced as a transition from the soon to be residential land up the valley. SEE ATTACHED (map) |
| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | Strongly agree | |
| 31809 Mr Andrew Spittal | Strongly agree | The intensification of Mapua is supported for the reasons outlined above. This provides for a more efficient use of land and infrastructure in close proximity to services and amenities |
| 31836 Paula M Wilks | Strongly agree | Go up not out. But parks & recreation areas significantly increased. |
| 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | Strongly disagree | Mapua is to far out from Nelson - any growth will create more traffic and more GHGs and environmental impacts. That is counter to NCC's objectives. |
| | | |

| Strongly disagree | This would be a disaster - people come here for recreation - cycling kayaking etc and Mapua can only just cope with the increase in residents in the close rural areas over the last few years. |
|----------------------|---|
| Strongly disagree | HOW ON EARTH CAN THIS COMMUNITY HANDLE MORE EXPANSIONTHE MEDICAL AND EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES ARE ALREADY OVERSTRETCHEDTHE INFRASTRUCTURE CANNOT HANDLE MORE TRAFFIC ALONG A FRAGILE COASTAL ROAD PROVEN TO BE SUBJECT TO TIDAL INUNDATION AND ERODING CLIFF AS YOU CLIMB UP OUT OF MAPUA TOWARDS MOTUEKA. LASTLY THERE ARE NOT THE WATER RESOURCES TO HANDLE FURTHER EXPANSION. THIS AREA HAS BEEN DEVELOPED ALMOST TO ITS MAXIMUM SUSTAINABLE EXTENT. |
| Strongly disagree | Change in Mapua has happened rapidly. More change and population undermines the unique quality of Mapua as a village. The school is oversubscribed, there is often no parking at the local shop and the congestion on the roads to Richmond is noticeable. Growing Mapua's population will only add to the congestion. Adding more shops, supermarkets etc. to this area will certainly undermine Mapua's unique village quality. The infrastructure is also at risk. Already mitigation has had to be put in place for wastewater, new housing developments have had to find their own water. |
| Strongly disagree | The shear number of houses allowed in T042 is absurb. There is no plan to preserve the density of housing to a limit that already exists in areas beyond this zoning change. Housing areas beside still have limits on intensification but medium density is allowed in these rezoned areas. Medium density should be scaled back to large lot residential in keeping with surrounding areas. Preservation of views from existing properties towards the Richmond hills by avoiding building on hill tops and limiting to single story. Current school infrastructure does not support the speed of growth planned and the infrastructure needs to be developed before properties are built to avoid issues - stormwater issues with the Mapua Drive development being a classic example. Growth of areas should be in fitting with the adjacent zones. Timing should also be delayed to prioritise intensification and developing areas already in the process rather than further impacting the natural environment where greenfield sites are planned. |
| Strongly disagree | Mapua is a small coastal village chosen by residents who want to experience a small village community, NOT a suburb! It is successful as a highly functional community because residents donate a huge number of volunteer hours to ensure that it is a great community. The recent influx of "commuters" has already degraded the community spirit. There is huge opposition to gobbling up rural land for suburban development. |
| | disagree Strongly disagree Strongly disagree Strongly disagree |

| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | Strongly disagree | Strongly disagree. Mapua is already too big for its infrastructure (including schooling, jobs as well as usual infrastructure of sewage etc). Plus it would lose its charm as a rural village. |
|---------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | Strongly disagree | This will increase traffic to Nelson. |
| 31242 Ms Suzie Ilina | Strongly disagree | Mapua has a unique village atmosphere which so many people from Nelson and Motueka enjoy as well as the residents, It has unique bird and wildlife areas, some of which have already been destroyed |
| 31247 Mr yuri aristarco | Strongly disagree | other productive land destroyed and lost forever, where is the sustainability here? |
| 31279 Mr Jeremy Thompson | Strongly disagree | See answer 3 |
| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | Strongly disagree | This does not need more concrete. |
| 31325 Dr Ann Briggs | Strongly disagree | A doubling of population within the time-span of the plan will destroy this settlement. We are already losing orchard- and farm-land, there are proposals to build on wetland, and we are at risk from coastal inundation and inland storm-flooding. Health and school infrastructure are at / beyond capacity. There are no major employers and little access to public transport. Intensification means more water run-off and increased GHG emissions, as people commute to other centres. |
| 31334 Diane Sutherland | Strongly disagree | Māpua does not have enough jobs. Residents are already commuting long distances to work. The type of intensification proposed here is largely converting rural residential into standard low-density housing. Even calling this "intensification" is a nonsense. We don't need any more sprawling suburbs. What is missing for Māpua (and many other rural towns) are smaller housing options to cater for local needs. Currently members of the local community that want or need to downscale are forced out of their local community. There is already greenfield capacity available in Māpua and the rules for these areas should be changed so that a variety of housing requires a significant percentage of smaller housing options. |
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | Strongly disagree | |
| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | Strongly disagree | In an area that already puts excessive demands on the council's limited funds to supply water, we shouldn't be creating expansive soulless low density residential areas |

| 31346 Martin Hartman | Strongly disagree | Māpua does not have enough jobs. Residents are already commuting long distances to work. Why should we make a bad situation worse? Māpua does not need any more new residents until there is enough employment for everybody. The type of intensification proposed here is largely converting rural residential into standard low-density housing. Even calling this "intensification" is ludicrous. We don't need any more sprawling suburbs. What is missing for Māpua (and many other rural towns) are smaller housing options to cater for local needs. Currently members of the local community that want or need to downscale are forced out of their local community. There is already greenfield capacity available in Māpua and the rules for these areas should be changed so that a variety of housing requires a significant percentage of smaller housing options. The same applied for existing residential areas in and near the town centre. |
|------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31349 Laurien Heijs | Strongly disagree | Endorse NelsonTasman2050 submission. |
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | Strongly disagree | |
| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | Strongly disagree | I disagree with any policy that results in encouraging car-use. There is also the big question of water supply and resilience, and Mapua doesn't lend itself to large growth, even though demand remains very strong. I lived there for 30 years, but moved into Nelson to end my commuting. Again the IPCC demand remains the highest priority - reduction of emissions. The embodied carbon of every new separate house is huge, another valid reason to only permit going UP from now on, everywhere. |
| 31356 Stephen Williams | Strongly disagree | People living away from the centers will likely increase transport emissions and roading requirements. |
| 31360 Ms Thuy Tran | Strongly disagree | |
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | Strongly disagree | Māpua does not have enough jobs. Residents are already commuting long distances to work. Why should we make a bad situation worse? Māpua does not need any more new residents until there is enough employment for everybody. The type of intensification proposed here is largely converting rural residential into standard low-density housing. Even calling this "intensification" is ludicrous. We don't need any more sprawling suburbs. |
| 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann | Strongly disagree | Please see my comments on Brightwater and Wakefield. The same applies here. |
| | | |

| 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett 31400 Miss Heather Wallace 31405 Mr Doug Hattersley 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle 31407 Dr Andrew Tilling 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling 31410 Mr Scott Smithline 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling Strongly disagree Strongly disagree Strongly disagree Strongly disagree | Loss of productive land. Says the same from question 21 to 28. Wasteful use of land. from question 21 to 28. Māpua does not have enough jobs. Residents are already commuting long distances to work. Why should we make a bad situation worse? Māpua does not need any more new residents until there is enough employment for everybody. The type of intensification proposed here is largely converting rural residential into standard low-density housing. Even calling this "intensification" is ludicrous. We don't need any more sprawling suburbs. What is missing for Māpua (and many other rural towns) (as well as employment opportunities) are smaller housing options to cater for local needs. Currently members of the local community that want or need to downscale are forced out of their local community. There is already greenfield capacity available in Māpua and the rules for these areas should be changed so that a variety of housing requires a significant |
|--|--|
| disagree 31405 Mr Doug Hattersley Strongly disagree 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle Strongly disagree 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling Strongly disagree 31410 Mr Scott Smithline Strongly disagree | Māpua does not have enough jobs. Residents are already commuting long distances to work. Why should we make a bad situation worse? Māpua does not need any more new residents until there is enough employment for everybody. The type of intensification proposed here is largely converting rural residential into standard low-density housing. Even calling this "intensification" is ludicrous. We don't need any more sprawling suburbs. What is missing for Māpua (and many other rural towns) (as well as employment opportunities) are smaller housing options to cater for local needs. Currently members of the local community that want or need to downscale are forced out of their local community. There is already greenfield capacity available in |
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling 31410 Mr Scott Smithline Strongly disagree Strongly disagree | we make a bad situation worse? Māpua does not need any more new residents until there is enough employment for everybody. The type of intensification proposed here is largely converting rural residential into standard low-density housing. Even calling this "intensification" is ludicrous. We don't need any more sprawling suburbs. What is missing for Māpua (and many other rural towns) (as well as employment opportunities) are smaller housing options to cater for local needs. Currently members of the local community that want or need to downscale are forced out of their local community. There is already greenfield capacity available in |
| disagree 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling Strongly disagree 31410 Mr Scott Smithline Strongly disagree | we make a bad situation worse? Māpua does not need any more new residents until there is enough employment for everybody. The type of intensification proposed here is largely converting rural residential into standard low-density housing. Even calling this "intensification" is ludicrous. We don't need any more sprawling suburbs. What is missing for Māpua (and many other rural towns) (as well as employment opportunities) are smaller housing options to cater for local needs. Currently members of the local community that want or need to downscale are forced out of their local community. There is already greenfield capacity available in |
| disagree 31410 Mr Scott Smithline Strongly disagree | percentage of smaller housing options. The same applied for existing residential areas in and near the town centre. |
| disagree | There is no need to intensify development there as the existing planned expansion of the town is already creating service problems and there isn need or space for commercial expansion |
| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling Strongly | see 18 |
| disagree | There is very little work in Mapua. More houses will just mean more car use into Nelson and Motueka. What aging residents in Mapua need is smaller sections and town houses. The change TDC is suggesting just changing rural residential into low density housing. The school cannot cope with more students, the medical centre can't cope with more patients. There are not enough essential facitilities to accommodate more residents |
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin Strongly disagree | Mapua is a satellite town and as such, more urban sprawl would just add to the commuter traffic problems. |
| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors Strongly disagree | Mapua is a small village, its special character needs to be protected. |
| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn Strongly disagree | Greenfield re-zoning should be rural residential as previously indicated, to blend with neighbouring areas |

| 31472 Dr David Briggs | Strongly | You are already destroying Mapua as a place to live. It's becoming a disjointed sprawl of poor quality |
|----------------------------|----------------------|--|
| | disagree | houses (black, architecturally sterile buildings surrounded by high wooden fences). The village facilities (school, medical centre, main shops) are already under huge strain; the visual character of the village is being destroyed by excessive use of concrete. Noise, traffic, street lighting are all becoming worse. The small areas of semi-natural green space (e.g. Aranui Park) are being damaged by developers even before they get permission to develop. This is another example of how not to plan and develop. Please, please, stop this archaic way of developing; take hold of the process and PLAN villages in ways that enhance their character and livability. Stop selling our heritage and our environment to developers. |
| 31473 Mr Andrew Downs | Strongly disagree | Māpua does not have enough jobs. Residents are already commuting long distances to work. Why should we make a bad situation worse? Māpua does not need any more new residents until there is enough employment for everybody. The type of intensification proposed here is largely converting rural residential into standard low-density housing. Even calling this "intensification" is ludicrous. We don't need any more sprawling suburbs. What is missing for Māpua (and many other rural towns) are smaller housing options to cater for local needs. Currently members of the local community that want or need to downscale are forced out of their local community. There is already greenfield capacity available in Māpua and the rules for these areas should be changed so that a variety of housing requires a significant percentage of smaller housing options. The same applied for existing residential areas in and near the town centre. |
| 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon | Strongly disagree | |
| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | Strongly disagree | No, not at all. Reasons have been detailed in my answers to previous questions. |
| 31481 Mrs Lucy Harrhy | Strongly disagree | We have enough new residential houses in Mapua without intensifying rural residential areas. People who have chosen to live in rural residential areas, do so, because it is rural residential, not because they're hoping to be driven out by intensification. |
| 31484 Mr Gavin Brent Cook | Strongly disagree | |
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | Strongly | Māpua does not have enough jobs. Residents are already commuting long |

| | | everybody. The type of intensification proposed here is largely converting rural residential into standard low-density housing. Even calling this "intensification" is ludicrous. We don't need any more sprawling suburbs. What is missing for Māpua (and many other rural towns) are smaller housing options to cater for local needs. Currently members of the local community that want or need to downscale are forced out of their local community. There is already greenfield capacity available in Māpua and the rules for these areas should be changed so that a variety of housing requires a significant percentage of smaller housing options. The same applied for existing residential areas in and near the town centre. |
|-------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31487 Ms Heather Spence | Strongly disagree | I understand Mapua is already bursting at the seams in terms of infrastructure services (water etc) and its newest housing development is so impractical for the future that I cringe to think how intensification by existing practices would look. Future intensification must be high density housing, going up rather than out, a range of housing sizes and costs. This would be acceptable. As long as it's done with community input, not a developer's idea of what's needed. |
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | Strongly disagree | Māpua does not have enough jobs. Residents are already commuting long distances to work. Why should we make a bad situation worse? Māpua does not need any more new residents until there is enough employment for everybody. The type of intensification proposed here is largely converting rural residential into standard low-density housing. Even calling this "intensification" is ludicrous. We don't need any more sprawling suburbs. What is missing for Māpua (and many other rural towns) are smaller housing options to cater for local needs. Currently members of the local community that want or need to downscale are forced out of their local community. There is already greenfield capacity available in Māpua and the rules for these areas should be changed so that a variety of housing requires a significant percentage of smaller housing options. The same applied for existing residential areas in and near the town centre. |
| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | Strongly disagree | Please note that my comments on Māpua are more extensive. The reason for this focus on Mapau is simple: I live there! However, some of my reasoning probably also applies to many other areas in the region. Māpua does not have enough jobs. Residents are already commuting long distances to work. Why should we make a bad situation worse? Māpua does not have enough jobs. Māpua does not need any more new residents until there is enough employment for everybody. The type of intensification proposed here is largely converting rural residential into standard low-density housing. Even calling this "intensification" is ludicrous. We don't need any more sprawling suburbs. The predictions for Mapua are incorrect refer to detail in attachment. |

| disagree we make a bad situation worse? Māpua does not need any more new residents until there is enough employment for everybody. The type of intensification proposed here is largely converting rural residential into standard low-densit housing. Even calling this "intensification" is ludicrous. We don't need any more sprawling suburbs. What is missing for Māpua (and many other rural towns) are smaller housing options to cater for local needs. Currently members of the local community that want or need to downscale are forced out of the local community. There is already greenfield capacity available in Māpua and the rules for these areas should be changed so that a variety of housing requires a significant percentage of smaller housing options. The same applied for existing residential areas in and near the town centre. Strongly disagree distances to work, which is adding to our carbon emissions. We should not make a bad situation worse by attracting more people to live in the area The rules for the greenfield capacity should be changed so Mapua can have more smaller housing to cate to local needs. Currently, locals are forced out as they can't afford to live there and there is no option to downsize. Although there are not enough jobs in Mapua. Classifying rural residential to residential is misappropriation of the concept of intensification for most of the land being proposed is currently not developed, thus any development will be greenfield. Any plan should favour intensification within the existing residential zone and green field is only necessary when intensification has been completed. As evidenced by the recent residential development in Mapua, the TDC has been singularly ineffective in its urban design and any aesthetically orientated urban design has been subjugated to the commercial desires of the developers and building companies. If any such "intensification" is to be undertaken, the TDC must prioritize aesthetics and residents needs above and beyond any developer commercial desires of the develo | | | |
|--|---|----------|---|
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert Strongly disagree Strongly See full submission. Summarised below (similar to NT2050 submission): singluar focus on growth, | 31495 Ms Mary Duncan 31496 Mrs Petra Dekker | disagree | employment for everybody. The type of intensification proposed here is largely converting rural residential into standard low-density housing. Even calling this "intensification" is ludicrous. We don't need any more sprawling suburbs. What is missing for Māpua (and many other rural towns) are smaller housing options to cater for local needs. Currently members of the local community that want or need to downscale are forced out of their local community. There is already greenfield capacity available in Māpua and the rules for these areas should be changed so that a variety of housing requires a significant percentage of smaller housing options. The same applied for existing residential areas in and near the town centre. Refer attachment: Māpua hardly offers enough employment and residents are already commuting long distances to work, which is adding to our carbon emissions. We should not make a bad situation worse by |
| disagree the land being proposed is currently not developed, thus any development will be greenfield. Any plan should favour intensification within the existing residential zone and green field is only necessary when intensification has been completed. As evidenced by the recent residential development in Mapua, the TDC has been singularly ineffective in its urban design and any aesthetically orientated urban design has been subjugated to the commercial desires of the developers and building companies. If any such "intensification" is to be undertaken, the TDC must prioritize aesthetics and residents needs above and beyond any developer commercial interests. Strongly disagree There's been more than enough actual & planned. Adding more just increases emissions & is against all current mitigation of damage to our planet. Greenfields proposed are using up valuable farmland. Greenfields proposed are using up valuable farmland. | 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | | The rules for the greenfield capacity should be changed so Mapua can have more smaller housing to cater to local needs. Currently, locals are forced out as they can't afford to live there and there is no option to |
| disagree current mitigation of damage to our planet. 31533 Wendy Trevett Strongly disagree Greenfields proposed are using up valuable farmland. disagree Strongly disagree Strongly See full submission. Summarised below (similar to NT2050 submission): singluar focus on growth, | 31515 Geoffrey Vause | • . | Any plan should favour intensification within the existing residential zone and green field is only necessary when intensification has been completed. As evidenced by the recent residential development in Mapua, the TDC has been singularly ineffective in its urban design and any aesthetically orientated urban design has been subjugated to the commercial desires of the developers and building companies. If any such "intensification" is to be undertaken, the TDC must prioritize aesthetics and residents needs above and beyond any developer commercial |
| disagree 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid Strongly See full submission. Summarised below (similar to NT2050 submission): singluar focus on growth, | 31530 Mr Richard Clement | | |
| | 31533 Wendy Trevett | | Greenfields proposed are using up valuable farmland. |
| | 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | | See full submission. Summarised below (similar to NT2050 submission): singluar focus on growth, challenges underlying growth projections, insufficient consultation, misleading submission form (outcome |

| | | questions), community feedback ignored, biased process, non-compliance with government directives. Recommends re-think of the draft. |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31554 Wendy Barker | Strongly disagree | It's getting ruined already. |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | Strongly disagree | Village intensification has to be seriously implemented first before rural residential land is rezoned into residential Māpua does not need a Berryfields development up Seaton Valley away from services, amenities and dependent on vehicles and commuting to Richmond or Nelson for work |
| 31562 Grant palliser | Strongly disagree | a dormitory suburb has already been createddestroying the village feel. Mapua is fast becoming 'a tale of two cities'intensification up Seaton Valley will only increase this. |
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | Strongly disagree | Māpua does not have enough jobs. Residents are already commuting long distances to work. Why should we make a bad situation worse? Māpua does not need any more new residents until there is enough employment for everybody. The type of intensification proposed here is largely converting rural residential into standard low-density housing. Even calling this "intensification" is ludicrous. We don't need any more sprawling suburbs. What is missing for Māpua (and many other rural towns) are smaller housing options to cater for local needs. Currently members of the local community that want or need to downscale are forced out of their local community. There is already greenfield capacity available in Māpua and the rules for these areas should be changed so that a variety of housing requires a significant percentage of smaller housing options. |
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | Strongly disagree | Māpua does not have enough jobs. Residents are already commuting long distances to work. Why should we make a bad situation worse? Māpua does not need any more new residents until there is enough employment for everybody. The type of intensification proposed here is largely converting rural residential into standard low-density housing. Even calling this "intensification" is ludicrous. We don't need any more sprawling suburbs. What is missing for Māpua (and many other rural towns) are smaller housing options to cater for local needs. Currently members of the local community that want or need to downscale are forced out of their local community. There is already greenfield capacity available in Māpua and the rules for these areas should be changed so that a variety of housing requires a significant percentage |

| | | near the town centre. |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham | Strongly disagree | Intensification should involve the wharf and village centre and not outlying areas that will create more care use. |
| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | Strongly disagree | As above Māpua does definitely not need to be 'intensified' it is rural and should remain so. Nowhere in this region does. Slow natural growth can be supported. Unnatural fast growth is unnecessary and should not be encouraged. In Māpua low level expansion is acceptable to support local natural growth |
| 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | Strongly disagree | There is enough development in progress - we are in danger of losing the character of the seaside community that attracts tourists to the area. It is already a commuter town so adding to it would only put more cars and traffic movement on the road. |
| 31588 pene Greet | Strongly disagree | |
| 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | Strongly disagree | Māpua does not have enough jobs. Residents are already commuting long distances to work. Māpua does not need any more new residents until there is enough employment for everybody. The type of intensification proposed here is largely converting rural residential into standard low-density housing. Even calling this "intensification" is ludicrous. We don't need any more sprawling suburbs. What is missing for Māpua (and many other rural towns) are smaller housing options to cater for local needs. Currently, members of the local community that want or need to downscale are forced out of their local community. There is already greenfield capacity available in Māpua and the rules for these areas should be changed to allow for a variety of smaller housing options. |
| 31593 Mr William Samuels | Strongly disagree | Māpua does not have enough jobs. Residents are already commuting long distances to work. Why should we make a bad situation worse? Māpua does not need any more new residents until there is enough employment for everybody. |
| | | The type of intensification proposed here is largely converting rural residential into standard low-density housing. Even calling this "intensification" is ludicrous. We don't need any more sprawling suburbs. |
| | | What is missing for Māpua (and many other rural towns) are smaller housing options to cater for local needs. Currently members of the local community that want or need to downscale are forced out of their local community. There is already greenfield capacity available in Māpua and the rules for these areas should be changed so that a variety of housing requires a significant percentage of smaller housing options. The same applied for existing residential areas in and near the town centre. |
| 31594 Ms Annemarie | Strongly | Mapua hasn't enough jobs for everybody. And having watched what happened there – more and more |
| | | |

| Braunsteiner | disagree | stand alone housing totally ruined the feel it had in the past. The type of intensification proposed here is largely converting rural residential into standard low-density housing. Even calling this "intensification" is misleading. There is no need for more sprawling suburbs. |
|---------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | Strongly disagree | Māpua does not have enough jobs. Residents are already commuting long distances to work. Why should we make a bad situation worse? Māpua does not need any more new residents until there is enough employment for everybody. The type of intensification proposed here is largely converting rural residential into standard low-density housing. Even calling this "intensification" is ludicrous. We don't need any more sprawling suburbs. What is missing for Māpua (and many other rural towns) are smaller housing options to cater for local needs. Currently members of the local community that want or need to downscale are forced out of their local community. There is already greenfield capacity available in Māpua and the rules for these areas should be changed so that a variety of housing requires a significant percentage of smaller housing options. The same applied for existing residential areas in and near the town centre. |
| 31598 Mrs Nicola Worsfold | Strongly disagree | |
| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | Strongly disagree | Māpua does not have enough jobs. Residents are already commuting long distances to work. Why should we make a bad situation worse? Māpua does not need any more new residents until there is enough employment for everybody. The type of intensification proposed here is largely converting rural residential into standard low-density housing. Even calling this "intensification" is ludicrous. We don't need any more sprawling suburbs. What is missing for Māpua (and many other rural towns) are smaller housing options to cater for local needs. Currently members of the local community that want or need to downscale are forced out of their local community. There is already greenfield capacity available in Māpua and the rules for these areas should be changed so that a variety of housing requires a significant percentage of smaller housing options. The same applied for existing residential areas in and near the town centre. |
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | Strongly disagree | Māpua does not have enough jobs. Residents are already commuting long distances to work. Why should we make a bad situation worse? Māpua does not need any more new residents until there is enough employment for everybody. |

| | | The type of intensification proposed here is largely converting rural residential into standard low-density housing. Even calling this "intensification" is ludicrous. We don't need any more sprawling suburbs. |
|-----------------------|----------------------|---|
| | | What is missing for Māpua (and many other rural towns) are smaller housing options to cater for local needs. Currently members of the local community that want or need to downscale are forced out of their local community. There is already greenfield capacity available in Māpua and the rules for these areas should be changed so that a variety of housing requires a significant percentage of smaller housing options. The same applied for existing residential areas in and near the town centre. |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | Strongly disagree | Māpua does not have enough jobs. Residents are already commuting long distances to work. Māpua does not need any more new residents until there is enough employment for everybody. The type of intensification proposed here is largely converting rural residential into standard low-density housing. Even calling this "intensification" is ludicrous. We don't need any more sprawling suburbs. What is missing for Māpua (and many other rural towns) are smaller housing options to cater for local needs. Currently, members of the local community that want or need to downscale are forced out of their local community. There is already greenfield capacity available in Māpua and the rules for these areas should be changed to allow for a variety of smaller housing options. |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | Strongly disagree | C/o- NT2050 Māpua does not have enough jobs. Residents are already commuting long distances to work. Why should we make a bad situation worse? Māpua does not need any more new residents until there is enough employment for everybody. The type of intensification proposed here is largely converting rural residential into standard low-density housing. Even calling this "intensification" is ludicrous. We don't need any more sprawling suburbs. What is missing for Māpua (and many other rural towns) are smaller housing options to cater for local needs. Currently members of the local community that want or need to downscale are forced out of their local community. There is already greenfield capacity available in Māpua and the rules for these areas should be changed so that a variety of housing requires a significant percentage of smaller housing options. The same applied for existing residential areas in and near the town centre. |

| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | Strongly disagree | There is plenty of room in mapua township without taking over rural land. |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | Strongly disagree | Coastal areas should not be developed |
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | Strongly disagree | What are you smoking to think this is a good idea? Archetypal dormitory suburb. Nooooo! |
| 31643 Inge Koevoet | Strongly disagree | And yet they all work in Richmond or Nelson and clog up the road driving to and from work. |
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | Strongly disagree | Māpua does not have enough jobs. Residents are already commuting long distances to work. Māpua does not need any more new residents until there is enough employment for everybody. The type of intensification proposed here is largely converting rural residential into standard low-density housing. Even calling this "intensification" is ludicrous. We don't need any more sprawling suburbs. What is missing for Māpua (and many other rural towns) are smaller housing options to cater for local needs. Currently, members of the local community that want or need to downscale are forced out of their local community. There is already greenfield capacity available in Māpua and the rules for these areas should be changed to allow for a variety of smaller housing options. |
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | Strongly disagree | Strongly disagree Māpua does not have enough jobs. Residents are already commuting long distances to work. Māpua does not need any more new residents until there is enough employment for everybody. The type of intensification proposed here is largely converting rural residential into standard low-density housing. Even calling this "intensification" is ludicrous. We don't need any more sprawling suburbs. What is missing for Māpua (and many other rural towns) are smaller housing options to cater for local needs. Currently, members of the local community that want or need to downscale are forced out of their local community. There is already greenfield capacity available in Māpua and the rules for these areas should be changed to allow for a variety of smaller housing options. |
| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | Strongly disagree | Strongly disagree Māpua does not have enough jobs. Residents are already commuting long distances to work. Māpua does not need any more new residents until there is enough employment for everybody. The type of intensification proposed here is largely converting rural residential into standard low-density housing. Even calling this "intensification" is ludicrous. We don't need any more sprawling suburbs. What is missing for Māpua (and many other rural towns) are smaller housing options to cater for local needs. Currently, members of the local community that want or need to downscale are forced out of their local community. There is already greenfield capacity available in Māpua and the rules for these areas should be changed to |

| | | allow for a variety of smaller housing options. |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | Strongly disagree | Māpua does not have enough jobs. Residents are already commuting long distances to work. Māpua does not need any more new residents until there is enough employment for everybody. The type of intensification proposed here is largely converting rural residential into standard low-density housing. Even calling this "intensification" is ludicrous. We don't need any more sprawling suburbs. What is missing for Māpua (and many other rural towns) are smaller housing options to cater for local needs. Currently, members of the local community that want or need to downscale are forced out of their local community. There is already greenfield capacity available in Māpua and the rules for these areas should be changed to allow for a variety of smaller housing options. |
| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | Strongly disagree | See Submission - The proposed growth is disproportionate in scale and inconsistent in type with our existing community and will destroy the look and feel of an already vibrant community. |
| 31688 Gerard McDonnell | Strongly disagree | This area is becoming too congested already |
| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | Strongly disagree | Māpua does not have enough employment to warrant growth. It has become a commuter town that requires residents to commute to their places of work. |
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | Strongly disagree | Growth should be restricted to areas that have already been identified for growth |
| 31716 Mr Alan hart | Strongly disagree | Mapua is susceptible to sea level rise so a precautionary approach should be taken to any expansion let alone intensification. |
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | Strongly disagree | |
| 31726 Mr John Jackson | Strongly disagree | The nature of the community will change in ways I do not want. |
| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | Strongly disagree | Māpua does not have enough jobs. Residents are already commuting long distances to work. Why should we make a bad situation worse? Māpua does not need any more new residents until there is enough employment for everybody. The type of intensification proposed here is largely converting rural residential into standard low-density housing. Even calling this "intensification" is ludicrous. We don't need any more sprawling suburbs. What is missing for Māpua (and many other rural towns) are smaller housing options to cater for local needs. Currently members of the local community that want or need to downscale are forced out of their local community. There is already greenfield capacity available in Māpua and the rules for these areas should be changed so that a variety of housing requires a significant percentage of smaller housing |

| | | entions. The same applied for existing residential areas in and peop the town centre |
|--|----------------------|--|
| | | options. The same applied for existing residential areas in and near the town centre. |
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | Strongly disagree | Māpua does not have enough jobs. Residents are already commuting long distances to work. Why should we make a bad situation worse? Māpua does not need any more new residents until there is enough employment for everybody. The type of intensification proposed here is largely converting rural residential into standard low-density housing. Even calling this "intensification" is ludicrous. We don't need any more sprawling suburbs. What is missing for Māpua (and many other rural towns) are smaller housing options to cater for local needs. Currently members of the local community that want or need to downscale are forced out of their local community. There is already greenfield capacity available in Māpua and the rules for these areas should be changed so that a variety of housing requires a significant percentage of smaller housing options. The same applied for existing residential areas in and near the town centre. |
| 31736 Ms Carol Curtis | Strongly disagree | where would these people work? is this holiday homes, and life stylers?? |
| 31763 Susan Rogers | Strongly disagree | Survey is flawed from the beginning. You need to redesign this entire line of questioning. It leads only to answers desired by the maker of the survey. |
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | Strongly disagree | Māpua does not have enough jobs. Residents are already commuting long distances to work. Why should we make a bad situation worse? Māpua does not need any more new residents until there is enough employment for everybody. The type of intensification proposed here is largely converting rural residential into standard low-density housing. Even calling this "intensification" is ludicrous. We don't need any more sprawling suburbs. What is missing for Māpua (and many other rural towns) are smaller housing options to cater for local needs. Currently members of the local community that want or need to downscale are forced out of their local community. There is already greenfield capacity available in Māpua and the rules for these areas should be changed so that a variety of housing requires a significant percentage of smaller housing options. The same applied for existing residential areas in and near the town centre. |
| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | Strongly disagree | No jobs - therefore commuting residents only! |

| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Strongly disagree | We need to keep Mapua as a tourist destination- so not intensive residential development. |
|--------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31801 Joan Skurr | Strongly disagree | Mapua is likely to act as a satellite suburb. To find what housing is needed there is a priority. Maybe a collection of small houses for elderly within the village could release larger houses for occupation? |

| 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan | Agree | Nelson needs a boost, it's a city and will benefit businesses and people for work, most infrastructure is there or will be and it's the only way forward for it as a city |
|----------------------------|-------|--|
| 31257 Mr Kent Inglis | Agree | Simply because intensification will not provide sufficient dwellings for an increasing population, and because the areas selected are not 'highly productive land'. |
| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | Agree | |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | Agree | To make public and active transport possible for work, school and shopping, intensification is the best option |
| 31280 Jenny Knott | Agree | |
| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | Agree | |
| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | Agree | |
| 31316 John Heslop | Agree | |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | Agree | Yes, infrastructure is already in place. |
| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | Agree | the city is constrained already, But plese proritise green parks and public places so intensification in the future has places for the community |
| 31360 Ms Thuy Tran | Agree | |
| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | Agree | Nelson needs to take a greater share of responsibility for regional growth and ensure costs for development of the built environment including supply of water from the Waimea Dam |
| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors | Agree | Intensification should happen in our main centres. Again, with exceptional town planning and skill, apartment buildings are key. |
| 31435 Mr Alan Eggers | Agree | |
| 31449 Mr John Chisholm | Agree | |
| 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon | Agree | |
| 31508 Mr Roger Barlow | Agree | |
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | Agree | infrastructure is already there |
| 31608 Robbie Thomson | Agree | There is not a lot of agriculture around Nelson City these days. That good land has been build on. Wha |

| | | remains is largely hill country which works for residential, albeit at a higher infrastructure and build cost. |
|---------------------------------------|-------|--|
| 31622 Peter Butler | Agree | |
| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | Agree | |
| 31647 Mrs Rebecca Parish | Agree | |
| 31651 Dr Patrick Conway | Agree | |
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | Agree | In terms of greenfield development opportunities in the Nelson Tasman region, N-106 would have less effects on the state highway network than other greenfield sites which link to already congested state highway routes. |
| | | This site is reasonably close to central Nelson and its associated services and infrastructure. There is potential to provide viable active transport links from the development area to the existing multi-modal facilities and potential to align with the GPS for Land Transport. |
| 31656 Mr brad malcolm | Agree | |
| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | Agree | As mentioned above. |
| 31667 barbara nicholas | Agree | |
| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | Agree | |
| 31704 Mr Paul Bucknall | Agree | |
| 31713 Mrs Debora Scholl Dos Santos | Agree | I like to see that a much higher percentage goes into intensification rather than greenfield. I'd love if greenfield housing would be kept to a minimum. |
| 31718 Kathryn & Keith Quigley | Agree | |
| 31741 Mr Robert Stevenson | Agree | |
| 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert- Watene | Agree | |
| 31774 Mrs Jane Sutherland | Agree | |
| 31777 Mr David Lucas | Agree | Except for the Maitai development because looking overseas, these recreational green areas are lost forever at the detriment of ratepayers. |
| 31783 Mr Peter Jones | Agree | |
| | | |

| 31114 Ms Jill Rogers | Disagree | |
|------------------------|----------|---|
| 31130 Trevor James | Disagree | |
| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson | Disagree | Greenfield areas should be preserved. |
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | Disagree | Please see attached for further details. Summarised - oppose N19 intensification, oppose Maitai Valley, general opposition to entire document. |
| | | There is not the existing infrastructure to support that growth, thanks to council deliberately diverting money for infrastructure to non-essential spending. |
| | | Attachment text: The essential points I wished to make in my submission are: |
| | | The projected intensification for N19 will destroy the character of the neighbourhood, especially with townhouse and multi-story development. The plans will cancel the very reasons people have located in the area. |
| | | The Greenfield development for the Maitai Valley is a proposal contrary to the results of all previous consultation by council for this area, which residents have stated they want to keep as a recreational area. |
| | | This is the worst planning document I have seen since I was at university in California in the 1970s. Why is Nelson determined to repeat the same mistakes made elsewhere? Is it blind stupidity or sheer incompetence? California and other areas now wish that they had restrained the kind of development proposed in the document, which created urban slums. |

| 31275 Kate Shaw | Disagree | Please see attached (text copied below) |
|----------------------------|----------|--|
| | | To whom it may concern, |
| | | I would like to submit my disagreement to any greenfield expansion housing in the Maitai Valley, Kaka tributary, or Orchard Flats. The Maitai valley is an important resource for families where children can safely explore river swimming and forested green space. To lose this space would be a great disadvantage to the Nelson region. |
| | | Nga Mihi, |
| | | Kate Shaw |
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | Disagree | Green areas should be preserved for public recreation in intensified communities. |
| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | Disagree | DISAgree as I feel we should only be working on the brownfield land. The green land / bare land should be protected and areas for restoration for planting , environmental protection and or public green space. Intensify by working with existing buildings and areas of housing |
| 31373 Ms Jenny Daniell | Disagree | Intensification is more environmentally sustainable in the long run. |
| 31381 Robert Haas | Disagree | Please see attached = text copied below: |
| | | With reference to '2022 Future Development Strategy'. |
| | | Question 22: "Do you agree with the location and scale of the proposed greenfield housing areas in Nelson? |
| | | I do not agree with the location and scale of the proposed greenfield housing areas in Nelson. See below the reasons for my objection. |
| | | The Maitai Valley is too precious a resource to lose to a mass housing development. A new suburb in the Maitai Valley would no longer provide a peaceful escape from the urban environment. |
| | | Hundreds of houses in the Maitai Valley would degrade the widely recognised scenic value of the valley. |

| | | Maitai Valley Road and Nile Street as well as Collingwood, Brougham, Tasman, Milton and Bridge Street East would all become congested with much greater volumes of traffic (NZTA guidelines estimate thousands of vehicles per day) affecting safety, noise for residents and, passing schools, a creche, and NMIT. |
|---------------------------------------|----------|--|
| | | Robbert Haas |
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | Disagree | The greenfield housing areas need to be reduced and intensification increased. Unless this change is planned for, there will be no reduction in the carbon emissions. |
| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling | Disagree | Greenfield expansion just encourages more sprawl. It would be better to relax the rules on multi-purpose dwellings and offer incentives for mixed housing |
| 31416 Tim Leyland | Disagree | Once agricultural land is lost it cannot come back. |
| 31429 Richard Kyle | Disagree | Please see attached - text copied below: To whom it may concern |
| | | I wish to submit to the Council on the Future development strategy particularly in reference to question 22 Do you agree with the location and scale of the proposed greenfield housing areas in Nelson? |
| | | While I acknowledge that further housing areas are needed I would suggest intensification of current areas is first. I would like to formally oppose any greenfield expansion housing anywhere in the Maitai Valley, especially Kaka tributary or Orchard Flats as the wider Maitai catchment has a unique and important aspect to Nelson's wider community of being mostly housing free. It is accessible and for many with limited resources to travel further is respite from the city to swim and mix in relative peace by a wide and diverse community. To lose this would be a crime and sacrilege never to be able to be revisited. |
| | | Yours Richard Kyle formal Nelsonian with a desire to return) |
| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn Ball | Disagree | Disagree with residential re-zoning of the Maitai Valley. |

| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | Disagree | I oppose greenfield housing areas. Rather build higher and create good public transport. Keep the green areas that are still there! |
|-------------------------------|----------|---|
| 31481 Mrs Lucy Harrhy | Disagree | I disagree with all greenfield housing proposals. |
| 31484 Mr Gavin Brent Cook | Disagree | |
| 31485 Ms Robin Schiff | Disagree | Only if the planning starts from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
| 31488 Annette Starink | Disagree | It creates more car dependencytherefore we need public transport people can rely on. Car sales yards scattered, garages, warehouses and mega shops in and near the town centre is rediculous Valuable land for building homes near work, shops, schools etc Those big business can be moved to the outskirts of town. |
| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless | Disagree | |
| 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | Disagree | |
| 31520 Andrew Stirling | Disagree | Don't ruin the unique character of the Maitai Valley. |
| 31572 Mr David Todd | Disagree | |
| 31588 pene Greet | Disagree | |
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | Disagree | Better to have more intensification within Nelson if the area is made attractive with leafy green spaces between buildings and walkways etc |
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | Disagree | Do we need to build more greenfield homes, if we seek to build more intensive housing? |
| 31617 Ms steph jewell | Disagree | Unlikely I'll agree but sorry again, haven;t studied the proposal. |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | Disagree | For reasons and themes expressed elsewhere in this submission. Please try again. Think dense. Think far far more dense - and 5-10yrs not 30. |
| 31637 Ms Frances Kemble Welch | Disagree | |
| 31663 Roland Goos | Disagree | Determined from email "disagrees" with Question 22. Please see attached - text copied below: Answer to Question 22: "Do you agree with the location and scale of the proposed greenfield housing |
| | | |

| | | areas in Nelson? Please explain why." |
|-----------------------------|---------------|--|
| | | I don't want greenfield expansion housing anywhere in the Maitai Valley, especially Kaka tributary or Orchard Flats. There is no need for the destruction of this beautiful area. There are enough potential development sites around Nelson and as there is no reasonable plan for the infrastructure there should not even be talk about any development in the valley. Speaking in front of the council in '21 and to MP Rachel Boyack in '22 about this made me realise that the driving force behind any development in the Maitai valley is greed. It will have 0 impact on the social housing crisis as no affordable housing is planned. No thought has been put into the traffic-Desaster it will bring to the old parts of Nelson Not a good way forward! Cheers Roland |
| 31673 Mike Drake | Disagree | I haven't read the 76 page document. Any land developed needs to be high density housing. There needs to be a good cost benefit. One three bedroom house taking away food production is not a good swap. |
| 31688 Gerard McDonnell | Disagree | Greenfield development should be minimised. More intense brownfield development should be prioritised |
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | Disagree | |
| 31722 Trevor Chang | Disagree | |
| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | Disagree | Please see attached - Determined Disagree from submission: A: No we do not agree with the Orchard Flat area being included as potential future development. This is prime Maitai Valley recreational land. Having recreational land readily accessible by foot and bicycle from the centre of Nelson is a value most of us hold dear and development here should be resisted. With the Kaka Valley Greenfield development, although our convenor is in favour of it only the motor vehicle access is via Atawhai, the rest of our committee are not, so we reject this too. |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | Disagree | No other greenfields beyond plan changes in process. Net Enduring Restorative Outcomes and carrying capacity apply. Must be Papakainga opportunities. |
| 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | Don't know | Don't know what Greenfield housing is |
| 31219 Mrs kate windle | Don't know | |
| 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | Don't | |

| | know | |
|------------------------------|---------------|---|
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman | Don't | If these greenfield areas include the Maitai, no I don't agree. Where is the map? |
| | know | |
| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | Don't | |
| 31324 WII DHAILHAWUIUIILE | know | |
| 24225 Ma Casassins Business | | |
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | Don't know | |
| | | |
| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31406 Ms Floortje van Lierop | Don't | See above |
| , | know | |
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | Don't | |
| 31.11. Wis rerry (1833e) | know | |
| 31431 Katerina Seligman | Don't | |
| 31431 Vareillia Seligiliali | know | |
| 24452.44.5. :15. :1 | | |
| 31452 Mr David Bartle | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31473 Mr Andrew Downs | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | Don't | |
| | | |

| | know | |
|----------------------------|-------|--|
| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31483 Debbie Hampson | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31487 Ms Heather Spence | Don't | Need to maximise housing intensification withiin the existing town boundaries before going greenfields |
| | know | |
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31521 Mrs Marie Waterhouse | Don't | If it is going to happen - plan it correctly. NOt what you would want in an ideal world - we don't live in |
| | know | that ideal world - need to be realistic with what people require. |
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | Don't | Not assessed as I've needed to focus on area I know. |
| | know | |
| 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31598 Mrs Nicola Worsfold | Don't | |
| | - | |

| | know | |
|---------------------------------|---------------|--|
| 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31641 Mr Stephen (Steve) Hayden | _ | |
| | know | |
| 31643 Inge Koevoet | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | Don't | |
| 24522 | know | |
| 31693 Carolyn Rose | Don't know | |
| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | Don't | |
| 31094 Wil Greg Bate | know | |
| 31697 Robert King-Tenison | Don't | |
| 0_007 11000101111116 101110011 | know | |
| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | Don't | Not answering any of these leading questions |
| | know | |
| 31759 Mr Damian Campbell | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31784 Ms Teresa James | Don't know | |
| 2110F Mufanuay lamas | N/A | Limit grounfields development unless it is intensive |
| 31185 Myfanway James | | Limit greenfields development unless it is intensive. |
| 31363 Mr Steve Cross | N/A | I reject the premise of this question |
| 31364 Mrs Christine Tuffnell | N/A | I disagree with housing developments in the Maitai Valley. This area is a wonderful natural area used by many for peaceful recreation. |
| 31623 Ms Lucy Charlesworth | N/A | I am wary of answering this question as I cannot be sure of how my answer will be interpreted. So I will |
| | | state - I do not agree with developing green spaces. These spaces need to be reserved and protected to allow for sustainable biodiversity and for future generations. Intensification within Nelson CBD needs to |
| | | |

| | | be a priority. I do not agrees with building on Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. I do not agree with housing development on green fields. There is a climate emergency. Remove these areas from the FDS. |
|---|---------|---|
| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | Neutral | I believe intensification should be the priority over greenfield development particuarly if there is a genuine interest to enhance the mauri of te taiao |
| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | Neutral | |
| 31129 Mrs Gaynor Brooks | Neutral | |
| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | Neutral | |
| 31192 Ms Rebecca Patchett | Neutral | |
| 31227 Ms Lee Eliott | Neutral | |
| 31240 Michael Markert | Neutral | |
| 31250 Mr Richard Wyles | Neutral | |
| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | Neutral | |
| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | Neutral | |
| 31286 Mr David Short | Neutral | |
| 31309 Mr & Mrs Rose & Phillip Windle | Neutral | |
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | Neutral | |
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | Neutral | |
| 31347 Ms Paula Baldwin | Neutral | Not sure about this question what is greenfield housing? On the 5a Map showing the strategy for Nelson City Centre, there isn't any greenfield; but purple, red an pink areas. Purple = yes. No to everything else. |
| 31355 Mr Barney Hoskins | Neutral | |
| 31365 michael monti | Neutral | |
| 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer | Neutral | |
| 31403 Mr Richard Deck | Neutral | |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas Hollyman | Neutral | |
| | | |

| 31430 Muriel Moran | Neutral | Any green field housing should be a last choice but where such fields are surrounded by housing and therefore much less likely to be used for food production due to the close proximity of housing then it probably makes sense. |
|--------------------------------|---------|--|
| 31434 Mrs cushla Moorhead | Neutral | |
| 31441 Mr Chris Head | Neutral | Again, it feels as though this expansion is being rushed through without due consideration for future-proofing (just continuing to expand the way we've always done it). I understand Council's concern about market perceptions regarding intensification vs greenfield (the assumption I suppose being that Kiwis want their own plot of land) but I think if the Councils did a good job of planning and sharing how intensification would create opportunities for property ownership and engagement in neighbourhoods and communities, that there would be a high level of uptake, particularly from international immigrants who are more used to this style of living. I think the Councils should be wary of just playing to perception of what they think people want. There will be uptake either way, and it is up to the Councils to take the lead on how we manage housing development in our City. |
| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | Neutral | |
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | Neutral | |
| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | Neutral | Only if the planning starts from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | Neutral | I am not as informed about these area I'm sorry. |
| 31505 Cheryl Heten | Neutral | |
| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | Neutral | |
| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | Neutral | Neutral. NMH has lodged a separate submission on the Mahitahi Bayview Plan Change. In that submission, we have stressed the importance of universal design requirements, the need for affordable housing and the adoption of inclusionary zoning, a variety of typologies, the adoption of a Life Cycle Assessment to provide useful information to support eco-efficient and to reduce the climate impact of buildings, further investment in prioritising walking and cycling routes, and requirements for cycle and electronic scooter parking, and the creation of accessible recreational areas. |
| | | |

| 31549 Mr Ian McComb | Neutral | Agree that some greenfield housing is required to cater for future demand, but how much is already catered for in existing growth areas? A greater emphasis should be placed on infill and intensification. |
|--------------------------------|---------|--|
| 31551 Mrs Jo Kitchen | Neutral | |
| 31558 Mr Steve Jordan | Neutral | |
| 31560 Ms Steph Watts | Neutral | If there is allowance for tiny homes and/ sustainably built homes on sections rather than the current trend for enormous houses. Do away with covenents on minimum sizes for homes and have covenents that allow for a % cover of trees and vegetation on each section to absorb carbon, catch rain and attrac wildlife. |
| 31574 Mr David Bolton | Neutral | |
| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | Neutral | Only where necessary when people indicate they want to, and need to move to Nelson. Nelson is already a small city and will naturally grow which is normal. As above, don't try to 'create' new towns in rural areas. Expand the infrastructure we already have. It's about people not money |
| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | Neutral | |
| 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz | Neutral | |
| 31606 Mr Trent Shepard | Neutral | |
| 31614 Mr mark Morris | Neutral | |
| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | Neutral | |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | Neutral | |
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | Neutral | I am not an expert and able to comment everything. Please listen to Joni Tomsett or Tim Neubauer. I think they represent my ideas. |
| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | Neutral | |
| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | Neutral | |
| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | Neutral | |
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | Neutral | |
| 31692 Mr Alasdair Gardiner | Neutral | |
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | Neutral | See attached submission. Summarised - no specific comments on this question, generally supports FDS |
| 31716 Mr Alan hart | Neutral | |

| 31726 Mr John Jackson | Neutral | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31744 Mrs Lorna CRANE | Neutral | |
| 31752 Jill Pearson | Neutral | |
| 31765 Mrs Lorna Ivy Cooper | Neutral | |
| 31775 Dr Thomas Carl | Neutral | |
| 31835 Mr Ian Wishart | Neutral | NCC has little option but to build on terraces below Barnicoat range & Atawhai. Please no more bespoke massed house. Get creative guys. |
| 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | Strongly agree | Good. There are some future conflicts here regarding sea level rise and flooding issues. It may make development less viable. Also from a planning perspective, this needs to be enabled and Nelson has a lo of historic heritage buildings which may prevent some of this development taking place. |
| 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | Strongly agree | |
| 31284 Mr Jarmo Saloranta | Strongly agree | |
| 31356 Stephen Williams | Strongly agree | Growth should occur close to employment opportunities and existing infrastructure. |
| 31358 George Harrison | Strongly agree | |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | Strongly agree | It is providing housing where work, services , and amenities are. |
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | Strongly agree | I do not agree with any of these. We do not want Greenfield development. Stop it now and think creatively. |
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | Strongly agree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our lovely landscape into a concrete and tarmac covered greyscape |
| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | Strongly agree | Very opposed to building in greenfield - prefer brownfield intensification. |
| 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | Strongly agree | |
| 31815 Peter Wilks | Strongly agree | |

| 31836 Paula M Wilks | Strongly agree | As above. |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31836 Paula M Wilks | Strongly agree | As above. |
| 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | Strongly disagree | Greenfield housing without developer-financed public transport will increase GHGs and environmental impacts. |
| 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS | Strongly disagree | |
| 31118 Ms Sarah Varey | Strongly disagree | I think it is vitally important that the NCC is forward-thinking and does NOT consent to greenfield housing development in the Maitai Valley (Kaka tributary and Orchard Flats). |
| | | This is a green space that is used recreationally by many - walkers, bikers, dogs, picnickers, swimmers. school and church groups etc. It is SO close to town that it can be accessed by foot (or bike) making it an absolute gem. |
| | | Planners in New York managed to ring-fence Central Park from housing development. Look at an aerial photo and see what an expanse of green is in this major city. Those planners knew how vital preserving it was. Similarly the large parks of London. |
| | | You might say that New York or London are not Nelson, you're right, but they once were that size and planners with foresight kept precious green spaces for all. |
| 31122 Mr Johan Thomas Wahlgren | Strongly disagree | Absolutely against the destruction of the Maitai valley/ kaka valley/ orchard flats. Such an important asset for Nelsonians. Do not want any greenfield expansion, look at what is going on in the world, do you think it is a good trade - a house instead of food production?? |
| 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | Strongly disagree | Changing the rural landscape in the Maitai valley, Kaka valley and Orchard Flats will deprive both resident and visitors to Nelson of a special recreational area, used and appreciated both historically and currantly by all. |
| | | I object to the proposed housing developement, and wish it to be left unchanged, as it is, for future |
| | | generations to enjoy. For reasons of climate change, maintaining the health of the Maitai river, and avoidance of pollution in all its forms my preference is strengthened, and I cannot understand how a housing development has even |

| 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren | Strongly disagree | Leave any greenfield area proposed for development alone, especially in Maitai valley as It would destroy the natural environment of the valley, ecosystems and create higher risks for flooding and contaminant of the Maitai River. The recreational opportunity for the community would be lost and the character of a beloved valley erased forever. The traffic would clog up the inner city and thousands of cars every day commuting through the valley leaving it polluted and unsafe for others to travel by bike, walking or running. |
|-------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31135 Mr Tony Haddon | Strongly disagree | Council has over the years received considerable feedback opposing residential development of the Maitai Valley. It needs to take notice of this as required by the regional policy statement Pg44 DH1 Urbar expansion "The people of Nelson also have opinions in terms of what they value in their environment. Some assessment of these values is required to indicate whether they are compatible with continued urban growth." |
| 31136 Mrs Sophie Bisdee | Strongly disagree | It will forever change the nature of our valley that makes Nelson so unique. I think for the mental health of all Nelsonians that love this valley , that we leave it in peace. Put apartments in the city center. Leave our valley . |
| 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward | Strongly disagree | There should be no greenfield development in the Maitai Valley, including the Kaka tributary and Orchard Flats. This area should be preserved as a valuable recreational resource for the people of Nelson. |
| 31138 Mr Tony Haddon | Strongly disagree | Council has over the years received significant feedback opposing residential development in the Maitai Valley. Please see attached file - summarised below: Save the Maitai Petition with comments, 9636 signatures |
| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | Strongly disagree | The Maitai area has huge amenity value as an undeveloped green space. Losing this from the Nelson central area would be a big loss to the people of Nelson that walk their dogs, swim, play with thier kids and play sports on the now quiet roads. That many houses would create a busy, noisy and much less desirable feel to the valley. Water quality would suffer, as would the things that live in the river. |
| 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert | Strongly disagree | Please see attached for further detail: I don't want Greenfield expansion housing anywhere in the Maitai Valley, especially Kaka tributary or Orchard Flats - My submission is that: |

Private Plan change 28 should be declined

- 1. I request that you protect the Maitai Valley and the Kaka stream as a significant Landscape. The proposed urban development would result in loss of open space in the city's greenbelt, and conflict with recreational values. Undeveloped green spaces like the Maitai Valley are essential for people's health and wellbeing. It is a backdrop to many of the most popular recreational areas in the Maitai valley including the swimming holes, walking and biking tracks and the cricket grounds.
- 2. Opportunities for intensification of existing built areas should be exhausted before any more urban sprawl is allowed. There is sufficient land for housing within the Nelson city without this site, we only need to look at the example in the Toi Toi reserve where land within biking and walking distance to the CBD is being developed with affordable housing . Traditional housing developments with urban sprawl are not the way of the future, instead the NCC needs to focus on policies and support to enable intensification within the boundaries of our city. Until July 2020 , your very own website said " In response to submissions the council has decided not to pursue residential rezoning in the Maitai Valley (Nelson Urban Growth Strategy 2006)
- 3. There are no existing public transport routes, meaning transport will be predominantly private cars. The development's transport and buildings are not consistent with the decarbonisation pathways required to achieve net zero carbon.4. Ongoing sedimentation of the river from site works over 30 40 years, plus hydrological changes and pollutants from increased stormwater runoff from the new suburb will cause long-term degradation of the Maitai River. This will adversely affect the many highly valued swimming holes nearby (including Dennes Hole, Black Hole and Girlies Hole) and Nelson Haven. It will also affect residents down stream and I am worried about the potential for flooding.
- 5. The development is contrary to the strategy of ecological restoration of the Maitai tributaries and taonga species. The value of the site as habitat (including for pekapeka/native bats) has not been adequately investigated and urbanisation of this habitat could have significant adve

31141 Libby Newton

Strongly disagree

To align with our Smart little City title we MUST be preserving green spaces.

There are a large number of people from so many countries and walks of life who speak and write about this. Green spaces are essential for our health and wellbeing. Physically, mentally and emotionally. We have a perfect opportunity to learn from mistakes already made and ensure we preserve these spaces in our city.

What an irreparable loss if we refused to take heed and thought of profit only, for our citizens now and

| | | for generations to come. I would feel truly sad to see this happen here in Nelson. Please preserve our green spaces. Thank You. |
|---------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | Strongly disagree | Intensify the Port reclaimed land . |
| 31143 Ms Prudence Roborgh | Strongly disagree | The development of the Maitai Valley has alarmed & drawn passionate opposition & submissions from over 740 people & over 12.000 people have signed a petition who for environmental, biodiversity, mental health, recreational, religious reasons see this valley as sacrosanct and a well utilised Green Space close to the city. Is it arrogance or ignorance to ignore the views of the people by whom you were elected to represent our best interests. |
| 31145 Ms Maggie Sweetman | Strongly disagree | In this day and age we need places that are close to go to for our mental health. To be in nature is the best thing for us humans .please don't take this from us . The rate we are going with the sizes of houses we will use up all the land very soon and what for !for dwellings housing a few people it's madness. We need nature that's why we moved to nelson to get away from urban sprawl now here we are again god help us |
| 31149 Mr Richard Friend | Strongly disagree | NO development in the Matai / Kaka valley region, NO change of zoning. Rural and preserve that status for all future Nelsonians. |
| 31171 Ms Sallie Griffiths | Strongly disagree | We need areas of green, we do not need more subdivisions, grow up not out. |
| 31173 Mr Roderick Watson | Strongly disagree | development along Maitai will destroy valuable natural asset, feel of Nels I love walking along river, and it so close to town .Also infrastructure inadequate - Nile st will become clogged up producing more ghg. And the houses will not solve the housing shortage, more likely to provide great views for those with lots of money. |
| 31174 Ms Alison Westerby | Strongly disagree | Development along Maitai will spoil the character of nelson. Locals stay here because it's beautiful place with easy access to nature. I love walking along the river, and it's so close to town. Also infrastructure inadequate - Nile st will become clogged up producing more ghg. And the houses will not solve the housing shortage, more likely to provide great views for those with lots of money. Main beneficiaries of Maitai development will developers. |
| 31184 Mr Stuart Campbell | Strongly disagree | Agree with the need for more affordable housing but reports suggest this can be achieved without damaging the natural environment of the Maitai. |
| 31186 Mr Gary Scott | Strongly | Maitai Valley/Kaka valley needs to be left alone. Do not build any houses in the Maitai valley or Orchard |
| | | |

| | disagree | flats. I don't trust the developers to be honest with us. Once the Valley is gone it can never be returned to the iconic peaceful haven we all enjoy. The increase in traffic, the noise, pollution of the river, the loss of green space so close to the city and the ugliness of the proposed subdivision are all reasons not to build there. |
|---------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31187 Mr David Ward | Strongly disagree | The area shown as N 032 is completely unsuitable for development - it is far too steep to be developed. There is nothing flat about it which raises the question of the competence (lack of) involved in including it in the first place. It is incorrectly referred to as "Orchard Flat". Orchard Flat (the paddocks bordering the Maitai River) is designated as a Reserve. |
| 31191 Mrs Linda McDougall | Strongly disagree | Absolutely disagree. That area must be prioritized as a green space to be used enjoyed looked at and enhanced by all members of our community. Not for housing. |
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | Strongly disagree | I strongly do not agree with this. The Maitai valley /Kaka valley is the sole remaining quiet close respite for all central nelsonians and to recommend any change that would lead to the destruction of this would be a disservice to those many thousands of Nelsonians. |
| 31197 Ms Catherine Parry | Strongly disagree | I am against the spread of housing into the Matai Valley and Kaka Valley in particular. That is a beautiful park that I use daily. Bringing in developers not only spoils the land for future use but it means YEARS of construction congestion, noise, and degradation of the landscape meaning loss of wildlife forever. There are many options not being considered and too much influence by developers in this decision process. |
| 31200 Mrs Jo Watson | Strongly disagree | I am very definitely against the areas in the Maitai Valley being earmarked for intensification. It is currently zoned as rural and should be left as such - it has been protected for more than a century until it was erroneously included in the 2019 plan. Councillors may agree or disagree about how this arose but personally, I did not recognise the areas of Kaka Valley and Orchard Flat as it was then referred to and therefore did not raise any objection. Obviously if the words "Maitai Valley" had been correctly used, there would have been hundreds of objections raised at that time. |
| | | I have managed to get through life without protesting about any other matter but I just cannot let this one pass. There are people far more expert than me who will outline the many reasons why not but it seems blatantly obvious that the Maitai Valley is just not the place for such a development. Yes, I have heard the argument that the tracks etc. will still be there and of course they will but no-one can possibly believe that the area will not be negatively impacted forever. I see problems ahead for the health of the river, the huge impact of the additional traffic, not just on the Maitai area but for the many roads leading from there. As a frequent user of the area, the road is just not suitable for a huge increase in users - there are two known dodgy areas (one lane bridges/intersections) - will ratepayers be liable for costs of |

| | | improvement needed to save lives? Additional issues regarding flood plains have also been raised. I note also that while the figures originally talked about were 750 houses for Kaka, the plan change application was submitted for 350 and now it has miraculously risen to 900 - how can that possibly be? Additionally, I just cannot reconcile the fact that the Mahitahi Project was granted circa \$3m to restore the ecosystem of the Maitai Valley and here we have Council now pushing for intensive housing development in the very same area. How can these two "projects" possibly achieve the same outcomes. |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| | | I have read recently about Te Mana o Te Wai which is now the law and states that the health of the river must come first; health of environment before economy. Or does this not apply in Nelson? |
| | | Please Councillors, do not play into the hands of the developers - once this is done, it is done and future generations will look back and be incredulous at the decision taken. Do not "pave paradise and put in a parking lot". |
| 31202 Jonas Asmussen | Strongly disagree | I do not support the development of housing in the lower Maitai valley/Kaka valley. It should be kept rural and protected for the enjoyment of future generations. the additional housing is not needed and the damage caused by such a development far outweighs the benefits for the public, in my opinion, it is also irreversible. I don't believe promises that the damage to the river and the pressure on the infrastructure can be avoided or mitigated once the green light for such a development is given. I am surprised that the 10 000+ signatures the "Save the Maitai" movement has collected are not a clear enough sign for the Council that they have to even include this question in this survey. Will you repeat the question in different forms and places until you get the answer you want? |
| 31216 Ms Judith Holmes | Strongly disagree | Intensify. Build upwards! |
| 31225 Mrs Beverley Diane Trengrove | Strongly disagree | I am opposed to any residential zoning proposed by Maitahi Bayview Development in the KAka Valley, Stretching into the MAitai Valley based on: |
| | | loss of open spacesconflicts with recreational valueeffects of more traffic and noise in the valley |
| 31229 Mr Dave North | Strongly disagree | Additional housing out of town will increase commuter costs, congestion and greenhouse gas emissions |
| 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | Strongly | I don't like the idea of runoff into the Maitai. In Austin, Texas, where I come from, an area in the heart of |
| | | |

| | disagree | the city Barton Springs (kinda like Pupu Springs) has been kept free from development and disturbance by activists who have worked for decades to keep the city's hands off the property. After they started showcasing Barton Springs as a tourist attraction, the city has kept its distance. It's now more valuable to them as a swimming hole and a trail through the canyons than as a place to erect buildings. |
|----------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | Strongly disagree | Strongly disagree with ANY greenfield development because of climate change, as well as productive needs. |
| 31237 Mr David Powdrell | Strongly disagree | I don't want to have the Maitai valley and surrounds spoiled and polluted both by noise,air,and water damage,caused by the massive proposed housing developement planned for that area. |
| 31238 Mr Patrick Burke | Strongly disagree | Strongly disagree with 3-6 Storey housing proposed for the Tahunanui N026-034 area. I have been a manager of high level apartments in Auckland and know the effects they have which are detrimental to current living conditions in this area. This area includes Centennial Rd Muritai St Parkers Rd and Golf Rd I disagree with intensfication in general in these areas. |
| 31242 Ms Suzie Ilina | Strongly disagree | One of the special qualities of Nelson is that you can actually walk to outside the city and enjoy nature. This is beneficial to the physical and mental health of the population and should be preserved. We want to enjoy the country, fields, rivers and trees, we do not want acres and acres of more houses and the destruction of nature. |
| 31245 Mrs Robyn Fitzsimons | Strongly disagree | Specifically the Maitai, Kaka Valley, Orchard Flat area. This area should not be built on, it should be retained as a park for recreation, peace and appreciation of its natural environment. This is so necessary for healthy humans. It is the only area of a decent size that is accessible to the elderly and young alike. It is within walking and easy biking distance from the city. As Nelson grows this space will become even more vital! |
| 31246 Mr dean Straker | Strongly disagree | I would like my 5 acre section at 123 halifax st to be included in the N-109 Wood South zoning. It appears highly illogical that such a large section of land would not be included when it is currently zoned residential. I would like the team behind the FDS to explain the reasoning behind this ommission as, by excluding this parcel of land, I don't think the council have fulfilled the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development. |
| 31247 Mr yuri aristarco | Strongly disagree | This is simple madness. The Matai valley should remain untouched. It's a Nelson landmark Like central park in New York! We are the only city in the world that has wilderness within walking distance from the CBD why should we lose this? For what? In the name of what? Other houses? I bet that the Central Park land is far more valuable that the Matai Valley, I also bet that the urgency for housing in Manhattan is far more need that in Nelson but there are limits that we shouldn't cross to save our city beauty, to save our |

| | | life quality and wellbeing. This is a crucial battle for Nelson and to decide what kind of future we want for our city. |
|---------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | Strongly disagree | Keep out of the Maitai at all costs. If you don't know why by now, you never will. |
| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley | Strongly disagree | I see Nelson's future including lots of residential housing in the city centre and opportunities to walk or cycle to areas of recreation. I see the Maitai River as the most important area of recreation we have. It is peaceful and life enhancing. Many people have worked hard to help the river recover from past (and current) pollution. Tha Maitai is our Taonga and a place for renewal, where we walk away from noise into peace. |
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | Strongly disagree | Areas such a sKaka Valley and Waahi are places of beauty and diversity. They must be preserved. |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | Strongly disagree | Leave the Matai as "Nelson central park" |
| 31278 Wendy Ross | Strongly disagree | Nelson is already heavily intensified with few green areas left. The idea in the local paper re building up and over the car parks seems to be a great jplan if it is done with sympathy and with great need for the residents lifestyle. And not yet another "let's build it and see" mentality. |
| 31279 Mr Jeremy Thompson | Strongly disagree | Per answer 3, Nelson needs to regard what little greenspace immediately surrounding the city as sacrosanct with its current role being to provide valuable greenspace for existing Nelson residents to enjoy while remaining as a positive contribution to our community's commitment to New Zealand's climate Change obligations. One day not far away in the future, the current 'leadership mantra' of GDP Growth is the only way forwards will be recognised as the reason we face climate change catastrophy (look at Gisborne last week, Queensland and NSW the previous week - think WHY?) but NCC seem to not be seeing the results of continuing with the destructive status quo. |
| | | NCC: Please wake up. We need to devise strategies that increase CO2 consumption and increase O2 production. Placing vast swathes of greenfields land under housing is fundamentally wrong for Nelson's existing citizens. To do so is to invite further increases to costly weather events. Less greenfileds, more housing, more people = increased deterioration of our climate and increased insurance costs which will one day cause litigation to be aimed at Councils that made decisions that caused it. |
| 31287 Ms Suzanne Bateup | Strongly disagree | I disagree with the proposed greenfield housing expansion anywhere in the Maitai Valley, especially the Kaka tributary or Orchard Flats. The Maitai/Mahitahi River is a taonga in Whakatū Nelson. It is an integral part of the city, linking us, within a a few minutes from the CBD, to peaceful green spaces; walking, running and cycling tracks; and |
| | | |

| | | I am concerned that the proposed greenfield housing in these areas will destroy this peaceful river valley and have major environmental and social impacts. The proposed development does not align with the strategy of ecological restoration of the Maitai tributaries and taonga species. The value of the site as habitat (including for pekapeka/native bats) has not been adequately investigated and urbanisation of this habitat could have significant adverse impacts. Hydrological changes and pollutants from increased stormwater runoff from the housing will cause long-term degradation of the Maitai River. Engineered changes to the Maitai River floodplains and Kaka Stream realignment will create a flood risk for downstream residents and impact on the mana, habitat value and natural character of these waterbodies. Issues of the safety, noise, air pollution and climate impacts from construction traffic and new resident's vehicles, plus through traffic if this becomes a temporary or long-term alternative to SH6 will be huge. Once this taonga is lost, it is lost forever. |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | Strongly disagree | Leave green, green. |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | Strongly disagree | Please see attached for further detail: Does not support Greenfield development in the Maitai and Orchard Flats. |
| 31322 Mrs BARBARA AND TIM ROBSON | Strongly disagree | |
| 31328 Ms Karen du Fresne | Strongly disagree | |
| 31334 Diane Sutherland | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons above |
| 31339 Ms Karen Berge | Strongly disagree | I strongly oppose the greenfield expansion now showing on Orchard Flat in the Maitai Valley. Housing development in the Kaka Valley would inevitably increase traffic flows down the Maitai Valley to and from Nelson, but houses located on Orchard Flat would also change the entire character of a precious accessible green resource which adds so much to Nelson's quality and uniqueness. How can the council achieve it's stated goals of combating climate change and improving our environmental footprint while allowing this development to proceed? |
| 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman | Strongly disagree | It is counter-productive of the supposed anti- climate change stance supposedly adopted by NCC. It is obvious that the already established developed areas in the central areas should be more densely occupied if the obsession with growth must be satisfied. The surrounding green areas MUST be preserved to provide the lungs of the City as well as maintaining the areas for passive recreation. Allow Richmond to expand into the surrounding flat, horticultural land if that fulfills the wish for GROWTH! |

| disagree plan. | | | |
|--|----------------------------|-----|---|
| Strongly disagree Depose turning more of our landscape into suburbs and commuter zones. Depose turning more of our landscape into suburbs and commuter zones. Depose turning more of our landscape into suburbs and commuter zones. Depose turning more of our landscape into suburbs and commuter zones. Depose turning more of our landscape into suburbs and commuter zones. Depose turning more of our landscape into suburbs and commuter zones. Depose turning more of our landscape into suburbs and commuter zones. Depose turning more of our landscape into suburbs and commuter zones. Depose turning more of our landscape into suburbs and commuter zones. Depose the fere into uncase). The existing Nelson community has a very strong voice on this, please listen to us. Depose the class of turning and a reason people love coming to Nelson and want to mentry value, an icon for the Nelson area and a reason people love coming to Nelson and want to mentry value, an icon for the Nelson area and a reason people love coming to Nelson and want to mentry value, an icon for the Nelson area and a reason people love coming to Nelson and want to mentry value, an icon for the Nelson area and a reason people love coming to Nelson and want to mentry value, an icon for the Nelson area and a reason people love coming to Nelson and want to mentry value, an icon for the Nelson area and a reason people love coming to Nelson and want to mentry value, an icon for the Nelson area and a reason people love coming to Nelson and want to mentry value, an icon for the Nelson area and a reason people love coming to Nelson and want to mentry value, an icon for the Nelson area and a reason people love coming to Nelson and want to mentry value, an icon for the Nelson area and a reason people love coming to Nelson and want to mentry value, an icon for the Nelson area and a reason people love coming to Nelson and want to mentry value, an icon for the Nelson area values. Even and value very value value value value value value value value valu | 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | | |
| disagree We have enough of these already and need to preserve our rural and productive land. Strongly disagree with the two greenfield developments proposed in the Maitai. This is an area of high disagree with the two greenfield developments proposed in the Maitai. This is an area of high amenity value, an icon for the Nelson area and a reason people love coming to Nelson and want to me here (in our case). The existing Nelson community has a very strong voice on this, please listen to us. I area would never retain the same values. Even a low impact subdivision design cannot stop future residents from polluting the waterway through everyday behaviours (washing car, stripping paint, etc And picnicking or swimming along this unique river will never be the same if we're essentially doing it someone's backyard. Strongly disagree 1 oppose the development of Orchard Flats N32 which I think is even worse. The Maitai Valley is currently is a green recreation area available to everyone - building houses in it is vandalism. Please designate the Maitai Valley as recreation land and keep it green and open for current and future resid single the Maitai Valley as recreation land and keep it green and open for current and future resid warnings, and these warnings are shrill now. Let alone the materials needed and out-of-stock! Green development was a 20th century growth model that has had its time, and is now contra-indicated for most important needs this decade, to reduce GHG's fast. Strongly disagree 1 tooks as if the council is ignoring g the wishes of a huge percentage of the citizens in the Nelson area development in the Maitai Valley including Kaka tributary or Orchard Flats. Petit disagree for the citizens of the citizens of the citizens of the omest likely in a floodplain. Strongly disagree for the natural environment far outweigh the dubious claim that the development would provial environment far outweigh the dubious claim that the development would provial effordable housing. 1100 houses in this area would ch | 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | | It's foolhardy to have greenfield housing areas. I agree neither with the intensification or the scale of the plan. |
| disagree amenity value, an icon for the Nelson area and a reason people love coming to Nelson and want to me here (in our case). The existing Nelson community has a very strong voice on this, please listen to us. 1 area would never retain the same values. Even a low impact subdivision design cannot stop future residents from polluting the waterway through everyday behaviours (washing car, stripping paint, etc. And picnicking or swimming along this unique river will never be the same if we're essentially doing it someone's backyard. 1 oppose the development of housing in Kaka Valley in the Maitai Valley area (area N106) and I strong oppose the possible development of Orchard Flats N32 which I think is even worse. The Maitai Valley is currently is a green recreation area available to everyone - building houses in it is vandalism. Please designate the Maitai Valley as recreation land and keep it green and open for current and future resid singures. 13353 Mr Hilary Blundell Strongly disagree worse and more distant from centres. Those arguing for more green field subdivision are not heeding warnings, and these warnings are shrill now. Let alone the materials needed and out-of-stock! Green development was a 20th century growth model that has had its time, and is now contra-indicated for most important needs this decade, to reduce GHG's fast. 13362 Ms Fiona Macdonald Strongly disagree turning Kaka Valley into luxury housing is bad enough - now you intend to ruin the river on the other too most likely in a floodplain 1 strongly oppose any development in the Maitai Valley including Kaka tributary or Orchard Flats. Petit have been signed, and hundreds of submissions made to express opposition to the proposed development of this beautiful, unique recreational area. Infrastructure pressures, flooding risks and the impact on the natural environment far outweigh the dubious claim that the development would provi affordable housing. 1100 houses in this area would change the valley completely, reducing access to | 31346 Martin Hartman | • . | |
| disagree oppose the possible development of Orchard Flats N32 which I think is even worse. The Maitai Valley is currently is a green recreation area available to everyone - building houses in it is vandalism. Please designate the Maitai Valley as recreation land and keep it green and open for current and future resid designate the Maitai Valley as recreation land and keep it green and open for current and future resid designate the Maitai Valley as recreation land and keep it green and open for current and future resid standards. The proposed designate the Maitai Valley as recreation land and keep it green and open for current and future resid standards. The proposed designate the Maitai Valley as recreation land and keep it green and open for current and future resid designate the Maitai Valley in specific proposed development of Drchard Flats N32 which I think is even worse. The Maitai Valley including Kaka tributary or Orchard Flats Petit have been signed, and hundreds of submissions made to express opposition to the proposed development of this beautiful, unique recreational area. Infrastructure pressures, flooding risks and thin pact on the natural environment far outweigh the dubious claim that the development would proviaffordable housing. 1100 houses in this area would change the valley completely, reducing access to | 31349 Laurien Heijs | | residents from polluting the waterway through everyday behaviours (washing car, stripping paint, etc). And picnicking or swimming along this unique river will never be the same if we're essentially doing it in |
| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell Strongly disagree more and more distant from centres. Those arguing for more green field subdivision are not heeding warnings, and these warnings are shrill now. Let alone the materials needed and out-of-stock! Green development was a 20th century growth model that has had its time, and is now contra-indicated for most important needs this decade, to reduce GHG's fast. 31361 Mrs Lyn Crowlesmith Strongly disagree Turning Kaka Valley into luxury housing is bad enough - now you intend to ruin the river on the other stoo most likely in a floodplain Strongly disagree I strongly oppose any development in the Maitai Valley including Kaka tributary or Orchard Flats. Petit have been signed, and hundreds of submissions made to express opposition to the proposed development of this beautiful, unique recreational area. Infrastructure pressures, flooding risks and the impact on the natural environment far outweigh the dubious claim that the development would provi affordable housing. 1100 houses in this area would change the valley completely, reducing access to | 31350 Ms Janet Tavener | • , | I oppose the development of housing in Kaka Valley in the Maitai Valley area (area N106) and I strongly oppose the possible development of Orchard Flats N32 which I think is even worse. The Maitai Valley as it is currently is a green recreation area available to everyone - building houses in it is vandalism. Please designate the Maitai Valley as recreation land and keep it green and open for current and future residents |
| disagree more and more distant from centres. Those arguing for more green field subdivision are not heeding warnings, and these warnings are shrill now. Let alone the materials needed and out-of-stock! Green development was a 20th century growth model that has had its time, and is now contra-indicated for most important needs this decade, to reduce GHG's fast. Strongly disagree Turning Kaka Valley into luxury housing is bad enough - now you intend to ruin the river on the other stoo most likely in a floodplain Strongly disagree Have been signed, and hundreds of submissions made to express opposition to the proposed development of this beautiful, unique recreational area. Infrastructure pressures, flooding risks and the impact on the natural environment far outweigh the dubious claim that the development would proving affordable housing. 1100 houses in this area would change the valley completely, reducing access to | 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | | |
| disagree Turning Kaka Valley into luxury housing is bad enough - now you intend to ruin the river on the other stoo most likely in a floodplain Strongly disagree Have been signed, and hundreds of submissions made to express opposition to the proposed development of this beautiful, unique recreational area. Infrastructure pressures, flooding risks and the impact on the natural environment far outweigh the dubious claim that the development would provide affordable housing. 1100 houses in this area would change the valley completely, reducing access to | 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | | Times up on green field subdivision, sorry. There is no justification left - it creates car-centric suburbs more and more distant from centres. Those arguing for more green field subdivision are not heeding the warnings, and these warnings are shrill now. Let alone the materials needed and out-of-stock! Green field development was a 20th century growth model that has had its time, and is now contra-indicated for our most important needs this decade, to reduce GHG's fast. |
| disagree have been signed, and hundreds of submissions made to express opposition to the proposed development of this beautiful, unique recreational area. Infrastructure pressures, flooding risks and the impact on the natural environment far outweigh the dubious claim that the development would provide affordable housing. 1100 houses in this area would change the valley completely, reducing access to | 31361 Mrs Lyn Crowlesmith | • , | It looks as if the council is ignoring g the wishes of a huge percentage of the citizens in the Nelson area. Turning Kaka Valley into luxury housing is bad enough - now you intend to ruin the river on the other side, too most likely in a floodplain |
| | 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | • . | development of this beautiful, unique recreational area. Infrastructure pressures, flooding risks and the impact on the natural environment far outweigh the dubious claim that the development would provide affordable housing. 1100 houses in this area would change the valley completely, reducing access to |

| 31366 Ms Maree Sharland | Strongly disagree | I strongly disagree with the proposed greenfield housing areas that the Nelson City Council is supporting in the Maitai Valley - Kākā Valley and Orchard Flats. Supporting these areas for mass housing is lazy policy. We elect our Councils in the hope that they will show some vision and back bone, a Council that will lead us into a better future bearing in mind the climate crisis we have got ourselves into, and the harmful effects of the increasing urban sprawl around towns and cities all over the country. Urban sprawl is a major threat to the sustainability of the planet and to the lives of our people. Urban sprawl results in relatively low density neighbourhoods with virtually no street or community life, masses of cement and asphalt. Property developers will almost always prefer greenfield developments on the peripheries, to the complexities of brownfield regeneration but we want liveable urban neighbourhoods - towns and cities where buildings are three plus stories high, located on narrow streets with pavements, trees and small piazzas for social engagement, with good connections to motorised and non-motorised forms of transport. This way our cities begin to live again, there is hope for the retailers and hospitality operators in our city, and there is hope for the environment. Please have a look (and learn from) the examples of successes and failures around the world. City Councillors you have a great deal of responsibility. Carbon constraints make urban sprawl untenable. However, the alternative of a liveable, accessible, multicentred (institutions, education, businesses, green and residential areas all within walkable distance allowing access to all the benefits of urban living without the need for transportation), high density Nelson, saves the Maitai, a well loved well used sanctuary for Nelsonians and visitors, and makes a positive contribution to world climate targets. Hand it over to the developers and the lower reaches of the Valley will be decimated forever. The traffic alone will destroy the peace |
|------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | Strongly disagree | No high rise buildings over 3 stories anywhere |
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | Strongly disagree | Definitely do not put housing in the Maitai Valley. There are heaps of sections being developed in the Bayview/Atawhai subdivision, Whakapuaka subdivision and Enner Glynn etcalong with these sites, and intensification why would you need to use greenspace areas such as the Maitai Valley? |
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, there is no need to turn the picturesque landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony |
| 31378 Liz Potter | Strongly disagree | Please SEE ATTACHED: TEXT COPIED BELOW (selected strongly disagree after reading sub) - I wish to lodge my major objection to the proposed development of the Matai Valley. This is such a special area so close to town and the walk from the city into the lovely river environment was one the big attractions as we made the decision to move to the Nelson area. It a travesty that such an asset could be |
| | | · |

| | lost to all the users and lovers of that part of the valley. I am very concerned that I will be amongst the last generation to enjoy the open spaces, peace and tranquillity and beautiful natural landscapes of the Maitai Valley if construction of many hundreds of houses goes ahead. I am also worried about the impacts on the Maitai Valley and river itself. PLEASE RECONSIDER APPROVING THIS DEVELOPMENT. Liz Potter |
|----------------------|--|
| Strongly disagree | I do not support the greenfield expansion housing anywhere in the Maitai Valley, especially Kaka tributary or Orchard Flats. |
| | The Nelson Council and then the NZ Government has declared a climate emergency. Extreme weather events are increasing world wide. Nelson Council needs to be evaluating how to mitigate the effects of increased flooding in the very near future, particularly around rivers and particularly around the Maitai river. This is quite apparent when one considers the ongoing flooding crises in New South Wales and Queensland currently and also across all parts of New Zealand. |
| | It is the duty of the Nelson Council to protect the current housing stocks and not to inflame the situation by allowing further development that will add to the current stock of highly at risk property in the Nelson region. |
| Strongly disagree | We should really shift the focus on conserving the greenlands we have instead of covering them with even more houses outside the town centre. You would be destroying Nelson's special character. |
| Strongly disagree | There should be NO residential rezoning/greenfield development (or any other sort) in the Maitai Valley - particularly Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. Maitai Valley is a major recreation area for the city of Nelson, people from Tasman and visitors (local and international). The majority of users don't go further up the valley than Orchard Flats. They are bikers, dog walkers, walkers, swimmers, picnickers, relaxers, meditators, school groups, family groups, individuals, ethnic groups, frizby throwing groups, pest trapping groups, runners, elderly, youths, children, people of all physical abilities - to name a few. But it is particularly attractive to people with disabilities - it is close to town, flat, good walking/wheel chair/walker areas. It is not forward thinking to plan to annihilate what we already have - a much treasured recreation spot. Development in the Maitai Valley would mean traffic, traffic noise and pollution, construction traffic, noise and pollution. Increased storm water into the Maitai River would detract from the 4 main swimming holes in the river. The Maitai River and Valley are one of Nelson's taonga. The Plan states that recreational areas would be much needed if high density housing went ahead. In 8.1 Nelson City Centre and Surrounds - 'Investment in and new and improved open spaces will be needed'. These spaces |
| | Strongly disagree Strongly |

| | | are already there. |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31410 Mr Scott Smithline | Strongly disagree | Keep green spaces green - they're not making anymore |
| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling | Strongly disagree | Protect our landscape from even more housing development! |
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin | Strongly disagree | Bayview - yes. Maitahi - no. Orchard Flats - no. These areas are a recreational treasure as should be retained as such for future generations. |
| 31415 Mrs Zanahe Ruth Galloway | Strongly disagree | Beside the center of town most locations are not ecologically environmentally sustainable. Most people want a pleasant friendly biking walking relaxed town where children can walk bike with a sense of security to school. The scale and location of most of the proposed areas will generate such frustration with intense car truck transport traffic noise pollution converging to the center of Nelson especially if the speed is left at 50 km/hour. Nelson has attain its viable friendly acceptable population limit. To keep increasing its population is going totally against and ignoring the statements of the latest IPCC report on Climate Change and going against NCC Climate Change Emergency proclamation! The Bayview Mahitai development is the most unacceptable location and scale as Kaka Valley floor is a wetland that should be protected. 1100 new houses in the Greenfield areas N-106 and N-032 should be removed from the draft of the Future Development Strategy 2022-2052 as the scale of these developments will have strong impacts on the storm water management during the increasing number and intensification of major rain events with greater tides followed by flooding. Increased light pollution noise traffic in the Maitai Valley, unacceptable increased consumption of unpredictable limited water resources because of climate change, overloading of treatment plant facility at Glenduan (already in a precarious location because of sea level rise). The location areas N-106 and N-032 are basically and naturally a marshland that are the natural boarders of the Maitai River and theses 2 locations must be protected and kept greenfield. |
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | Strongly disagree | Unnecessary development at the cost of local amenity, there are better options with intensification, increasing occupancy levels and change of use of current housing stock |
| 31423 Mr Roger Frost | Strongly disagree | |
| 31443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | Strongly | Maitahi and Orchard Flat area should definitely NOT be included for housing developments. |
| | | |

| | disagree | Too important for recreation, easily accessible even by active transport. It would be extremely short sighted and a crime to present and future generations to spoil this precious valley through urbanization. |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31447 Dr David Jackson | Strongly disagree | Strongly disagree with proposed growth areas in the Kaka Valley (i.e. Kaka part of N-106) and all of N-106. N-032 is called 'Orchard Flat' - presumably this ironic as the flat part of the location is reserve land and is not available for housing (and to be fair is not identified as part of N-032). The land in N-032 is very steep. It beggars belief that is (again) is proposed to be included in the FDS for housing. The topography is not ideal and access to the land will be difficult. But most significantly the proposed area would extend from about 40m from Black Hole, up the Maitai past Sunday Hole. Sunday Hole and Waahi Taakaro would become an island surrounded completely by housing up Kaka Valley and Orchard Flat, and both Black Hole and Sunday Hole would be overlooked by the proposed housing in N-032, just for the gain of 206 houses. Black, Dennes and Sunday Hole are regional treasures and well used and loved picnicing, BBQ and swimming amenities just a few minutes from urban Nelson, but with the same feel of travelling for 30 or 40min up the Aniseed or Lee Valley, but without the carbon cost. The natural and amenities values of these sites would be forever lost in what seems like a shortsighted and indecent haste to pack in every more houses. Once that is spoiled - where to next? Can some things not be sacrosant? More and affordable housing is important but not at any cost. The politicians of New York and Christchurch have managed to keep their hands off Central Park and Hagley Park, even though they'd meet a lot of the criteria in the FDS - close city centre, flat, good transport links, not very high natural values (human created environments). Can Nelson's councillors not have the courage and foresight to protect the Maitai Valley from the Kaka and Orchard Flat developments, as our Central or Hagley Park. Once lost, these areas can never be regained. |
| 31450 Mr David Clark | Strongly disagree | I am strongly against that Kaka Valley and Orchard Flat are designated for housing development. This is a valuable recreational area that must be maintained for future generations. |
| 31457 Mr J Santa Barbara | Strongly disagree | No greenfield expansion in this area. Focus on expanding existing areas with med density mixed use. |
| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | Strongly disagree | I consider that the plans for the Matai area are very misguided. The area is extremely well used for recreation. I understand that the type of much of the housing is likely to be similar to that currently being built around Atawhai - large houses, reliant on vehicle transport with many householders have more than one car. The disruption through Nelson is very significant and will continue possibly for years. It is said that this greenfield land is not productive. However although it may not be suitable for arable I understand it has been farmed in the past. I am aware that Ngati Koata are to build some'social' or affordable housing towards the river. There could be other areas for this.at The building itself will affect river flow, land settlement etc I understand that the plan is to divert the river flow, Usually a way of creating future difficulties. This development should not go ahead. |

| 31462 Mr Graham Watson | Strongly disagree | I am against the areas in the Maitai Valley being earmarked for intensification. They is currently zoned as rural and should be left as such. It has been so highly valued by past generations that it has been protected for more than a century and was more recently publicly consulted on in 2006. At that time there was very strong public opposition to such a development and the Council stated that there would never be intensification in the Maitai Valley. It was then erroneously included in the 2019 plan by referring to it as Kaka Valley and Orchard Flat, which were areas most Nelsonians had not heard of and therefore did not raise any objection to. Obviously if the words "Maitai Valley" had been correctly used, there would have been hundreds of objections raised at that time. |
|---------------------------|----------------------|--|
| | | I don't believe that the Maitai Valley is a suitable place for a new subdivision. The negative impact on the Valley and surrounding roads and areas of Nelson will be enormous. I note it has now miraculously grown to include 900 houses in Kaka (plan change was for 350) and 200 on Orchard flats - so 1,100 houses in this last remaining, undeveloped valley, it just does not make sense. The Maitai Valley is one of the many reasons that made me fall in love with Nelson - how lucky are we to have this beautiful asset so close to our city, for all to enjoy. Yes, I know the tracks will still be there should this development be pushed through, but the area will be forever changed and not in a good way. If people are relying on a portion of these houses being "affordable" I am thinking that by the time if/when they are built, they will be hugely out of reach for most so please do not use that as a reason to barrel on ahead. Once this is done, it cannot be undone so please think about whether progress for progress' sake is really progress at all. |
| 31463 Jo Kinross | Strongly disagree | I am totally opposed to areas of the Maitai Valley, especially Kaka Valley and Orchards Flats being included in the FDS as future areas for Greenfield development. |
| | | I believe, along with thousands of others, that the Maitai Valley's rural character and amenity should be protected and preserved for the benefit of current and future generations. Urban development will change the nature of this valley forever. The expansion of residential developments into the Maitai will result in the loss of open space in the city's greenbelt, and conflict with recreational values. Undeveloped green spaces like the Maitai Valley are essential for the community's health and wellbeing. There is already sufficient land for housing in the Nelson region without the Maitai Valley, Kaka Valley or Orchards Flats being included in the FDS as a potential greenfield area. Please remove Kaka Valley, Orchards Flats and the Maitai Valley in general from the Draft FDS as a potential area for Greenfield development. |
| 31464 Mr David Matulovich | Strongly disagree | The Maitai/Kaka valleys are a sanctuary for Nelsonians and visitors. If this area was lost to development, it would be such a loss to future generations. Once lost, it can never be retrieved. There are other places to build without ruining this unique and priced area. Also the ease and enjoyment of living in Nelson |

| | | township will be compromised, as it doesn't have the infrastructure, motorways in and out, enough parking spaces, etc. |
|----------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31467 J R Duncan | Strongly disagree | Please see attached for further detail - have sumarised email below (Summarised from email that they strongly disagree - did not answer multi-choice question) |
| | | Reasons I do not support greenfield subdivision in general and the Maitai Valley in particular: 1. Greenfield development or 'urban sprawl' contravenes the aims of the National Policy Statement on Urban Design (NPS-UD). |
| | | Greenfield development has multiple negative impacts on the environment. |
| | | 3. It increases reliance on private motor vehicles, which in turn create more climate change emissions.4. It uses more resources for yet more infrastructure, when we could simply increase use of existing infrastructure by intensification. |
| | | 5. It draws investment and residents away from the city and limits meaningful growth within existing urban areas. |
| | | 6. It reduces market demand for intensification by stymying uptake and perpetuating the unsustainable cycle of ever-increasing urban sprawl. |
| | | 7. It results in negative impacts on housing affordability. |
| | | 8. It contravenes the desires of the Nelson community, who in feedback last year noted an overwhelming "preference for intensification over expansion". Continual outward expansion of our suburbs is not the future we want. |
| | | 9. The Maitai Valley (or Mahitahi, or Maitahi) including its tributary Kaka Valley has very high amenity value for many people as a tranquil rural backdrop to the very popular adjacent public recreation and relaxation areas. |
| | | 10. Subdivision in the Maitai Valley area would rob Nelson of a prime asset enjoyed by thousands of the local population as well as visitors to the region. |
| 31468 Mr Mike Tasman-Jones | Strongly disagree | Please see attached for further detail - have sumarised email below (Summarised from email that they strongly disagree - did not answer multi-choice question) |
| | | Reasons I do not support greenfield subdivision in general and the Maitai Valley in particular: |
| | | 1. Greenfield development or 'urban sprawl' contravenes the aims of the National Policy Statement on Urban Design (NPS-UD). |
| | | Greenfield development has multiple negative impacts on the environment. |
| | | 3. It increases reliance on private motor vehicles, which in turn create more climate change emissions.4. It uses more resources for yet more infrastructure, when we could simply increase use of existing |

| | | infrastructure by intensification. |
|---|----------------------|--|
| | | 5. It draws investment and residents away from the city and limits meaningful growth within existing urban areas. |
| | | 6. It reduces market demand for intensification by stymying uptake and perpetuating the unsustainable cycle of ever-increasing urban sprawl. |
| | | 7. It results in negative impacts on housing affordability. 8. It contravenes the desires of the Nelson community, who in feedback last year noted an overwhelming "preference for intensification over expansion". Continual outward expansion of our suburbs is not the future we want. |
| | | 9. The Maitai Valley (or Mahitahi, or Maitahi) including its tributary Kaka Valley has very high amenity value for many people as a tranquil rural backdrop to the very popular adjacent public recreation and relaxation areas. |
| | | 10. Subdivision in the Maitai Valley area would rob Nelson of a prime asset enjoyed by thousands of the local population as well as visitors to the region. |
| 31472 Dr David Briggs | Strongly disagree | A totally stupid idea which will greatly damage Nelson's character. |
| 31480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | Strongly disagree | |
| 31482 Mrs Pauline Miller | Strongly disagree | I am totally against the proposed development in the Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. This is the last undeveloped valley in Nelson and an area of natural beauty which is used by many for recreational and wellbeing purposes. It is right beside the Matai River and a development as proposed would irrevocably impact the river and its ecosystem. |
| 31491 Ms Annette Milligan | Strongly disagree | I do not support greenfileds developments in general. There are already many developments in progress and much which can be done to intensify developments in the exisiting boundary. I am particularly concerned about the proposed development in the Kaka/Maitai valleys which are currently a recreational haven. With a greater population in Nelson which comes as a result of intensification, it is even more crucial to protect the nearby open spaces. Once lost, they can never be re-claimed |
| 31492 Anton, Benni, Shalom, AJ Bank, Bonnin, Shalom Davis | Strongly disagree | |
| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | Strongly disagree | I don't support greenfield development. |
| | | |

| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need more sprawl. |
|--------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31496 Mrs Petra Dekker | Strongly disagree | This would be in strong contradiction with the Zero Carbon Act. |
| 31497 Mrs Uta Purcell | Strongly disagree | We cannot afford to loose green spaces, recreational areas close to nelson. They are appreciated, easily accessible. The amount of transport and services will be destructive. |
| 31506 Mr Grant McCauley | Strongly disagree | I DO NOT support the proposed subdivisions in the Maitai Valley, specifically, but not limited to N-32 Orchard Flats (Maitai Valley) and N-106 Maitahi/Bayview (Maitai Valley PPC28). Why would you ignore the 12,900 signatures along with the current and all historic protests. Nelsonians treasure this greenspace, understand it's importance and value to the city, for themselves, visitors and future generations. |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne | Strongly disagree | It threatens the 'green belt' needed for the city's health and recreation. Maitai Valley, close to the centre is especially valuable so Kaka Valley and Orchard flats should not be used for housing. |
| 31514 Ms Helen Black | Strongly disagree | Maitai Valley must remain a peaceful permanent recreational area for all the leisure activities that are undertaken there and retain the protection it has had for the last 100 years. The valley is currently providing safe children's areas, picnic areas, sport areas, it provides walking in a rural area mainly on the flat which can only be found in urbanised areas in Nelson which is welcomed by many. Its current tranquillity nourishes mental health which is something that is very important to daily life and is now acknowledged by health professionals overseas. It provides safe dog walking, lots of swimming and fresh air within walking distance from the Nelson CDB. To build 1,100 houses in Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats must NOT go ahead. The pressure these two housing developments would put onto the near entrance of the Maitai Valley would turn it into another common urban sprawl with visual/noise pollution and in addition affecting those areas of the tracks around Centre of New Zealand and above Branford Park, negative traffic and safety impacts and river degradation. The degradation of the Brook stream since the housing areas were built up stream is noticeable. Would hate for the Maitai River to go that way. Stormwater is not clean water and will affect several swimming areas downstream. If anything, we need to do more to improve the health of the Maitai River. If these two housing developments go ahead, there is no going back and there is no land around Nelson that can provide a natural, mainly flat area to support mental and physical health like the Maitai. The recreational area upstream of Orchard Flats narrows quite quickly which impact severely on recreation usage and tranquility along the Maitai River track. Many people walking from town seek a natural environment when going to the cricket ground or the cow |

| | paddocks and they often return there. 1,100 houses in Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats would change this. We don't need less of these kinds of recreational areas, we need more. The recreational facilities starting at the entrance to the Maitai Valley is what makes Nelson special and unique. No to large scale housing development affecting the Maitai Valley thank you. |
|----------------------|--|
| Strongly disagree | Same issues as explained above with respect to the outcomes and proposals |
| Strongly disagree | If proposed greenfield is in fact productive then no. If unproductive then as little as possible. eg Kaka Valley is supposedly unproductive but development threatens recreation and traffic safety values. |
| Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| Strongly disagree | Matai/Kaka shouldn't go ahead, it will forever alter the character of the lower Maitai and significantly affect traffic flows in Nile St and potentially Walters Bluff or Atatwhai depending on where cars are Brought out. |
| | Strongly oppose this and don't think it will by any means achieve it's stated goal of affordable housing. |
| Strongly disagree | The proposed development in the Maitai Valley goes against the long-standing and well-known wishes of the community for the valley to be protected from development. NCC has failed in its duties to adequately consult on this issue. Please listen to the community and commit to protecting the Maitai Valley for current and future generations. |
| Strongly disagree | |
| Strongly disagree | See full submission. Summarised below (similar to NT2050 submission): singluar focus on growth, challenges underlying growth projections, insufficient consultation, misleading submission form (outcome questions), community feedback ignored, biased process, non-compliance with government directives. Recommends re-think of the draft. |
| Strongly disagree | I am ok with the area on the western side of the Walter's Bluff hill as that area is already spoilt. However, I strongly and absolutely oppose the incursion into the Maitai Valley area including the Kaka area on the southern side of the hill. As for the area to the south of the Maitai River, I find it abhorrent that the Council can even think that that is a possible area for housing. It is part of the Maitai Valley, part of the Maitai walkway and cycleway, right alongside a popular swimming hole. This is a very rural and peaceful part of the valley providing a beautiful recreation area close to the city where people can get away and enjoy nature. It cannot and must not be developed. Far better for people of Nelson for the Council to buy it and make it into a park for everyone to enjoy. |
| | disagree Strongly |

| 31555 Ms Jutta Schultheis | Strongly disagree | I strongly disagree with the suggested housing development areas in Mahitahi (Kaka Valley) and Orchard Flat. The Maitai Valley is Nelson's last valley available for recreation and too valuable to Nelsonians and visitors to be sacrificed to housing. There are enough other options for future housing and we should look to intensification within the present city bounaries first. |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31563 Mrs Loretta Anne Hogg | Strongly disagree | 1100 new houses in the Greenfield areas N-106 and N-032 should be removed from the draft of the Future Development Strategy 2022-2052 as the scale of these developments will have strong impacts on the storm water management during the increasing number and intensification of major rain events with greater tides followed by flooding. Increased light pollution noise traffic in the Maitai Valley, unacceptable increased consumption of unpredictable limited water resources because of climate change, overloading of treatment plant facility at Glenduan (already in a precarious location because of sea level rise) . The location areas N-106 and N-032 are basically and naturally a marshland that are the natural boarders of the Maitai River and theses 2 locations must be protected and kept greenfield. |
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31568 Mrs Sarah Thornton | Strongly disagree | The proposed development of Kaka valley will have a hugely detrimental effect on the landscape and lifestyle of the residents. This is an area of natural beauty and natural resources which should not be polluted by housing developments and associated transport and infrastructure. This will be truly devastating to this area and a blight on the reputation of the council if this plan goes ahead in the face of such strong opposition. |
| 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett | Strongly disagree | |
| 31571 Ms Susan Drew | Strongly disagree | I do not support residential development in the Kaka Valley or Orchard flat. I have already submitted on this. See attachment - summarised below: objects to Maitai Valley for reasons related to environmental, stormwater, traffic. |
| 31573 Mrs Susan Lea | Strongly disagree | If this includes the Maitai valley I disagree - We need more than ever to preserve for ever green spaces fo recreation . Nelson has very few parksthe Maitai is perfect and surely in the spirit of Te Taiao |
| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | Strongly disagree | I do not approve of greenfield expansion. I especially do not approve of the proposed greenfield expansion in Kaka Valley and Orchard flats. |
| | | |

| 31579 Jane Tate | Strongly disagree | I do not agree with greenfield housing areas. If this land is high quality (or even medium quality), it should be left for food production. |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31580 Jenny Long | Strongly disagree | I 100% disagree with the location and the scale of the proposed greenfield housing areas in Nelson. We have ample scope for building upwards in our existing footprint. Destroying green spaces by allowing urban sprawl is a mistake that will send us backwards with regards to reducing carbon emissions, and negatively affect the wellbeing of individuals. The Maitai in particular is a Nelson treasure that must be protected. Building hundreds of homes in this area will destroy the peaceful rural and natural quality of this area for ever. It will lead to increased commuter emissions. It will lead to noise pollution and run-off pollution of the river that a large proportion of Nelson residents enjoy. It will lead to the road being less safe for the vast numbers of families and individuals who enjoy walking, biking or running in the valley. It would be a travesty to allow urban sprawl to ruin this precious green space that so many Nelson residents hold dear. |
| 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | Strongly disagree | Can we please stop turning our beautiful landscape into a concrete jungle. We need to show courage and change the status quo way of meeting demand. |
| 31584 Ms Melanie Beckett | Strongly disagree | I strongly disagree with the location and scale of the proposed greenfield housing areas in the Maitai Valley in Nelson. Developing both these areas will, in my opinion, ruin the peaceful tranquility of the Maitai Valley. This tranquility has been enjoyed and savored by generations of people who have used it for recreation and well-being. It is a much used and loved area of our town that will be ruined by development such as this. One of the really special things is that it is located so close to town. It is accessible to most people and they don't need to go far to appreciate and benefit from the beautiful surroundings. The quality of the river would be impacted by increased stormwater and also the increase of erosion and surface runoff during and post construction. The valley would be impacted by the huge increase in traffic, as would the surrounding suburbs. They'd be negatively impacted by the increased pollution, noise and increased volume of traffic. There are some areas that just shouldn't be developed. They should be treasured and restored. I strongly believe that the Maitai Valley is one of these places. |
| 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31593 Mr William Samuels | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |

| 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. And create further disconnect to our hardly exciting, lifeless centres. |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | Strongly disagree | I strongly disagree with the proposed intensification of housing in Greenfield areas of Nelson, especially the Maitai Valley. It is ridiculous to want to stuff 1100 houses into that beautiful Valley. Don't do it. The Maitai Valley is traditionally and historically a very special place for the people of Nelson. It is in constant use, providing mental and physical health opportunities for all - right next to the city centre. It is absolutely crazy to be allowing this to be re-zoned from rural to residential, and allowing developers to have their way with the most popular and most used section of the valley. This will totally change the character of Nelson, leaving us with much reduced natural resource. I object to this in the very strongest of terms. It's terribly sad that the council have been asleep at the wheel and if allowed the spectre of development to hang over one of our most valuable natural resources. I'm actually out raged by the councils neglect of the long-term future of Nelson, and very angry about it. |
| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31604 Mr Peter Moot | Strongly disagree | I have taken the time to make this submission purely because of my objection to the proposed rezoning of the Maitai/kaka Valley from rural to residential. I think the council have made a terrible mistake in allowing this anywhere near the future development strategy in 2019, and it looks like you're making the same terrible error at this point as well. Then Maitai provides unmistakable, irreplaceable high value recreational opportunities to all the residents of this city. Every day people use the Valley for a multitude of recreational purposes. Not the least of which is learning to River swim for children in the three beautiful traditional swimming holes next to Branford Park. This is the very area that will suffer the most from the run-off of the 1100 houses propose to go right next to it. This is an absolutely ridiculous crazy shortsighted town planning decision that I find absolutely abhorrent. It is short termism at its very worst. I'm sorry to use strong language, but I feel very strongly about it, not only for myself, but for the future generations of Nelson who will not get to enjoy this beautiful natural resource - a place that they can walk and bike to within five minutes. It is ridiculous assertion on the part of the developers that this area will not be changed by the development. It will be fully changed and transformed into an urban suburb, characterless, and much like any other new urban suburb. The run off and increased traffic will eventually pollute the river. As it is, the Maitai Valley is an absolute treasure, well known outside of our area, and very attractive to visitors. The valley narrows after the proposed housing area and it's not used in the same way for recreation as the wide and beautiful fields trees and river swimming holes next to the proposed development area. Please Nelson City Council see the error of your ways by doing about face at |

| | | this point! The public of Nelson will applaud you now and into the future. |
|------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac. There is plenty of brownfield capacity in Nelson, and if you don't actually allocate greenfield, some of our canny developers might just turn their minds to figuring out how to use it. |
| | | Consider also how this will ever meet the outcomes. |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl |
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | Strongly disagree | See earlier comments |
| 31621 Dr Kath Walker | Strongly disagree | The Maitai Valley is Nelson's "Hagley Park, or Central Park". There are only tiny pocket parks within the city itself (including Queen's Garden) - far too small for the size of the city. It is absolutely vital to retain this area -within walking distance of the town-as the wonderful outdoor resource that it is. The plan for this area should not be to make it into a suburb but instead to gradually remove the pines up valley and enhance further the wildlife that by some miracle still exists not far up the Maitai Valley. |
| 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | Strongly disagree | |
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | Strongly disagree | |
| 31628 Mr Daniel Levy | Strongly disagree | I totally disagree with the location and scale of the proposed greenfield housing development areas in Kaka valley and Orchard Flats. I have detailed some of the reasons for my strong objections to urbanization of the Maitai Valley in the answers to the above questions. I also intend to further detail my opinion about this issue, in person, at the planned hearings. |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | Strongly disagree | Greenfield areas should remain rural to minimize effects of climate change and for the wellbeing of the increasing population |
| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | Strongly disagree | The Maitai Valley has for centuries held a special place in the hearts of generations of Nelsonians. |
| 31631 Mrs Joy Shackleton | Strongly disagree | Nelson needs to retain it's green spaces and reserves for the good of the residents of Nelson |
| 31633 Ms Jacquetta Bell QSM | Strongly disagree | Rural areas adjacent to cities are under pressure in a 'housing versus nature' scenario that is occurring in many parts of Aotearoa-NZ and world-wide. The benefits of nature for mental health and wellbeing are |
| | | |

| | | now well recognised, are backed by science and are even prescribed by doctors. It's very important that we limit growth, keep it to intensification in urban Nelson, and balance this by preserving the Maitai Valley for recreation. |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31636 Joanna Santa Barbara | Strongly disagree | |
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | Strongly disagree | Intensification in the city centre instead of taking up the green areas that are accessible for recreation (add to the quality of life) |
| 31654 Ms brenda wraight | Strongly disagree | |
| 31657 Mrs Andrea Hay | Strongly disagree | I agree that some greenfield development will need to occur, but please limit this to areas that already have existing services near by and limit it to areas where development will have minimal impact the environment and recreational areas. (for example, do not develop the Maitai Valley). |
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | Strongly disagree | Strongly disagree For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | Strongly disagree | Do not support development in the Kaka Stream area nor on Orchard Flat. This is a prime recreational area that integrates several different forms of recreation that are treasured by thousands of Nelson residents and visitors and should be left in rural zoning |
| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | Strongly disagree | Strongly disagree For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| | | |

| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | Strongly disagree | The Maitai Valley should be completely off limits, non-negotiable in terms of large scale residential development. It is a significant recreational asset to Nelson as a rural environment and will become more and more important as we intensify this city. Think Hagley Park to Christchurch, Central Park to New York. It will compete with central city intensification options more than any other development proposal. Please listen to the people of Nelson regarding the Maitai. |
|----------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31683 Richard Davies | Strongly disagree | The Maitai Valley should be protected as an exquisite recreational area for the enjoyment and pleasure of all. |
| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | Strongly disagree | We need to intensify brownfield sites in Nelson. We can't keep growing Nelson. |
| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | Strongly disagree | No. More green field developments in this area will dramatically change the landscape in an area that many people value for recreation. It is a development on a wetland and around a major river which could have a big negative impact on the ecology of the area as well as have a knock on effect such as an increase in pollution and flooding risk further down the river. It is likely to cause a big increase in motor vehicle traffic into the city centre putting pressure on roads and parking. We should instead be focusing on making better use of our city centre, reducing the need for parking and repurposing that land for example. |
| 31703 Ms Paula Holden | Strongly disagree | The Maitai Valley is a taonga, an equivalent precious greenspace to London's rambling Hampstead Heath. This beautiful peaceful valley, with a river you can swim in, so close to town was a main reason for my family choosing to live & base our business in Nelson. We love it's quiet spaciousness & experiencing the joy of people & families utilising the rivers & parks. It breaks my heart to imagine it covered with sprawling housing to the level proposed! The huge number of houses planned for the Kaka Valley & Orchard Flat area will be detrimental to the health of the river & the community/cultural values we treasure. Be the 'smart little city' Nelson & don't destroy it's environmental assets! |
| 31706 Paul Donald Galloway | Strongly disagree | 1100 new houses in the Greenfield areas N-106 and N-032 should be completely removed from the draft of the Future Development Strategy 2022-2052 and not zoned residential as the scale of these developments will have strong impacts on the storm water management during the increasing number and intensification of major rain events with greater tides followed by flooding. Increased light noise traffic cars pollution in the Maitai Valley, unacceptable increased consumption of unpredictable limited water resources because of climate change, (https://www.stuff.co.nz/nelson-mail/127502339/nelson-on-hotspot-list-for-potential-drought) overloading of treatment plant facility at Glenduan (already in a precarious location because of sea level rise). The location areas N-106 and N-032 are basically and naturally marshland wetland that are the natural boarders of the Maitai River and theses 2 locations must be protected and kept greenfield not covered in houses. It goes totally against the latest IPCC report as |

Carbon Emissions will increase again with such a number of houses and cars chocking this narrow valley which also has too many hours, weeks, months in the shadow of the surrounding hills. Unacceptable increase of energy demands to heat these houses. Geographically Nelson (wedged between hills, narrow valleys and ocean) has attained its acceptable comfortable pleasant number of cars-residents. The only wise move for Nelson is intensification of the Centre of town not spreading dormitories with people having to use their cars all at the same time, afraid for themselves and their children to use bicycles on roads and streets unfortunately still with 50km/hour target. Its a car door or a frustrated driver on 50 km/hour streets that is the scary reality for biking in Nelson

https://www.cnet.com > science > nasa-predicts-moon-wobble-and-climate-change-will-lead-to-more-floods-more-often

NASA predicts moon 'wobble' and climate change will lead to more floods, more often. The slightest change in the moon's orbit could see big problems for coastal regions.

| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | Strongly disagree | I am endorsing the Nelson Tasman Climate Forum's view . |
|--------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31710 Ms Angela Fitchett | Strongly disagree | Stop right now with the Greenfield development around Nelson and priorities intensification. See comments on 5. |
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | Strongly disagree | Build up and not out. Maximise the asset of attractive rural land adjacent to the town for our enjoyment. |
| 31720 Ms Rainna Pretty | Strongly disagree | Strongly disagree to intensification - 4-6 storey buildings in The Wood. Developers don't have to provide off-street parking which will affect car parking availability on the street. 3x3 Townhouses can be built 1m from my boundary without consultation therefore no privacy, no view, no sunlight. |
| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31736 Ms Carol Curtis | Strongly disagree | Greenfield housing as a concept should be banned. to protect the objectives of the OUTCOMES, the whole strategy of developing both housing, business, local food growing, lifestyle, nature/nurture, etc, ALL need to be rigorously assessed through these OUTCOMES. single large stand alone houses which have huge garages and no sense of community, on single parcels of legally inflexible land, are not good for society, for the environment and for resilience. |

| | | envisioning built environments which offer flexible and multiple end-users, whether sleeping, working, educating, playing, shopping all need to be considered at the same time, within the same land. open up opportunity, diversification, and collaboration in all areas of life, with shared resources. |
|--|----------------------|--|
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | Strongly disagree | I strongly disagree with development up the Maitai Valley. The other valleys have already been severely compromised so I am neutral regarding the continuation of development up those areas. I do not want the Maitai Valley turned into another Dodsons Valley or Todd Valley where growth has wrecked any rura qualities they had. I speak from personal experience of the huge increase in noise and traffic, and reduction in landscape qualities that has occurred in both valleys. |
| 31763 Susan Rogers | Strongly disagree | Survey is flawed from the beginning. You need to redesign this entire line of questioning. It leads only to answers desired by the maker of the survey. |
| 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | Strongly disagree | I am opposed to the plans to create a satellite suburb in the Maitai valley, as it will adversely impact on the incredible amenity value to Nelson of the beautiful Maitai valley & its walking tracks, swimming holes public reserves, amazing views, peaceful landscape etc. |
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete an tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31769 Ms Jo Gould | Strongly disagree | I think the greenfield housing area in the Maitai Valley has the potential for negative impact. I do not agree with intensive greenfield housing development on the flat area of the Bayview / Maitai Valley development (close to the Maitai River). This has the potential for negative impact on river water quality. The Orchard Flat area is very close to the river, with the potential for flooding risk and negative effects or river water quality. Both greenfield sites in the Maitai valley could negatively impact on the current amenity and recreation |
| | | values of that area. |
| 31771 Colleen Shaw | Strongly disagree | As stated I strongly oppose the proposed greenfield housing areas in the Kaka Valley, Orchard Flats as there is too much incursion into precious recreational green spaces with housing that would be on the upper level of cost and not affordable. This would ruin an accessible recreational space with the propose 1100 further housing and increase traffic density issues. (Even though it is accessible by bicycle, I would predict most house owners would be using cars and are likely to have 2 vehicles.) |
| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | Strongly disagree | |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Strongly disagree | Please see attached: Maitai Valley and Maitai River need protecting. Greenfield housing would ruin the river through excessive stormwater run off. |
| | | |

| 31801 Joan Skurr | Strongly disagree | Current greenfield development or planning is encouraging more commuting because public transport is not planned alongside the design, nor is a small amenity centre eg. The Wood, in Milton St. Trees would be more appropriate on some of the stages. |
|---------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31830 K.M. McDonald | Strongly disagree | I strongly object to intensive development in the Matai Valley. If this is "developed" it's gone forever. The area would be ideal for a regional park, enhancing the wellbeing of our citizens and visitors. |

| 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | Agree | |
|---------------------------------------|-------|---|
| 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert | Agree | Because it is not greenfield development |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | Agree | To make public and active transport possible for work, school and shopping, intensification is the best option. |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | Agree | Well suited to greenfield |
| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | Agree | |
| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | Agree | |
| 31316 John Heslop | Agree | |
| 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | Agree | The areas around Stoke have already been developed. The Marsden Valley, Ngawhatu and Saxton would be growth areas where there is already housing development. |
| 31405 Mr Doug Hattersley | Agree | |
| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn Ball | Agree | |
| 31449 Mr John Chisholm | Agree | |
| 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon | Agree | |
| 31508 Mr Roger Barlow | Agree | |
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | Agree | infrastructure is already there |
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers | Agree | people need houses |
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | Agree | Probably, because greater intensification is needed close to infrastructure & jobs etc. |
| 31572 Mr David Todd | Agree | |
| 31637 Ms Frances Kemble Welch | Agree | |
| 31647 Mrs Rebecca Parish | Agree | |
| 31657 Mrs Andrea Hay | Agree | |
| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | Agree | As mentioned above |
| 31667 barbara nicholas | Agree | |

| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | Agree | Stoke is a compact largely flat area close to Nelson city and Richmond and with excellent access to many facilities therefore intensification could include further areas for 2-3 story housing |
|--------------------------------------|----------|--|
| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | Agree | |
| 31688 Gerard McDonnell | Agree | Greenfield development should be minimised. More intense brownfield development should be prioritised. Development on hills preferred |
| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | Agree | |
| 31704 Mr Paul Bucknall | Agree | |
| 31718 Kathryn & Keith Quigley | Agree | |
| 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert- Watene | Agree | |
| 31774 Mrs Jane Sutherland | Agree | |
| 31783 Mr Peter Jones | Agree | |
| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | Agree | A: Yes we agree with this, given its proximity to Stoke centre and its location between Nelson and Richmond. However this needs to be a higher density than the sprawling single story, large lot developments common in the area. The lots should be small, building 2 stories high up to side boundaries should be allowed and perhaps there should be a 2 story (minimum) height. The reason for asking for increased densities in any new subdivision is that with new houses it is very unlikely that increases in density will happen in the following 40 years. These need to be built right from the get go as higher density subdivisions |
| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson | Disagree | As for 22. |
| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | Disagree | |
| 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | Disagree | See answers above. |
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | Disagree | Green areas should be preserved for public recreation in intensified communities. |
| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | Disagree | as above DISAgree as I feel we should only be working on the brownfield land. The green land / bare land should be protected and areas for restoration for planting, environmental protection and or public green space. Intensify by working with existing buildings and areas of housing |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | Disagree | Please see attached - summarised below: As above, N100 is next to riding for the disabled, N11 already has housing. Does not support further greenfield development on this site. |

| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | Disagree | Too much greenfield |
|--------------------------------|----------|---|
| 31349 Laurien Heijs | Disagree | Focus should first be on intensification. Stoke feels very sprawled already. See Q14 response |
| 31373 Ms Jenny Daniell | Disagree | Intensification is more environmentally sustainable in the long run. |
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | Disagree | Reduce greenfield development. |
| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling | Disagree | Greenfield expansion just encourages more sprawl. It would be better to relax the rules on multi-purpose dwellings and offer incentives for mixed housing closer to shops and facilities |
| 31415 Mrs Zanahe Ruth Galloway | Disagree | Beside the center of town most locations are not ecologically environmentally sustainable. Most people want a pleasant friendly biking walking relaxed town so children can walk bike securely to school. The scale of most of the proposed areas will generate such frustration with intense car truck transport traffic noise pollution converging to the center of Stoke especially if the speed is left at 50 km/hour . Stoke has attain its viable friendly acceptable population limit. To keep increasing its population is going totally against and ignoring the statements of the latest IPCC report on Climate Change. |
| 31416 Tim Leyland | Disagree | |
| 31441 Mr Chris Head | Disagree | |
| 31481 Mrs Lucy Harrhy | Disagree | see above |
| 31485 Ms Robin Schiff | Disagree | Only if the planning starts from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
| 31488 Annette Starink | Disagree | See 22 |
| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless | Disagree | |
| 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | Disagree | |
| 31505 Cheryl Heten | Disagree | As per Q16. |
| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | Disagree | |
| 31580 Jenny Long | Disagree | I disagree with the location and the scale of the proposed greenfield housing areas in Stoke. We have ample scope for building upwards in our existing footprint. Destroying green spaces by allowing |
| | | |

| | | urban sprawl is a mistake that will send us backwards with regards to reducing carbon emissions, and negatively affect the wellbeing of individuals. |
|-----------------------------|---------------|--|
| 31588 pene Greet | Disagree | |
| 31608 Robbie Thomson | Disagree | Its happened and happening now.Prefer more intense housing here. |
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | Disagree | Better to have more intensification within Stoke Centre if the area is made attractive with leafy green spaces between buildings and walkways etc |
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | Disagree | Do we need more greenfield homes if we seek to intensify housing? This seems counterintuitive. |
| 31617 Ms steph jewell | Disagree | as 22 |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | Disagree | For reasons and themes expressed elsewhere in this submission. Please try again. Think dense. Think far far more dense - and 5-10yrs not 30. |
| 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | Disagree | |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | Disagree | |
| 31673 Mike Drake | Disagree | See Q22. We need green space for people to walk, ride and relax. |
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | Disagree | |
| 31722 Trevor Chang | Disagree | |
| 31726 Mr John Jackson | Disagree | |
| 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | Disagree | |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | Disagree | History confirms that greenfields do not attain Net Enduring Restorative Outcomes and carrying capacity to the detriment of Te Taiao. |
| 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | Don't know | |
| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | Don't know | |
| 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | Don't know | Don't know what Greenfield housing is |
| 31219 Mrs kate windle | Don't know | |
| 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | Don't | |
| | | |

| | know | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|---|
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman | Don't | Since the maps are so vague it is very difficult to make a comment. |
| | know | |
| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31278 Wendy Ross | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | Don't know | |
| 24225 14 2 | | |
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | Don't know | |
| 24250 Da Miller Ashiba | | |
| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | Don't know | |
| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | Don't | |
| 31374 Dr inge Boit | know | |
| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | Don't | |
| 21303 IVII GOLUOII Hallipsoli | know | |
| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | Don't | |
| SITOT CAMMENDATIEN | know | |
| 31406 Ms Floortje van Lierop | Don't | See above |
| or too this flooring valit eletop | know | |
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | Don't | |
| , | | |

| | know |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| 31431 Katerina Seligman | Don't |
| | know |
| 31452 Mr David Bartle | Don't |
| | know |
| 31473 Mr Andrew Downs | Don't |
| | know |
| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | Don't |
| | know |
| 31483 Debbie Hampson | Don't |
| | know |
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | Don't know |
| 24.407. Ma. Haathau Caasa | |
| 31487 Ms Heather Spence | Don't As #22. know |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne | Don't |
| 31307 Renatus Rempthorne | know |
| 31521 Mrs Marie Waterhouse | Don't |
| | know |
| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard | Don't |
| | know |
| 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery | Don't |
| | know |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | Don't |
| | know |
| 31558 Mr Steve Jordan | Don't |
| | know |
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | Don't |
| | know |
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | Don't |
| | |

| | know | |
|---------------------------------|---------------|--|
| 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31598 Mrs Nicola Worsfold | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31641 Mr Stephen (Steve) Hayden | | |
| | know | |
| 31643 Inge Koevoet | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31651 Dr Patrick Conway | Don't know | |
| 21CO2 Caralya Basa | Don't | |
| 31693 Carolyn Rose | know | |
| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | Don't | |
| 31054 Wil Greg Bate | know | |
| 31697 Robert King-Tenison | Don't | |
| 0_00, 1102010111116 101110011 | know | |
| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | Don't | Not answering any of these leading questions |
| | know | |
| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31759 Mr Damian Campbell | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | Don't | |
| | | |

| | know | |
|------------------------------|---------------|--|
| 31784 Ms Teresa James | Don't know | |
| 31185 Myfanway James | N/A | Limit greenfields development unless it is intensive. |
| 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan | N/A | Keeping the housing growing here and in Nelson keeps our productive rural land safer for longer |
| 31363 Mr Steve Cross | N/A | I reject the premise of this question |
| 31364 Mrs Christine Tuffnell | N/A | Best commented on by local people of that area |
| 31623 Ms Lucy Charlesworth | N/A | I am wary of answering this question as I cannot be sure of how my answer will be interpreted. So I will state - I do not agree with developing green spaces. These spaces need to be reserved and protected to allow for sustainable biodiversity and for future generations. Intensification within Nelson CBD needs to be a priority. I do not agrees with building on Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. I do not agree with housing development on green fields. There is a climate emergency. Remove these areas from the FDS. |
| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | Neutral | |
| 31114 Ms Jill Rogers | Neutral | |
| 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS | Neutral | |
| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | Neutral | |
| 31129 Mrs Gaynor Brooks | Neutral | |
| 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward | Neutral | |
| 31173 Mr Roderick Watson | Neutral | |
| 31174 Ms Alison Westerby | Neutral | |
| 31186 Mr Gary Scott | Neutral | |
| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | Neutral | |
| 31192 Ms Rebecca Patchett | Neutral | |
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | Neutral | |
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | Neutral | |
| 31227 Ms Lee Eliott | Neutral | |
| 31240 Michael Markert | Neutral | |

| 31247 Mr yuri aristarco | Neutral | no |
|---|---------|---|
| 31250 Mr Richard Wyles | Neutral | |
| 31257 Mr Kent Inglis | Neutral | |
| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | Neutral | |
| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | Neutral | |
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | Neutral | As above |
| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | Neutral | |
| 31286 Mr David Short | Neutral | |
| 31309 Mr & Mrs Rose & Phillip Windle | Neutral | |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | Neutral | |
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | Neutral | |
| 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman | Neutral | |
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | Neutral | |
| 31355 Mr Barney Hoskins | Neutral | |
| 31358 George Harrison | Neutral | |
| 31360 Ms Thuy Tran | Neutral | |
| 31365 michael monti | Neutral | |
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | Neutral | |
| 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer | Neutral | |
| 31403 Mr Richard Deck | Neutral | |
| 31423 Mr Roger Frost | Neutral | |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas Hollyman | Neutral | |
| 31430 Muriel Moran | Neutral | Same as for Nelson. |
| 31434 Mrs cushla Moorhead | Neutral | We need to keep as much Greenfield as we can for people's health and mental well being as well as for |
| | | |

| | | production. |
|--------------------------------|---------|---|
| 31435 Mr Alan Eggers | Neutral | |
| 31443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | Neutral | |
| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | Neutral | |
| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | Neutral | No comment |
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | Neutral | |
| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | Neutral | Only if the planning starts from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
| 31472 Dr David Briggs | Neutral | |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | Neutral | |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | Neutral | |
| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | Neutral | As with the above I am not as well informed on the scale of proposed greenfield housing in these areas. However, I do see the development of areas along SH6 as being advantageous in terms of easy access to all towns along the route. |
| 31480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | Neutral | |
| 31484 Mr Gavin Brent Cook | Neutral | |
| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | Neutral | Only agree with the the areas not too far from the main road through Stoke. |
| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | Neutral | Neutral. Please refer to our comments to Q22. It is critically important that any new development is well integrated into the public and active transport networks. Given the proposed number of houses for this area, additional support may be required for Stoke Centre in order for it to be able to service the expanded community. |
| 31520 Andrew Stirling | Neutral | |
| 31529 Mr Steven King-Turner | Neutral | |

| 31549 Mr Ian McComb | Neutral | There are already problems with runoff causing flooding in areas below the newer developments, during heavy rain periods. This would need to be addressed adequately in further developments. Transport issues are also a concern. |
|---------------------------|---------|---|
| 31551 Mrs Jo Kitchen | Neutral | |
| 31554 Wendy Barker | Neutral | It's already developed here |
| 31560 Ms Steph Watts | Neutral | If there is allowance for tiny homes and/ sustainably built homes on sections rather than the current trend for enormous houses. Do away with covenents on minimum sizes for homes and have covenents that allow for a % cover of trees and vegetation on each section to absorb carbon, catch rain and attract wildlife. |
| 31573 Mrs Susan Lea | Neutral | Appears this housing project is well on the way |
| 31574 Mr David Bolton | Neutral | |
| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | Neutral | As above Stoke does definitely not need to be 'intensified' it is semi-rural and should remain so. Nowhere in this region does. Slow natural growth can be supported. In a way maybe more so than Wakefield or Brightwater, Stoke can grow because people who want to live there want to live in a town. Unnatural fast growth is unnecessary and should not be encouraged. Low level expansion is acceptable to support local natural growth |
| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | Neutral | |
| 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz | Neutral | |
| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | Neutral | |
| 31604 Mr Peter Moot | Neutral | |
| 31606 Mr Trent Shepard | Neutral | |
| 31614 Mr mark Morris | Neutral | |
| 31622 Peter Butler | Neutral | |
| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | Neutral | |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | Neutral | |
| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | Neutral | |
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | Neutral | I am not an expert and able to comment everything. Please listen to Joni Tomsett or Tim Neubauer. I think they represent my ideas. |
| | | |

| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | Neutral | Stoke Valleys greenfield development is unlikely to affect the state highway network, however Waka Kotahi would support good urban design that aligns with the NPS-UD and GPS-Land Transport. |
|--------------------------------|----------------|---|
| 31656 Mr brad malcolm | Neutral | |
| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | Neutral | |
| 31683 Richard Davies | Neutral | |
| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | Neutral | |
| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | Neutral | |
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | Neutral | |
| 31692 Mr Alasdair Gardiner | Neutral | |
| 31703 Ms Paula Holden | Neutral | |
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | Neutral | See attached submission. Summarised - no specific comments on this question, generally supports FDS |
| 31716 Mr Alan hart | Neutral | |
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | Neutral | See above comments. |
| 31741 Mr Robert Stevenson | Neutral | |
| 31744 Mrs Lorna CRANE | Neutral | |
| 31752 Jill Pearson | Neutral | |
| 31765 Mrs Lorna Ivy Cooper | Neutral | |
| 31769 Ms Jo Gould | Neutral | |
| 31775 Dr Thomas Carl | Neutral | |
| 31777 Mr David Lucas | Neutral | |
| 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | Strongly agree | Just an expansion on existing areas. |
| 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | Strongly agree | |
| 31284 Mr Jarmo Saloranta | Strongly agree | |

| 31356 Stephen Williams | Strongly agree | Growth should occur close to employment opportunities and existing infrastructure. |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | Strongly agree | It is providing housing where work, services , and amenities are. |
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | Strongly agree | Stoke is already a sprawling suburb eating up countryside. Don't let's continue this outdated mode of solving housing problems. It's lazy and backward thinking. |
| 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | Strongly agree | |
| 31815 Peter Wilks | Strongly agree | |
| 31836 Paula M Wilks | Strongly agree | As above. |
| 31122 Mr Johan Thomas Wahlgren | Strongly disagree | Same argument |
| 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren | Strongly disagree | Leave any greenfield area alone |
| 31171 Ms Sallie Griffiths | Strongly disagree | |
| 31216 Ms Judith Holmes | Strongly disagree | Intensify. |
| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | Strongly disagree | Strongly disagree with ANY greenfield development because of climate change, as well as productive needs. |
| 31279 Mr Jeremy Thompson | Strongly disagree | Answer 3 |
| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | Strongly disagree | Leave green, green. |
| 31322 Mrs BARBARA AND TIM ROBSON | Strongly disagree | |
| 31328 Ms Karen du Fresne | Strongly disagree | |
| | | |

| 31334 Diane Sutherland | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons above |
|------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | Strongly disagree | I oppose turning more of our landscape into suburbs and commuter zones. We have enough of these already and need to preserve our rural and productive land. |
| 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | Strongly disagree | It's foolhardy to have greenfield housing areas. I agree neither with the intensification or the scale of the plan. |
| 31346 Martin Hartman | Strongly disagree | I oppose turning more of our landscape into suburbs and commuter zones. We have enough of these already and need to preserve our rural and productive land. |
| 31347 Ms Paula Baldwin | Strongly disagree | , |
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | Strongly disagree | Should be above the village on the foothills |
| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | Strongly disagree | Same. |
| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | Strongly disagree | No need more |
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, there is no need to turn the picturesque landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony |
| 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann | Strongly disagree | No more changing greenlands into housing developments if the demand can also be channelled into townhouses, intensification in towns. |
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31410 Mr Scott Smithline | Strongly disagree | see 22 |
| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling | Strongly disagree | Protect our landscape from even more housing development. |
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin | Strongly disagree | No more urban sprawl |
| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors | Strongly disagree | Stop Sprawling, more green spaces for communal use and build up (apartments) |
| | | |

| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | Strongly disagree | Unnecessary development at the cost of local amenity, there are better options with intensification, increasing occupancy levels and change of use of current housing stock |
|---|----------------------|--|
| 31457 Mr J Santa Barbara | Strongly disagree | No greenfield expansion in this area. Focus on expanding existing areas with med density mixed use. |
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into a concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31491 Ms Annette Milligan | Strongly disagree | See 21 |
| 31492 Anton, Benni, Shalom, AJ Bank, Bonnin, Shalom Davis | Strongly disagree | |
| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | Strongly disagree | I don't support greenfield development. |
| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need more sprawl. |
| 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31496 Mrs Petra Dekker | Strongly disagree | contradiction with the Zero Carbon Act. |
| 31515 Geoffrey Vause | Strongly disagree | Same issues as explained above with respect to the outcomes and proposals |
| 31516 Mr Peter Lole | Strongly disagree | Absolute minimum of greenfield development though. |
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | Strongly disagree | For the same reasons given for Q22 |
| 31533 Wendy Trevett | Strongly disagree | |
| 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | Strongly disagree | See full submission. Summarised below (similar to NT2050 submission): singluar focus on growth, challenges underlying growth projections, insufficient consultation, misleading submission form (outcon questions), community feedback ignored, biased process, non-compliance with government directives. |

| | | Recommends re-think of the draft. |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett | Strongly disagree | |
| 31579 Jane Tate | Strongly disagree | I do not agree with greenfield housing areas. If this land is high quality (or even medium quality), it should be left for food production. |
| 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | Strongly disagree | Can we please stop turning our beautiful landscape into a concrete jungle. We need to show courage and change the status quo way of meeting demand. |
| 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31593 Mr William Samuels | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. And create further disconnect to our hardly exciting, lifeless centres. |
| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac. Consider also how this will ever meet the outcomes. |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | Strongly disagree | See earlier comments |
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | Strongly disagree | |

| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | Strongly disagree | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31636 Joanna Santa Barbara | Strongly disagree | |
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | Strongly disagree | As above |
| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | Strongly disagree | |
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | Strongly disagree | Strongly disagree For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | Strongly disagree | Strongly disagree For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | Strongly disagree | Stoke is already a large sprawl. It should not be allowed to continue that sprawl. |
| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | Strongly disagree | No. We need to concentrate on intensification, not on green field developments. |
| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | Strongly disagree | I am endorsing the Nelson Tasman Climate Forum's view . |
| 31710 Ms Angela Fitchett | Strongly disagree | Ref answer to 22. |
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | Strongly disagree | It is unnecessary if the correct utilisation of our existing urban areas can be intensified. |
| | | |

| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
|--|----------------------|--|
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31736 Ms Carol Curtis | Strongly disagree | as above. |
| 31763 Susan Rogers | Strongly disagree | |
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | Strongly disagree | As for 23. above |
| 31771 Colleen Shaw | Strongly disagree | I would like to minimize greenfield development as much as possible. |
| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | Strongly disagree | |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Strongly disagree | Stoke foothills needs protecting from development. With an inland route to Nelson it may become more practical. Infrastructure required would be massive and across fault zones. |
| 31801 Joan Skurr | Strongly disagree | Once again, this leads to more commuting and does not include planning for amenities. New roads and infrastructure are costly. |
| | | |

| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | Agree | There are existing nearby services to support this. |
|-----------------------------|-------|---|
| 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | Agree | I see Richmond as becoming the centre of the "Top of the south", with more available retail space, and flat land for affordable housing, where the builds would be cheaper, for that reason, and the climate sunnier and warmer, than some of the suggested sites in Nelson |
| 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan | Agree | Just don't touch the Waimea plains and put a bypass in |
| 31257 Mr Kent Inglis | Agree | |
| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | Agree | |
| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | Agree | |
| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | Agree | |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | Agree | |
| 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman | Agree | |
| 31360 Ms Thuy Tran | Agree | |
| 31405 Mr Doug Hattersley | Agree | |
| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors | Agree | The jobs and amenities are (hopefully) there, less travel and infrastructure already in place. Again though, mitigate sprawl by designing a vibrant inner CBD living environment |
| 31449 Mr John Chisholm | Agree | |
| 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon | Agree | |
| 31484 Mr Gavin Brent Cook | Agree | Common ground and employment within the area, |
| 31505 Cheryl Heten | Agree | On new developed land areas not affected by roading (within walking distance of town). |
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | Agree | infrastructure is already there |
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers | Agree | people need houses |
| 31529 Mr Steven King-Turner | Agree | |
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | Agree | A/A |
| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | Agree | Expansion into greenfield areas close to the existing urban areas is understandable progression. For example the development at Bateman Road in Richmond. Build more houses near to existing towns lik |
| | | |

| | | Richmonddon't try to 'create' new ones in rural areas. Expand the infrastructure we already have. It's about people not money |
|--------------------------------------|----------|--|
| 31647 Mrs Rebecca Parish | Agree | |
| 31656 Mr brad malcolm | Agree | |
| 31667 barbara nicholas | Agree | |
| 31688 Gerard McDonnell | Agree | Not on quality agricultural/ horticultural land! Development on hills preferred |
| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | Agree | |
| 31718 Kathryn & Keith Quigley | Agree | |
| 31741 Mr Robert Stevenson | Agree | |
| 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert- Watene | Agree | |
| 31774 Mrs Jane Sutherland | Agree | |
| 31783 Mr Peter Jones | Agree | |
| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | Disagree | Intensification |
| 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | Disagree | Disagree unless there is guaranteed frequent, reliable and cheap public transport into Richmond Centre and Nelson CBD (Bridge/Trafalgar St) |
| 31114 Ms Jill Rogers | Disagree | If this includes areas for livestock and growing food then no |
| 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward | Disagree | Don't lose productive land. |
| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | Disagree | The threat to productive land will be impossible to stop. |
| 31186 Mr Gary Scott | Disagree | The location should be further away from the main road. |
| 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman | Disagree | Where is the detailed map? Most buildings can look to 100yrs of use. Mc Shane Rd does not have this long. Developments like Estuary Place are ridiculous. Inland of the Appleby Highway would be the closes to the sea that one should consider. |
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | Disagree | Most of the new build seems to be on a flood plain and is using up highly productive farm land |
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | Disagree | Green areas should be preserved for public recreation in intensified communities. |
| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | Disagree | as above DISAgree as I feel we should only be working on the brownfield land. The green land / bare land should b |
| | | |

| | | | protected and areas for restoration for planting, environmental protection and or public green space. Intensify by working with existing buildings and areas of housing |
|---|---------------|----------|---|
| 31322 Mrs BARBARA ROBSON | A AND TIM | Disagree | |
| 31349 Laurien Heijs | | Disagree | See Q14 response |
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Ku | ıykendall | Disagree | |
| 31409 Dr Andrew Til | lling | Disagree | Greenfield expansion just encourages more sprawl. It would be better to relax the rules on multi-purpos dwellings and offer incentives for mixed housing |
| 31415 Mrs Zanahe R | Ruth Galloway | Disagree | Create new towns , encourage the revival of Wakefield and other rural villages. |
| 31416 Tim Leyland | | Disagree | |
| 31437 Mr & Mrs Der Ball | rek & Gaylyn | Disagree | T 040 Should be a continuation of neighbouring rural residential area. Disagree with re-zooming areas that are orchards and nurseries. |
| 31441 Mr Chris Head | d | Disagree | |
| 31443 Dr Monika Cla | ark-Grill | Disagree | Richmond needs to be intensified rather than expanded out |
| 31481 Mrs Lucy Har | rhy | Disagree | see above |
| 31485 Ms Robin Sch | iff | Disagree | Only if the planning starts from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
| 31488 Annette Stari | nk | Disagree | See answer 22 |
| 31492 Anton, Benni, Bank, Bonnin, Davis | | Disagree | |
| 31498 Ms Anne Kolle | ess | Disagree | |
| 31554 Wendy Barke | r | Disagree | I think it's a shame to continue to allow creep up the hills. |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palli | iser | Disagree | |

| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | Disagree | |
|--------------------------------|----------|---|
| 31580 Jenny Long | Disagree | I disagree with the location and the scale of the proposed greenfield housing areas in Richmond. We have ample scope for building upwards in our existing footprint. Destroying green spaces by allowing urban sprawl is a mistake that will send us backwards with regards to reducing carbon emissions, and negatively affect the wellbeing of individuals. |
| 31608 Robbie Thomson | Disagree | Near centres is where we need multi storey/multi unit development. |
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | Disagree | Better to have more intensification within central Richmond if the area is made attractive with leafy green spaces between buildings and walkways etc |
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | Disagree | Do we need more greenfield homes if we seek to intensify housing? This seems counterintuitive. |
| 31617 Ms steph jewell | Disagree | as 22 |
| 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | Disagree | |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | Disagree | |
| 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin | Disagree | Prefer existing intensification first |
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | Disagree | There should be no further greenfield development in Richmond South and there could be more intensification for mixed homes. businesses in central areas of Richmond |
| 31673 Mike Drake | Disagree | See 23. |
| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | Disagree | I do support growth South of Richmond but what about land north of the Appleby highway where the productive values are less than land to the south? |
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | Disagree | There is too much proposed for SH6 |
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | Disagree | |
| 31704 Mr Paul Bucknall | Disagree | I think this is a mistake. Even though the proposed areas are away from the best and most versatile soils, it's still stretching the extent of the urban area and therefore increasing the likelihood of future division and even partial development of productive land. We have seen places such as the vineyard in Hope that suggested cutting the corner off the block for some affordable homes and the more the sprawl continues, even along the lower slopes of the ranges, the more people and developers perceive the impact of development will be lower. |
| 31722 Trevor Chang | Disagree | |
| 31759 Mr Damian Campbell | Disagree | |
| 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | Disagree | |

| 31771 Colleen Shaw | Disagree | I would like to minimize greenfield development as much as possible. |
|-----------------------------|---------------|---|
| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | Disagree | A: No there should be no sprawl to Richmond South and even T-114 has to be questioned being so far from the town centre and in the hills almost guaranteeing car dependency. There has been almost no intensification of Richmond to date and huge potential there given the older housing stock and large sections. Also the very centre of Richmond is shown as residential infill when it should be mixed use shops and offices and car parking below, apartments above. |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | Disagree | History confirms that greenfields do not attain Net Enduring Restorative Outcomes and carrying capacity to the detriment of Te Taiao. |
| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | Don't know | |
| 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | Don't know | Don't know what Greenfield housing is |
| 31219 Mrs kate windle | Don't know | |
| 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | Don't know | |
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | Don't know | |
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | Don't know | |
| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | Don't know | |
| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | Don't know | |
| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley | Don't know | |
| 31278 Wendy Ross | Don't know | |
| 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | Don't know | |
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | Don't | |
| | | |

| | know | |
|------------------------------------|---------------|----------------------------------|
| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31406 Ms Floortje van Lierop | Don't know | See above |
| | | |
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | Don't know | |
| 24.42C Ma Davida | | |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas Hollyman | Don't know | |
| 31473 Mr Andrew Downs | Don't | |
| J1475 WII Allalew Dowlis | know | |
| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31483 Debbie Hampson | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31487 Ms Heather Spence | Don't | As #22. |
| | know | |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne | Don't | Richmond also needs a green belt |
| | know | |
| 31521 Mrs Marie Waterhouse | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard | Don't | |
| | | |

| | know | |
|---------------------------------|---------------|--|
| 31558 Mr Steve Jordan | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31572 Mr David Todd | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins | Don't know | |
| 24500 14 11 1 14 5 11 | | |
| 31598 Mrs Nicola Worsfold | Don't know | |
| 31606 Mr Trent Shepard | Don't | |
| 31000 Wil Hellt Sliepard | know | |
| 31641 Mr Stephen (Steve) Hayden | | |
| 0_0 | know | |
| 31643 Inge Koevoet | Don't | |
| G | know | |
| 31651 Dr Patrick Conway | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31693 Carolyn Rose | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31697 Robert King-Tenison | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | Don't | Not answering any of these leading questions |
| | | |

| | know | |
|------------------------------|---------------|---|
| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | Don't | |
| 24704 Ma Tarrasa Jarrasa | know | |
| 31784 Ms Teresa James | Don't know | |
| 31185 Myfanway James | N/A | Limit greenfields development unless it is intensive. |
| 31247 Mr yuri aristarco | N/A | no |
| 31363 Mr Steve Cross | N/A | I reject the premise of this question |
| 31364 Mrs Christine Tuffnell | N/A | Best commented on by local people of that area |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | N/A | It is providing housing where work, services, and amenities are. However it should be situated on the hills behind Richmond as this reduces the pressure on the productive land. |
| 31623 Ms Lucy Charlesworth | N/A | I am wary of answering these questions as I cannot be sure of how they will be interpreted. So I will state - I do not agree with developing green spaces. These spaces need to be reserved and protected to allow for sustainable biodiversity and for future generations. Intensification within Nelson CBD needs to be a priority. I do not agrees with building on Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. I do not agree with housing development on green fields. There is a climate emergency. Remove these areas from the FDS. |
| 31129 Mrs Gaynor Brooks | Neutral | |
| 31130 Trevor James | Neutral | |
| 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert | Neutral | |
| 31173 Mr Roderick Watson | Neutral | |
| 31174 Ms Alison Westerby | Neutral | |
| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | Neutral | |
| 31192 Ms Rebecca Patchett | Neutral | Productive land needs protection. Food security is an issue. |
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | Neutral | |
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | Neutral | |
| 31227 Ms Lee Eliott | Neutral | |

| 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | Neutral | See answers above |
|---|---------|---|
| 31240 Michael Markert | Neutral | |
| 31250 Mr Richard Wyles | Neutral | |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | Neutral | Richmond West is a prime example of development on prime horticultural land that mustn't be allowed to happen any more |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | Neutral | |
| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | Neutral | |
| 31286 Mr David Short | Neutral | |
| 31309 Mr & Mrs Rose & Phillip Windle | Neutral | |
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | Neutral | |
| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | Neutral | expansing into the hills is fine, but where is the intensification around the main shopping area |
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | Neutral | |
| 31347 Ms Paula Baldwin | Neutral | Already said intensification directly around the CBD is expected; but the map takes it too far; and don't agree with any other intensification colours on Map Figure 7. |
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | Neutral | |
| 31355 Mr Barney Hoskins | Neutral | |
| 31358 George Harrison | Neutral | |
| 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | Neutral | |
| 31365 michael monti | Neutral | |
| 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer | Neutral | |
| 31403 Mr Richard Deck | Neutral | |
| 31423 Mr Roger Frost | Neutral | |
| 31430 Muriel Moran | Neutral | I think hillside housing options need to be pursued first. A large area of productive land has already been put into housing. |
| 31435 Mr Alan Eggers | Neutral | |
| | | |

| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | Neutral | |
|------------------------------|---------|---|
| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | Neutral | No comment |
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | Neutral | |
| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | Neutral | Only if the planning starts from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | Neutral | |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | Neutral | |
| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | Neutral | As above |
| 31480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | Neutral | |
| 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | Neutral | |
| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | Neutral | Neutral. Please refer to our comments to Q5, Q22 & Q23. The proposed greenfield development is predominately away from the centre of Richmond. Consideration needs to be given to provision of daily services which people can easily access through active modes rather than having an emphasis on urban sprawl where people will be forced to rely on their vehicles. The Business sites (T-035 & T-122) could become Mixed Use sites where commercial activity and residential is encouraged especially as these sites are on the main trunk link. |
| 31520 Andrew Stirling | Neutral | |
| 31549 Mr Ian McComb | Neutral | |
| 31551 Mrs Jo Kitchen | Neutral | |
| 31560 Ms Steph Watts | Neutral | If there is allowance for tiny homes and/ sustainably built homes on sections rather than the current trend for enormous houses. Do away with covenents on minimum sizes for homes |
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | Neutral | Find the intensification of Lower Queen street in what must be a potential area for sea level rise, and the demand for housing that was offered at Hope for an affordable option declined repeatedly as not |

| 31563 Mrs Loretta Anne Hogg | Neutral | Within context. Create new self sufficient communities. Leave green in-beween and then create another comfortable community - schools biking, shops etc. Not everybody having to drive to the one big place. |
|-----------------------------|---------|---|
| 31574 Mr David Bolton | Neutral | |
| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | Neutral | |
| 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz | Neutral | |
| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | Neutral | |
| 31604 Mr Peter Moot | Neutral | |
| 31614 Mr mark Morris | Neutral | |
| 31622 Peter Butler | Neutral | |
| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | Neutral | |
| 31628 Mr Daniel Levy | Neutral | I disagree with the proposed greenfield sites on existing fertile farmland in this area but do not specifically object to development in the less fertile hill sites. |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | Neutral | |
| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | Neutral | |
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | Neutral | I am not an expert and able to comment everything. Please listen to Joni Tomsett or Tim Neubauer. I think they represent my ideas. |
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | Neutral | Support intensification of existing urban areas as a priority, however acknowledge that demand cannot be met without greenfield development. These sites are an extension of the Richmond urban area which has social and economic infrastructure in place, and if FDS outcomes are achieved, could support moving away from a reliance on private vehicle transport. |
| | | Waka Kotahi have provided feedback to Tasman District Council via the 'Reimagining Richmond South' process, TDC Growth Plan Change process. |
| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | Neutral | |
| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | Neutral | |
| 31683 Richard Davies | Neutral | |
| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | Neutral | |

| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | Neutral | |
|----------------------------|---------|--|
| 31692 Mr Alasdair Gardiner | Neutral | |
| 31703 Ms Paula Holden | Neutral | |
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | Neutral | See attached submission. Summarised - no specific comments on this question, generally supports FDS. |
| 31716 Mr Alan hart | Neutral | |
| 31744 Mrs Lorna CRANE | Neutral | |
| 31752 Jill Pearson | Neutral | |
| 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | Neutral | T-040 and T-114, yes |
| | | T-035, T-038, T-039, T120, T-121, no. Stop destorying quality land with housing |
| | | |
| 31765 Mrs Lorna Ivy Cooper | Neutral | |
| 31769 Ms Jo Gould | Neutral | |
| 31775 Dr Thomas Carl | Neutral | |
| 31814 Jackie McNae | Neutral | SEE ATTACHED PDF |
| | | Both organizations seek that their landholdings be identified as business growth options within the Future Development strategy and in due course, both landholdings should be rezoned in their entirety to Rural Industrial. |
| 31819 Jackie McNae | Neutral | SEE ATTACHED PDF The outcome the Submitters seek through the FDS process, is confirmation that the subject landholdings are identified for Residential development with the opportunity to undertake a range of densities of development, including Medium to High Density Development. The FDS should also signal that within new Residential areas that provision should be included for neighbourhood commercia and community activities. The Submitters wish the Ahimia land to be identified as a residential growth option enabling a range of densities of development and a range of housing typology. The SHA process has confirmed how the land can be serviced and therefore the future of this land should be as Residential land, not left as Rural Residential with a minimum 2000m² per allotment. The FDS should encourage a |

level of Business growth through a mixed use approach, that should apply to the Submitters landholdings. Provision should be incorporated into the future Zoning framework for recreational activities to be provided for as permitted activities, together with service activities for the significant numbers of visitors, cyclists and walkers attracted into Silvan Park to have opportunity for service facilities such as cafes and lodge / accommodation facilities, as well as enclaves of residential development, located within suitable locations while still maintaining the low density, high amenity, backdrop to Richmond.

| 31835 Mr Ian Wishart | Neutral | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|---|
| 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | Strongly agree | |
| 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | Strongly agree | |
| 31284 Mr Jarmo Saloranta | Strongly agree | |
| 31316 John Heslop | Strongly agree | |
| 31356 Stephen Williams | Strongly Growth sagree | should occur close to employment opportunities and existing infrastructure. |
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | Strongly agree | |
| 31815 Peter Wilks | Strongly agree | |
| 31836 Paula M Wilks | Strongly As above agree | e. Do not sprawl onto Waimea Plains. |
| 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS | Strongly disagree | |
| 31122 Mr Johan Thomas Wahlgren | Strongly Same arg | gument |
| 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren | Strongly Leave ar disagree | ny greenfield area alone |
| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson | Strongly The tow | n has already over expanded. |
| | | |

| | disagree | |
|----------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31171 Ms Sallie Griffiths | Strongly disagree | |
| 31216 Ms Judith Holmes | Strongly disagree | Intensify. |
| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | Strongly disagree | Strongly disagree with ANY greenfield development because of climate change, as well as productive needs. |
| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | Strongly disagree | As above, I don't like the Richmond South development because of the use of productive farm land. |
| 31279 Mr Jeremy Thompson | Strongly disagree | Answer 3 |
| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | Strongly disagree | Leave green, green. |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | Strongly disagree | Please see attached - sumarised below: Disagrees with greenfield expansion, intensification of unused areas should be favoured. |
| 31328 Ms Karen du Fresne | Strongly disagree | |
| 31334 Diane Sutherland | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons above |
| 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | Strongly disagree | I oppose turning more of our landscape into suburbs and commuter zones. We have enough of these already and need to preserve our rural and productive land. |
| 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | Strongly disagree | It's foolhardy to have greenfield housing areas. I agree neither with the intensification or the scale of the plan. |
| 31346 Martin Hartman | Strongly disagree | I oppose turning more of our landscape into suburbs and commuter zones. We have enough of these already and need to preserve our rural and productive land. |
| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | Strongly disagree | Same - in the strongest terms. STOP IT! |
| 31366 Ms Maree Sharland | Strongly disagree | |
| | | |

| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | Strongly disagree | Using productive land simply is creating and forcing the use of intense horticulture in areas further away for population bases. |
|------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, there is no need to turn the picturesque landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony |
| 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann | Strongly disagree | Same arguments here!! |
| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | Strongly disagree | Loss of Highly productive heritage Soils |
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31410 Mr Scott Smithline | Strongly disagree | see 22 |
| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling | Strongly disagree | We nee to protect our A1 class soils from housing developments. |
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin | Strongly disagree | No more urban sprawl |
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | Strongly disagree | Unnecessary development at the cost of local amenity , there are better options with intensification, increasing occupancy levels and change of use of current housing stock |
| 31434 Mrs cushla Moorhead | Strongly disagree | There is so much productive land round Richmond being developed and it is counterproductive to the health and well-being of the area. |
| 31452 Mr David Bartle | Strongly disagree | This is high financial risk to TDC . Completed dormitory suburbs are already generating track which our roading system struggle's to accommodate. The plan would substantially reduce agricultural land, affect rural workforce employment and be highly divisive amongst local communities |
| 31457 Mr J Santa Barbara | Strongly disagree | No greenfield expansion in this area. Focus on expanding existing areas with med density mixed use. |
| 31472 Dr David Briggs | Strongly disagree | |
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into a concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31491 Ms Annette Milligan | Strongly disagree | See 21 |

| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | Strongly disagree | I don't support greenfield development. |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need more sprawl. |
| 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31496 Mrs Petra Dekker | Strongly disagree | contradiction with the Zero Carbon Act. |
| 31508 Mr Roger Barlow | Strongly disagree | Wasting good productive land. |
| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | Strongly disagree | The areas proposed are too far from the centre of Richmond. |
| 31515 Geoffrey Vause | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31516 Mr Peter Lole | Strongly disagree | Absolute minimum of greenfield development though. |
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | Strongly disagree | For the same reasons given for Q22 |
| 31533 Wendy Trevett | Strongly disagree | |
| 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | Strongly disagree | See full submission. Summarised below (similar to NT2050 submission): singluar focus on growth, challenges underlying growth projections, insufficient consultation, misleading submission form (outcome questions), community feedback ignored, biased process, non-compliance with government directives. Recommends re-think of the draft. |
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett | Strongly | |
| | | |

| | disagree | |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31579 Jane Tate | Strongly disagree | I do not agree with greenfield housing areas. If this land is high quality (or even medium quality), it should be left for food production. |
| 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | Strongly disagree | Can we please stop turning our beautiful landscape into a concrete jungle. We need to show courage and change the status quo way of meeting demand. |
| 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31593 Mr William Samuels | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. And create further disconnect to our hardly exciting, lifeless centres. |
| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac. There is plenty of brownfield capacity in Richmond (including the carparks), and if you don't actually allocate greenfield, developers might just figure out how to use it. |
| | | Consider also how this will ever meet the outcomes. |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | Strongly disagree | See earlier comments |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | Strongly disagree | I just sat through the R-South public engagement Zoom, and have provided ideas via the team. Again as per themes here don't create a strip suburb! |
| | | Break Hope from Richmond, create density and green surrounds etc. Strong active mode transport corridors. Heavy traffic on main road, some industry ok - but you need to get that industry diversified and |
| | | |

| | | spread out to hubs in Wakefield, Brightwater, Upper Moutere etc etc. |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | Strongly disagree | |
| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | Strongly disagree | |
| 31636 Joanna Santa Barbara | Strongly disagree | |
| 31637 Ms Frances Kemble Welch | Strongly disagree | |
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | Strongly disagree | As above |
| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | Strongly disagree | |
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | Strongly disagree | Strongly disagree For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | Strongly disagree | Strongly disagree For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | Strongly disagree | For all the same reasons as above. |
| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | Strongly disagree | No. We need to concentrate on intensification, not on green field developments. |
| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | Strongly | I am endorsing the Nelson Tasman Climate Forum's view . |
| | | |

| | disagree | |
|--|----------------------|--|
| 31710 Ms Angela Fitchett | Strongly disagree | ref answer to 22. |
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | Strongly disagree | It is unnecessary if the correct utilisation of our existing urban areas can be intensified. |
| 31726 Mr John Jackson | Strongly disagree | |
| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31736 Ms Carol Curtis | Strongly disagree | |
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | Strongly disagree | They are on productive soils and/or areas of landscape values. |
| 31763 Susan Rogers | Strongly disagree | |
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | Strongly disagree | Reasons as above |
| 31777 Mr David Lucas | Strongly disagree | It doesn't seem to make sense that the TDC has allowed sprawling single storey housing development over productive horticultural land. The majority of new houses sold in Richmond are to my age group as 2nd, 3rd and 4th houses and so are not meeting a so called housing crisis. |
| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | Strongly disagree | |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Strongly disagree | SH6 needs upgrading before any more development occurs in Richmond. Southern link needs priority. |
| 31801 Joan Skurr | Strongly disagree | Land around Richmond on the Plaines is needed for food production. Some of the sloping land could be used if it is not suitable for crops. Employment needs to be close by. |
| 31830 K.M. McDonald | Strongly disagree | The large new housing areas to the left of lower queen street are an example of exactly what should not be allowed - flood prone land, removal of productive land, sections too small for tress, concrete instead of natural plantings and restoration. |

| 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan | Agree | Great for commuting people to Richmond for work and shopping |
|--------------------------------|-------|---|
| 31257 Mr Kent Inglis | Agree | Still reasonable proximity to services and infrastructure |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | Agree | |
| 31284 Mr Jarmo Saloranta | Agree | |
| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | Agree | |
| 31316 John Heslop | Agree | |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | Agree | |
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | Agree | |
| 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman | Agree | |
| 31347 Ms Paula Baldwin | Agree | |
| 31356 Stephen Williams | Agree | As long as the growth is in proportion to the local employment opportunities. |
| 31360 Ms Thuy Tran | Agree | |
| 31405 Mr Doug Hattersley | Agree | |
| 31415 Mrs Zanahe Ruth Galloway | Agree | to revive this town and make it a thriving friendly town to live is a sensible option away from the rising se levels and possible flooding. |
| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors | Agree | These areas are on main routes and a lot of industry is along these roads. |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | Agree | Only if it is on low productive land classes, and dev is intensified multi story . |
| 31435 Mr Alan Eggers | Agree | Agree with Jefferies Road greenfield but also need to allow more rural res in the adjoing are of Spring Grovs |
| 31438 Aleisha Hosie | Agree | The Brightwater Community Association supports the application that the T-102 area should include the 4ha of land tot he west and north of snowdens bush. We would support this proposal if a portion of land was donated o DOC to provide a buffer of protection to Snowdens Bush - as per attached letter (summarised above). |
| 31449 Mr John Chisholm | Agree | |
| 31529 Mr Steven King-Turner | Agree | |

| 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin | Agree | Infill first |
|--------------------------------------|----------|--|
| 31647 Mrs Rebecca Parish | Agree | |
| 31656 Mr brad malcolm | Agree | |
| 31667 barbara nicholas | Agree | |
| 31688 Gerard McDonnell | Agree | Some development here as long as services (eg shops and other facilities) are also provided |
| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | Agree | |
| 31706 Paul Donald Galloway | Agree | Revive rebuild recreate new towns with reserves forest greenfield in between. Small towns are happy towns with relaxed people, a sense of security for parents for their children to walk bike to school to get to work easy access to parks, community gardens for a cohesive thriving community. |
| 31718 Kathryn & Keith Quigley | Agree | |
| 31741 Mr Robert Stevenson | Agree | |
| 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert- Watene | Agree | |
| 31774 Mrs Jane Sutherland | Agree | |
| 31783 Mr Peter Jones | Agree | |
| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | Disagree | |
| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson | Disagree | The region needs to preserve it's green spaces and farmland. |
| 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward | Disagree | Don't lose productive land - people need food. |
| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | Disagree | see 24 above. |
| 31227 Ms Lee Eliott | Disagree | |
| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | Disagree | as above DISAgree as I feel we should only be working on the brownfield land. The green land / bare land should be protected and areas for restoration for planting, environmental protection and or public green space. Intensify by working with existing buildings and areas of housing |
| 31322 Mrs BARBARA AND TIM ROBSON | Disagree | |
| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | Disagree | Too much greenfield |
| | | |

| 31349 Laurien Heijs | Disagree | See Q14 response |
|---|----------|---|
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | Disagree | |
| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling | Disagree | This will just encourage more sprawl |
| 31416 Tim Leyland | Disagree | |
| 31430 Muriel Moran | Disagree | |
| 31434 Mrs cushla Moorhead | Disagree | |
| 31441 Mr Chris Head | Disagree | |
| 31443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | Disagree | This is part of sprawling with no suitable transport infrastructure, forcing people into cars to get to jobs and schools etc |
| 31481 Mrs Lucy Harrhy | Disagree | see above |
| 31485 Ms Robin Schiff | Disagree | Only if the planning starts from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
| 31488 Annette Starink | Disagree | See 22 |
| 31492 Anton, Benni, Shalom, AJ Bank, Bonnin, Shalom Davis | Disagree | |
| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless | Disagree | |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne | Disagree | Brightwater has grown enough already. |
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | Disagree | not enough jobs, too much commuting |
| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | Disagree | Do not support T-001 - too far from the centre of Brightwater. |
| 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery | Disagree | Creeping into very productive land. |
| 31554 Wendy Barker | Disagree | Too much already |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | Disagree | |
| | | |

| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | Disagree | |
|--------------------------|----------|---|
| 31580 Jenny Long | Disagree | I disagree with the location and the scale of the proposed greenfield housing areas in Brightwater. We have ample scope for building upwards in our existing footprint. Destroying green spaces by allowing urban sprawl is a mistake that will send us backwards with regards to reducing carbon emissions, and negatively affect the wellbeing of individuals. |
| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | Disagree | As above Brightwater does not need to be 'intensified', nowhere in this region does. Slow natural growth can be supported. Unnatural fast growth is unnecessary and should not be encouraged |
| 31608 Robbie Thomson | Disagree | Build on the hills, leave the flats alone (except for commercial) |
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | Disagree | Not enough jobs in Brightwater for expansion without increasing commuting times and carbon emissions |
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | Disagree | Do we need more greenfield homes if we seek to intensify housing? This seems counterintuitive. It will turn Brightwater into even more of a commuter suburb. |
| 31617 Ms steph jewell | Disagree | as 22 |
| 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | Disagree | |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | Disagree | |
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | Disagree | No. Too many public transport problems and too far away from important public services |
| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | Disagree | Not horticultural land |
| 31722 Trevor Chang | Disagree | |
| 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | Disagree | |
| 31771 Colleen Shaw | Disagree | I would like to minimize greenfield development as much as possible. |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Disagree | Any more development would require prioritizing a southern link road and bypass around Brightwater. |
| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | Disagree | A: No, Increasing the number of people living in rural towns is counter to our climate change imperatives of settlement patterns largely eliminating car commuting. We can't see how many people living in Brightwater will be employed in Brightwater. Public Transport from Brightwater and Wakefield into Richmond and Nelson will most unlikely be quicker and more convenient than a car, 10 minute frequencies necessary for this just aren't going to happen in these satellite towns, people are going to be using the least energy and space efficient means to get to their workplaces, the hospital, their pilates classes - extra residents in these far flung settlements are going to mean more cars on the road and more congestion, more energy expended in 2 tonne metal boxes, daily car dependence. This is last centuries thinking. |

| 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | Don't know | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------------|
| 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | Don't know | |
| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | Don't know | |
| 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | Don't know | Don't know what Greenfield housing is |
| 31219 Mrs kate windle | Don't know | |
| 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | Don't know | |
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | Don't know | |
| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | Don't know | |
| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | Don't know | |
| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley | Don't know | |
| 31278 Wendy Ross | Don't know | |
| 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | Don't know | |
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | Don't know | |
| 31355 Mr Barney Hoskins | Don't know | |
| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | Don't know | |
| | | |

| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | Don't know | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|-----------|
| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | Don't know | |
| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | Don't know | |
| 31406 Ms Floortje van Lierop | Don't know | See above |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas Hollyman | Don't know | |
| 31431 Katerina Seligman | Don't know | |
| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn Ball | Don't know | |
| 31473 Mr Andrew Downs | Don't know | |
| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | Don't know | |
| 31483 Debbie Hampson | Don't know | |
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | Don't know | |
| 31487 Ms Heather Spence | Don't know | As #22. |
| 31505 Cheryl Heten | Don't know | |
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers | Don't know | |
| 31521 Mrs Marie Waterhouse | Don't know | |
| | | |

| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard | Don't | |
|----------------------------------|-------|--------------------|
| | know | |
| 31558 Mr Steve Jordan | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | Don't | |
| 31333 Dr. 134 Ganagner | know | |
| | | |
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | Don't | see above comments |
| | know | |
| 31572 Mr David Todd | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham | Don't | |
| 31373 Wil Allurew Damerilani | know | |
| | | |
| 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins | Don't | |
| | know | |
| | | |
| 31598 Mrs Nicola Worsfold | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31606 Mr Trent Shepard | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31641 Mr Stephen (Steve) Hayden | Don't | |
| 31041 Wil Stephen (Steve) Hayden | know | |
| | | |
| 31643 Inge Koevoet | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31651 Dr Patrick Conway | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 24.652 Mars Arrites Karanara | | |
| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31693 Carolyn Rose | Don't | |
| | know | |
| | | |

| 31697 Robert King-Tenison | Don't know | |
|------------------------------|---------------|---|
| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | Don't know | Not answering any of these leading questions |
| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | Don't know | |
| 31759 Mr Damian Campbell | Don't know | |
| 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | Don't know | |
| 31784 Ms Teresa James | Don't know | |
| 31185 Myfanway James | N/A | Limit greenfields development unless it is intensive. |
| 31363 Mr Steve Cross | N/A | I reject the premise of this question |
| 31364 Mrs Christine Tuffnell | N/A | Best commented on by local people of that area |
| 31623 Ms Lucy Charlesworth | N/A | I am wary of answering these questions as I cannot be sure of how they will be interpreted. So I will state - I do not agree with developing green spaces. These spaces need to be reserved and protected to allow for sustainable biodiversity and for future generations. Intensification within Nelson CBD needs to be a priority. I do not agrees with building on Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. I do not agree with housing development on green fields. There is a climate emergency. Remove these areas from the FDS. |
| 31114 Ms Jill Rogers | Neutral | |
| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | Neutral | |
| 31129 Mrs Gaynor Brooks | Neutral | |
| 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert | Neutral | |
| 31173 Mr Roderick Watson | Neutral | |
| 31174 Ms Alison Westerby | Neutral | |
| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | Neutral | |
| 31192 Ms Rebecca Patchett | Neutral | |
| | | |

| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | Neutral | |
|---|---------|--|
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | Neutral | |
| 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | Neutral | See answers above |
| 31240 Michael Markert | Neutral | |
| 31250 Mr Richard Wyles | Neutral | |
| 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman | Neutral | The area close to the Wairoa River is at risk of flooding by a very powerful river. The area up Jefferies Rd i good farmland. |
| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | Neutral | |
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | Neutral | |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | Neutral | |
| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | Neutral | |
| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | Neutral | |
| 31286 Mr David Short | Neutral | |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | Neutral | Please see attached - summarised below: T5 is OK but T102 is area of vineyards so does not support. Does not support T1, T3 given rural land. Concern about typologies of new developments being large houses. |
| 31309 Mr & Mrs Rose & Phillip Windle | Neutral | |
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | Neutral | |
| 31358 George Harrison | Neutral | |
| 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | Neutral | |
| 31365 michael monti | Neutral | |
| 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer | Neutral | |
| 31403 Mr Richard Deck | Neutral | |
| 31423 Mr Roger Frost | Neutral | I am concerned that this will generate much more private vehicle use, even though it may be needed to support better public transport. |
| | | support better public transport. |

| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | Neutral | No comment |
|------------------------------|---------|---|
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | Neutral | |
| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | Neutral | Only if the planning starts from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
| 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon | Neutral | |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | Neutral | |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | Neutral | |
| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | Neutral | As above. |
| 31480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | Neutral | |
| 31484 Mr Gavin Brent Cook | Neutral | |
| 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | Neutral | |
| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | Neutral | Neutral. Please refer to our comments to Q5, Q22 & Q23. T-001 is situated quite far from the town centre and it is important that there are good active transport connections so people can access their local services. |
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | Neutral | As per Q. 22 response. |
| 31549 Mr Ian McComb | Neutral | |
| 31551 Mrs Jo Kitchen | Neutral | |
| 31560 Ms Steph Watts | Neutral | If there is allowance for tiny homes and/ sustainably built homes on sections rather than the current trend for enormous houses. Do away with covenents on minimum sizes for homes and have covenents that allow for a % cover of trees and vegetation on each section to absorb carbon, catch rain and attract wildlife. |
| 31563 Mrs Loretta Anne Hogg | Neutral | Within context. Create new self sufficient communities. Leave green in-beween and then create another comfortable community - schools biking, shops etc. Not everybody having to drive to the one big place. |
| 31574 Mr David Bolton | Neutral | |

| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | Neutral | |
|----------------------------|---------|---|
| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | Neutral | |
| 31604 Mr Peter Moot | Neutral | |
| 31614 Mr mark Morris | Neutral | |
| 31622 Peter Butler | Neutral | |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | Neutral | |
| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | Neutral | |
| 31628 Mr Daniel Levy | Neutral | I disagree with the proposed greenfield sites on existing fertile farmland in this area but do not specifically object to development in the less fertile hill sites. |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | Neutral | |
| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | Neutral | |
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | Neutral | I am not an expert and able to comment everything. Please listen to Joni Tomsett or Tim Neubauer. I think they represent my ideas. |
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | Neutral | |
| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | Neutral | |
| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | Neutral | |
| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | Neutral | |
| 31683 Richard Davies | Neutral | |
| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | Neutral | |
| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | Neutral | |
| 31692 Mr Alasdair Gardiner | Neutral | |
| 31703 Ms Paula Holden | Neutral | |
| 31704 Mr Paul Bucknall | Neutral | |
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | Neutral | See attached submission. Summarised - no specific comments on this question, generally supports FDS. |
| 31716 Mr Alan hart | Neutral | |
| 31744 Mrs Lorna CRANE | Neutral | |

| 31752 Jill Pearson | Neutral | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | Neutral | Cancel T-002 and T-005. No more housing on high quality soils. |
| | | Agree with housing on the hills south of Brightwater, T-001 and T-003, with the TDC doing all they can to open up these two areas |
| 31765 Mrs Lorna Ivy Cooper | Neutral | |
| 31769 Ms Jo Gould | Neutral | |
| 31775 Dr Thomas Carl | Neutral | |
| 31777 Mr David Lucas | Neutral | |
| 31835 Mr Ian Wishart | Neutral | |
| 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | Strongly agree | Yes by T-104 has a conflict of land use next to it. Intensification of this area is not viable under the current district plan without proving reverse sensitivity issues effects are minor. |
| 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | Strongly agree | |
| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | Strongly agree | I think the areas chosen have low productivity values and hence are appropriate for residential use. |
| 31440 Chris Prattley | Strongly agree | See attached- summarised below: Owners of 100 Bryant Road in T-102 site, agree with outcomes and support site for urban growth. Our submission is limited to the future growth of Brightwater, and we are neutral on other areas which are being considered for growth. We own the property shown as T-102. The draft NTFDS identifies this as a suitable site for detached residential development. We strongly support this. We support growth of Brightwater both through intensification within the existing village and |
| | | appropriately located greenfield areas. While we appreciate that the NTFDS addresses growth options for the next 30 years and may inform but does not directly rezone land through the TRMP, we believe that T-102 is a growth area that is well located and well serviced to meet the demand for residential property in the district in the short to medium term. |
| 31508 Mr Roger Barlow | Strongly agree | This land is not suitable as productive land as the majority is clay based with minimal topsoil and unsuitable for agricultural machinery. It is close to Brightwater Town and SH 6. The valley floor could be |

| | | used as retention ponds to control storm water flows. No fear of problems from increased sea levels caused by global warming. |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31662 Joe Roberts | Strongly agree | As set out above, it is considered that T-102 should also include the 4ha to the west, and north of Snowden's Bush, being that land at 70A Waimea West Road. |
| 31815 Peter Wilks | Strongly agree | |
| 31836 Paula M Wilks | Strongly agree | As per Q21. |
| 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS | Strongly disagree | |
| 31122 Mr Johan Thomas Wahlgren | Strongly disagree | Same argument |
| 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren | Strongly disagree | Leave any greenfield area alone |
| 31171 Ms Sallie Griffiths | Strongly disagree | |
| 31216 Ms Judith Holmes | Strongly disagree | Intensify. |
| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | Strongly disagree | Strongly disagree with ANY greenfield development because of climate change, as well as productive needs. |
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | Strongly disagree | |
| 31247 Mr yuri aristarco | Strongly disagree | no |
| 31279 Mr Jeremy Thompson | Strongly disagree | Answer 3 |
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | Strongly disagree | Green areas should be preserved for public recreation in intensified communities. |
| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | Strongly disagree | Leave green, green. |
| | | |

| 31334 Diane Sutherland | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons above |
|------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | Strongly disagree | I oppose turning more of our landscape into suburbs and commuter zones. We have enough of these already and need to preserve our rural and productive land. |
| 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | Strongly disagree | It's foolhardy to have greenfield housing areas. I agree neither with the intensification or the scale of the plan. |
| 31346 Martin Hartman | Strongly disagree | I oppose turning more of our landscape into suburbs and commuter zones. We have enough of these already and need to preserve our rural and productive land. |
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | Strongly disagree | Intensify around mount heslington |
| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | Strongly disagree | Same. |
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | Strongly disagree | As above |
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, there is no need to turn the picturesque landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony |
| 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann | Strongly disagree | Same arguments here!! |
| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | Strongly disagree | Loss of highly productive Soils Ignores Future flooding risks in engineering modelling |
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31410 Mr Scott Smithline | Strongly disagree | see 22 |
| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling | Strongly disagree | There is no work there and we need to protect our landscape from more housing development. |
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin | Strongly disagree | |
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | Strongly | Proposal for T-01 Shannee Hills and T-03 Jeffries Rd would fragment rural land and are not in keeping with |
| | | |

| | disagree | the rural character of the area. They would also split the town and have significant traffic implications. |
|---------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | Strongly disagree | Unnecessary development at the cost of local amenity, there are better options with intensification, increasing occupancy levels and change of use of current housing stock |
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | Strongly disagree | |
| 31452 Mr David Bartle | Strongly disagree | This would simply further expand Brightwater as a dormitory town and is inconsistent with core objectives to reduce carbon emissions |
| 31457 Mr J Santa Barbara | Strongly disagree | No greenfield expansion in this area. Focus on expanding existing areas with med density mixed use. |
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into a concrete and tarmac covered wasteland. |
| 31491 Ms Annette Milligan | Strongly disagree | See 21 |
| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | Strongly disagree | I don't support greenfield development. |
| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need more sprawl. |
| 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31496 Mrs Petra Dekker | Strongly disagree | contradiction with the Zero Carbon Act. |
| 31515 Geoffrey Vause | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31516 Mr Peter Lole | Strongly disagree | Absolute minimum of greenfield development though. |
| 31520 Andrew Stirling | Strongly disagree | Would like to see area T-054, Teapot Valley to be intended north to include 4 Teapot Valley Road. This is the same land type and usage as surrounding, should be zoned the same. |
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | Strongly disagree | For the same reasons given for Q22. |
| | | |

| 31533 Wendy Trevett | Strongly disagree | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | Strongly disagree | See full submission. Summarised below (similar to NT2050 submission): singluar focus on growth, challenges underlying growth projections, insufficient consultation, misleading submission form (outcome questions), community feedback ignored, biased process, non-compliance with government directives. Recommends re-think of the draft. |
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31565 Mr Rodger Bashford | Strongly disagree | I have lived on our property at Jeffries Road since I was born (1942) and my family and I have thoroughly enjoyed the rural lifestyle and peaceful life we have spent throughout our lives here. When my parents first came here the property was predominantly covered in gorse and scrub with no fencing and very little access to the majority of the land. My family and I have worked extremely hard throughout our lives getting the property to the standard it is now and we would like to see the land used in the same way for the next generations. We are very proud to have produced some pretty exceptional stock over the years on this land. We believe the close proximity of Brightwater suburbia and the local rural mix is very beneficial to the community throughout the local schools and businesses and this has been proven throughout our lives here being both a business owner and rural property owner where we were able to host pony club activities, school trips and even some tourism with a local hotel sending guests to visit. Further to this we believe a lot of the land will not be suitable for housing, especially to the level proposed, due to the steepness of the hills and the significantly wet areas down the bottom of the hills. |
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett | Strongly disagree | |
| 31579 Jane Tate | Strongly disagree | I do not agree with greenfield housing areas. If this land is high quality (or even medium quality), it should be left for food production. |
| 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | Strongly disagree | Can we please stop turning our beautiful landscape into a concrete jungle. We need to show courage and change the status quo way of meeting demand. |
| 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31593 Mr William Samuels | Strongly | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and |
| | | |

| | disagree | tarmac covered monotony. |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. And create further disconnect to our hardly exciting, lifeless centres. |
| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac. Consider also how this will ever meet the outcomes. |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | Strongly disagree | |
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | Strongly disagree | |
| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | Strongly disagree | |
| 31636 Joanna Santa Barbara | Strongly disagree | |
| 31637 Ms Frances Kemble Welch | Strongly disagree | |
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | Strongly disagree | As above |
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | Strongly disagree | Strongly disagree For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |

| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | Strongly disagree | Strongly disagree For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31673 Mike Drake | Strongly disagree | See Q18 |
| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | Strongly disagree | Repeat of arguments above. |
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | Strongly disagree | Growth should be restricted to areas that have already been identified for growth |
| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | Strongly disagree | No. We need to concentrate on intensification, not on green field developments. |
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | Strongly disagree | |
| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | Strongly disagree | I am endorsing the Nelson Tasman Climate Forum's view . |
| 31710 Ms Angela Fitchett | Strongly disagree | Ref answer 22. |
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | Strongly disagree | It is unnecessary if the correct utilisation of our existing urban areas can be intensified. |
| 31726 Mr John Jackson | Strongly disagree | |
| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31736 Ms Carol Curtis | Strongly disagree | |
| | | |

| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | Strongly disagree | They are on productive soils, and encourage sprawl and commuter issues with no mitigating factors. |
|--|----------------------|---|
| 31763 Susan Rogers | Strongly disagree | Survey is flawed from the beginning. You need to redesign this entire line of questioning. It leads only to answers desired by the maker of the survey. |
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | Strongly disagree | As above |
| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | Strongly disagree | |
| 31801 Joan Skurr | Strongly disagree | As above for Richmond. |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | Strongly disagree | History confirms that greenfields do not attain Net Enduring Restorative Outcomes and carrying capacity to the detriment of Te Taiao. Particularly in the context of commuting emissions. |

| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | Agree | Yes but worry about lack of infrastructure and increasing traffic congestion |
|--------------------------------|-------|--|
| 31284 Mr Jarmo Saloranta | Agree | |
| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | Agree | |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | Agree | |
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | Agree | |
| 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman | Agree | |
| 31347 Ms Paula Baldwin | Agree | |
| 31356 Stephen Williams | Agree | As long as the growth is in proportion to the local employment opportunities. |
| 31405 Mr Doug Hattersley | Agree | |
| 31415 Mrs Zanahe Ruth Galloway | Agree | to revive this town and make it a friendly thriving town to live is a sensible option away from the rising sea levels and possible flooding. |
| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors | Agree | These areas are on main routes and a lot of industry is along these roads. |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | Agree | Only if it is on low productive land classes, and dev is intensified multi story . |
| 31435 Mr Alan Eggers | Agree | |
| 31449 Mr John Chisholm | Agree | |
| 31508 Mr Roger Barlow | Agree | Only using low productive land. |
| 31537 Mrs Juliana Trolove | Agree | Expansion of Wakefield up the valley is sensible as is close to existing amenities and infrastructure. It is not in an area of sea level rising. a good area for this. |
| 31551 Mrs Jo Kitchen | Agree | see above |
| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | Agree | As 19 |
| 31589 Mrs Renee Edwards | Agree | Agree, but would have liked to have seen a bit more of lower Pigeon Valley (specifically 172 Pigeon Valley) as rural residential. |
| | | It would be nice to see some of the lower valley preserved as lifestyle blocks, rather than <400sq sections. |
| | | I assume that the install for services on 950 homes (sewer, roading etc) would be a large scale investment and therefore also take some time to achieve. |

| 31591 Mr Ben Edwards | Agree | Agree, but would have liked to have seen a bit more of lower Pigeon Valley (specifically 172 Pigeon Valley) highlighted as rural residential. |
|---------------------------|-------|--|
| 31620 Mr Paul Baigent | Agree | We own the property at 57 Pigeon Valley which bounds the Baigents bush reserve. Part of our property is included on the eastern edge of the proposed greenfield residential area and we support this development in the medium term. While this is currently productive land it's close proximity to the current centre of Wakefield makes it a logical choice for future urban development. It bounds the bush reserve and the Great Taste Trail and is easy walking distance to the centre of the Village. Much of the recent development in Wakefield has been to the East and North of the centre. This proposed development would position the current commercial area as a more central hub to the future town. We would suggest that the eastern boundary of the proposed greenfield housing area be extended towards the bush reserve to include approximately one hectare of extra flood free land currently not included. |
| 31647 Mrs Rebecca Parish | Agree | |
| 31656 Mr brad malcolm | Agree | |
| 31667 barbara nicholas | Agree | |
| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | Agree | support the Greenfield Future Development Area T194. See attached document. Summarised: supports T194 (landowner) given proximity to amenities, infrastructure servicing, road access, no stability issues, fits in with existing surrounding res developments. |
| 31688 Gerard McDonnell | Agree | Some development here as long as services (eg shops and other facilities) are also provided |
| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | Agree | |
| 31704 Mr Paul Bucknall | Agree | |
| 31735 Mrs Ashleigh Calder | Agree | Agree, but would have liked to have seen a bit more of lower Pigeon Valley (specifically 172 Pigeon Valley) as rural residential. It would be nice to see some of the lower valley preserved as lifestyle blocks, rather than <400sq sections. I assume that the install for services on 950 homes (sewer, roading etc) would be a large scale investment and therefore also take some time to achieve. |
| 31738 Mrs Ngaire Calder | Agree | Agree, but would have liked to have seen a bit more of lower Pigeon Valley (specifically 172 Pigeon Valley) as rural residential. |

| | | It would be nice to see some of the lower valley preserved as lifestyle blocks, rather than <400sq sections. |
|---------------------------|----------|--|
| | | I assume that the install for services on 950 homes (sewer, roading etc) would be a large scale investment and therefore also take some time to achieve. |
| 31740 Mr Kevin Calder | Agree | Agree, but would have liked to have seen a bit more of lower Pigeon Valley (specifically 172 Pigeon Valley) as rural residential. |
| | | It would be nice to see some of the lower valley preserved as lifestyle blocks, rather than <400sq sections. |
| | | I assume that the install for services on 950 homes (sewer, roading etc) would be a large scale investment and therefore also take some time to achieve. |
| 31741 Mr Robert Stevenson | Agree | |
| 31743 Mr Zak Lyttle | Agree | Agree, but would have liked to have seen a bit more of lower Pigeon Valley (specifically 172 Pigeon Valley) as rural residential. |
| | | It would be nice to see some of the lower valley preserved as lifestyle blocks, rather than <400sq sections. |
| | | I assume that the install for services on 950 homes (sewer, roading etc) would be a large scale investment and therefore also take some time to achieve. |
| 31758 Mr Brayden Calder | Agree | Agree, but would have liked to have seen a bit more of lower Pigeon Valley (specifically 172 Pigeon Valley) as rural residential. |
| | | It would be nice to see some of the lower valley preserved as lifestyle blocks, rather than <400sq sections. |
| | | I assume that the install for services on 950 homes (sewer, roading etc) would be a large scale investment and therefore also take some time to achieve. |
| 31774 Mrs Jane Sutherland | Agree | |
| 31783 Mr Peter Jones | Agree | |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Agree | Wakefield could be further developed in the foothills towards the west. But Southern Link would be required first. |
| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson | Disagree | As for 25. |
| 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward | Disagree | Don't lose productive land. |
| | | |

| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | Disagree | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|---|
| 31185 Myfanway James | Disagree | Limit greenfields development unless it is intensive. |
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | Disagree | |
| 31227 Ms Lee Eliott | Disagree | |
| 31257 Mr Kent Inglis | Disagree | Distance from services and infrastructure |
| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | Disagree | DISAgree as I feel we should only be working on the brownfield land. The green land / bare land should be protected and areas for restoration for planting , environmental protection and or public green space. Intensify by working with existing buildings and areas of housing |
| 31322 Mrs BARBARA AND TIM ROBSON | Disagree | |
| 31349 Laurien Heijs | Disagree | See Q14 response |
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | Disagree | As above |
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | Disagree | |
| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling | Disagree | This will just encourage more sprawl |
| 31416 Tim Leyland | Disagree | |
| 31430 Muriel Moran | Disagree | |
| 31434 Mrs cushla Moorhead | Disagree | |
| 31441 Mr Chris Head | Disagree | |
| 31443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | Disagree | Same as above |
| 31481 Mrs Lucy Harrhy | Disagree | see above |
| 31485 Ms Robin Schiff | Disagree | Only if the planning starts from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
| 31488 Annette Starink | Disagree | See 22 |

| 31492 Anton, Benni, Shalom, AJ Bank, Bonnin, Shalom Davis | Disagree | |
|---|----------|--|
| 31496 Mrs Petra Dekker | Disagree | contradiction with the Zero Carbon Act. |
| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless | Disagree | |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne | Disagree | |
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | Disagree | not enough jobs, too much commuting |
| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | Disagree | Do not support T-028 or T-001. They are too far from the centre of Wakefield. |
| 31529 Mr Steven King-Turner | Disagree | Start of Pigeon Valley is okay but not Pigeon Valley South Branch as no infrastructure (water/sewer). Water provided from wells and bores will be at risk if demand too high. Septic tanks also increase the risk of ground water contamination. Roads are narrow and not suitable for large traffic volumes. The creek to the north side of south branch makes access to the land difficult. The south side relies mainly on tank water which in drought conditions is challenging. |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | Disagree | |
| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | Disagree | |
| 31580 Jenny Long | Disagree | I disagree with the location and the scale of the proposed greenfield housing areas in Wakefield. We have ample scope for building upwards in our existing footprint. Destroying green spaces by allowing urban sprawl is a mistake that will send us backwards with regards to reducing carbon emissions, and negatively affect the wellbeing of individuals. |
| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | Disagree | As above Wakefield does definitely not need to be 'intensified' it is rural and should remain so. Nowhere in this region does. Slow natural growth can be supported. Unnatural fast growth is unnecessary and should not be encouraged. In Wakefield low level expansion is acceptable to support local natural growth |
| 31608 Robbie Thomson | Disagree | Infill,multi-level,multi-unit,but don`t use that valuable farmland. |
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | Disagree | Better to have more intensification within central Wakefield if the area is made attractive with leafy green spaces between buildings and walkways etc |
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | Disagree | Do we need more greenfield homes if we seek to intensify housing? This seems counterintuitive. |
| 31617 Ms steph jewell | Disagree | as 22 |
| 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | Disagree | |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | Disagree | |
| | | |

| 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin | Disagree | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|---|
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | Disagree | No same as for Brightwater |
| 31683 Richard Davies | Disagree | Wakefield has a "character" that should be cherished. |
| 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | Disagree | |
| 31771 Colleen Shaw | Disagree | I would like to minimize greenfield development as much as possible. |
| 31775 Dr Thomas Carl | Disagree | |
| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | Disagree | Please see attached - Determined Disagree from submission: No for the same reasons as Brightwater given |
| 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | Don't know | |
| 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | Don't know | |
| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | Don't know | |
| 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | Don't know | Don't know what Greenfield housing is |
| 31219 Mrs kate windle | Don't know | |
| 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | Don't know | |
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | Don't know | |
| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | Don't know | |
| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | Don't know | |
| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley | Don't know | |
| 31278 Wendy Ross | Don't | |
| | | |

| | know | |
|------------------------------------|---------------|-----------|
| 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31355 Mr Barney Hoskins | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31406 Ms Floortje van Lierop | Don't know | See above |
| | | |
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | Don't know | |
| 24426 14 12 12 12 | | |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas Hollyman | Don't know | |
| · | Don't | |
| 31431 Katerina Seligman | know | |
| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn | Don't | |
| Ball | know | |
| 31473 Mr Andrew Downs | Don't | |
| STALS INII WHOLEM DOMIS | know | |
| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | Don't | |
| | | |

| | know | |
|----------------------------|---------------|--|
| 31483 Debbie Hampson | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31487 Ms Heather Spence | Don't As #22. | |
| | know | |
| 31505 Cheryl Heten | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31521 Mrs Marie Waterhouse | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31558 Mr Steve Jordan | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31572 Mr David Todd | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31598 Mrs Nicola Worsfold | Don't | |
| | | |

| | know | |
|---------------------------------|---------------|---|
| 31606 Mr Trent Shepard | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31641 Mr Stephen (Steve) Hayden | | |
| | know | |
| 31643 Inge Koevoet | Don't | |
| 24554 2 2 3 4 4 4 | know | |
| 31651 Dr Patrick Conway | Don't know | |
| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | Don't | |
| 31032 Wils Allita Ragaya | know | |
| 31693 Carolyn Rose | Don't | |
| , | know | |
| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31697 Robert King-Tenison | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | Don't | Not answering any of these leading questions |
| 247FF Da Coura Charle | know | |
| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | Don't know | |
| 31759 Mr Damian Campbell | Don't | |
| 31733 Wil Bullian Campbell | know | |
| 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31363 Mr Steve Cross | N/A | I reject the premise of this question |
| 31364 Mrs Christine Tuffnell | N/A | Best commented on by local people of that area |
| 31623 Ms Lucy Charlesworth | N/A | I am wary of answering these questions as I cannot be sure of how they will be interpreted. So I will state - |
| | | I do not agree with developing green spaces. These spaces need to be reserved and protected to allow for sustainable biodiversity and for future generations. Intensification within Nelson CBD needs to be a |
| | | |

| | | priority. I do not agrees with building on Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. I do not agree with housing development on green fields. There is a climate emergency. Remove these areas from the FDS. |
|---------------------------|---------|---|
| 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | N/A | T-108 should be at the start of Pigeon Valley. |
| | | For visual aspect, we do not want a business area at the entrance to Wakefield Village. |
| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | Neutral | |
| 31114 Ms Jill Rogers | Neutral | |
| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | Neutral | |
| 31129 Mrs Gaynor Brooks | Neutral | |
| 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert | Neutral | |
| 31173 Mr Roderick Watson | Neutral | |
| 31174 Ms Alison Westerby | Neutral | |
| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | Neutral | |
| 31192 Ms Rebecca Patchett | Neutral | |
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | Neutral | |
| 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | Neutral | See answers above |
| 31240 Michael Markert | Neutral | |
| 31250 Mr Richard Wyles | Neutral | |
| 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan | Neutral | |
| 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman | Neutral | I think that the scale is too large for the community and I think Wakefield is too far out of Richmond and Nelson to encourage commuters. |
| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | Neutral | |
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | Neutral | |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | Neutral | |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | Neutral | |
| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | Neutral | |

| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | Neutral | |
|---|---------|---|
| 31286 Mr David Short | Neutral | |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | Neutral | Please see attached - summarised below: Does not support T28, T41, T107 given existing productive activities and distance from centre. |
| 31309 Mr & Mrs Rose & Phillip Windle | Neutral | |
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | Neutral | |
| 31358 George Harrison | Neutral | |
| 31360 Ms Thuy Tran | Neutral | |
| 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | Neutral | |
| 31365 michael monti | Neutral | |
| 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer | Neutral | |
| 31403 Mr Richard Deck | Neutral | |
| 31423 Mr Roger Frost | Neutral | I am concerned that this will generate much more private vehicle use, even though it may be needed to support better public transport. |
| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | Neutral | |
| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | Neutral | No comment |
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | Neutral | |
| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | Neutral | Only if the planning starts from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
| 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon | Neutral | |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | Neutral | |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | Neutral | |

| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | Neutral | As above. |
|------------------------------|---------|---|
| 31480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | Neutral | |
| 31484 Mr Gavin Brent Cook | Neutral | |
| 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | Neutral | |
| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | Neutral | Neutral. The intended greenfield development of Wakefield will lead to a sprawled township. It is important that any large scale greenfield development is well supported with good transport links, and easy access to local services. |
| 31520 Andrew Stirling | Neutral | |
| 31549 Mr Ian McComb | Neutral | |
| 31560 Ms Steph Watts | Neutral | If there is allowance for tiny homes and/ sustainably built homes on sections rather than the current trend for enormous houses. Do away with covenents on minimum sizes for homes and have covenents that allow for a % cover of trees and vegetation on each section to absorb carbon, catch rain and attract wildlife. |
| 31563 Mrs Loretta Anne Hogg | Neutral | Within context. Create new self sufficient communities. Leave green in-beween and then create another comfortable community - schools biking, shops etc. Not everybody having to drive to the one big place. |
| 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz | Neutral | |
| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | Neutral | |
| 31604 Mr Peter Moot | Neutral | |
| 31614 Mr mark Morris | Neutral | |
| 31622 Peter Butler | Neutral | |
| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | Neutral | |
| 31628 Mr Daniel Levy | Neutral | I disagree with the proposed greenfield sites on existing fertile farmland in this area but do not specificall object to development in the less fertile hill sites. |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | Neutral | |
| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | Neutral | |
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | Neutral | I am not an expert and able to comment everything. Please listen to Joni Tomsett or Tim Neubauer. I think they represent my ideas. |
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | Neutral | |

| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | Neutral | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | Neutral | |
| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | Neutral | |
| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | Neutral | |
| 31692 Mr Alasdair Gardiner | Neutral | |
| 31703 Ms Paula Holden | Neutral | |
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | Neutral | See attached submission. Summarised - no specific comments on this question, generally supports FDS. |
| 31716 Mr Alan hart | Neutral | |
| 31718 Kathryn & Keith Quigley | Neutral | |
| 31722 Trevor Chang | Neutral | |
| 31744 Mrs Lorna CRANE | Neutral | |
| 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert- Watene | Neutral | |
| 31752 Jill Pearson | Neutral | |
| 31765 Mrs Lorna Ivy Cooper | Neutral | |
| 31769 Ms Jo Gould | Neutral | |
| 31777 Mr David Lucas | Neutral | |
| 31835 Mr Ian Wishart | Neutral | |
| 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | Strongly agree | |
| 31211 Mrs Alison Pickford | Strongly agree | Accommodation should be included above new commercial properties - intensifying land use, bringing people into the centre of town, and a security aspect also. |
| 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | Strongly agree | |
| 31316 John Heslop | Strongly agree | Yes as there is limited area to develop due to large area of rural residential zoning which ring fences Wakefield. This old zoning model or rural residential on the outskirts of residential zoning needs to be revisited now before it is too late. This applies to the entire district. |

| 31574 Mr David Bolton | Strongly agree | The greenfield development areas such as T-194 are well located for the growth of Wakefield. SEE ATTACHED DOCUMENT - summarised below: supports site for inclusion in the FDS, assesses against the outcomes. |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31706 Paul Donald Galloway | Strongly agree | Revive rebuild recreate new towns with reserves forest greenfield in between. Small towns are happy towns with relaxed people, a sense of security for parents for their children to walk bike to school to ge to work easy access to parks, community gardens for a cohesive thriving community. |
| 31815 Peter Wilks | Strongly agree | |
| 31836 Paula M Wilks | Strongly agree | As per Q21. |
| 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS | Strongly disagree | |
| 31122 Mr Johan Thomas Wahlgren | Strongly disagree | Same argument |
| 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren | Strongly disagree | Leave any greenfield area alone |
| 31171 Ms Sallie Griffiths | Strongly disagree | |
| 31216 Ms Judith Holmes | Strongly disagree | Intensify. |
| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | Strongly disagree | Strongly disagree with ANY greenfield development because of climate change, as well as productive needs. |
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | Strongly disagree | |
| 31247 Mr yuri aristarco | Strongly disagree | no |
| 31279 Mr Jeremy Thompson | Strongly disagree | Answer 3 |
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | Strongly disagree | Green areas should be preserved for public recreation in intensified communities. |
| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | Strongly | Leave green, green. |
| | | |

| | disagree | |
|------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31334 Diane Sutherland | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons above |
| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | Strongly disagree | Way too much |
| 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | Strongly disagree | I oppose turning more of our landscape into suburbs and commuter zones. We have enough of these already and need to preserve our rural and productive land. |
| 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | Strongly disagree | It's foolhardy to have greenfield housing areas. I agree neither with the intensification or the scale of the plan. |
| 31346 Martin Hartman | Strongly disagree | I oppose turning more of our landscape into suburbs and commuter zones. We have enough of these already and need to preserve our rural and productive land. |
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | Strongly disagree | |
| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | Strongly disagree | Same. |
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, there is no need to turn the picturesque landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony |
| 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann | Strongly disagree | Same arguments here!! |
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31410 Mr Scott Smithline | Strongly disagree | see 22 |
| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling | Strongly disagree | Not enough work here for more people. We need to protect our countryside from more housing development. |
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin | Strongly disagree | |
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | Strongly disagree | Unnecessary development at the cost of local amenity, there are better options with intensification, increasing occupancy levels and change of use of current housing stock |
| | | |

| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | Strongly disagree | |
|---------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31452 Mr David Bartle | Strongly disagree | This would simply further expand Wakefield as a dormitory town and is inconsistent with core objectives to reduce carbon emissions |
| 31457 Mr J Santa Barbara | Strongly disagree | No greenfield expansion in this area. Focus on expanding existing areas with med density mixed use. |
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31491 Ms Annette Milligan | Strongly disagree | See 21 |
| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | Strongly disagree | I don't support greenfield development. |
| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need more sprawl. |
| 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31516 Mr Peter Lole | Strongly disagree | Absolute minimum of greenfield development though. |
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | Strongly disagree | For the same reasons given for Q22. |
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | Strongly disagree | As per Q. 19 response. |
| 31533 Wendy Trevett | Strongly disagree | |
| 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | Strongly disagree | See full submission. Summarised below (similar to NT2050 submission): singluar focus on growth, challenges underlying growth projections, insufficient consultation, misleading submission form (outcome questions), community feedback ignored, biased process, non-compliance with government directives. Recommends re-think of the draft. |
| 31554 Wendy Barker | Strongly disagree | Too much already |
| | | |

| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett | Strongly disagree | |
| 31579 Jane Tate | Strongly disagree | I do not agree with greenfield housing areas. If this land is high quality (or even medium quality), it should be left for food production. |
| 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | Strongly disagree | Can we please stop turning our beautiful landscape into a concrete jungle. We need to show courage and change the status quo way of meeting demand. |
| 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31593 Mr William Samuels | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. And create further disconnect to our hardly exciting, lifeless centres. |
| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac. Consider also how this will ever meet the outcomes. |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | Strongly disagree | |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | Strongly | For reasons and themes expressed elsewhere in this submission. Please try again. |

| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | Strongly disagree | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | Strongly disagree | |
| 31636 Joanna Santa Barbara | Strongly disagree | |
| 31637 Ms Frances Kemble Welch | Strongly disagree | |
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | Strongly disagree | As above |
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | Strongly disagree | Strongly disagree For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | Strongly disagree | Strongly disagree For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31673 Mike Drake | Strongly disagree | See Q18 |
| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | Strongly disagree | |
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | Strongly disagree | Growth should be restricted to areas that have already been identified for growth |
| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | Strongly disagree | No. We need to concentrate on intensification, not on green field developments. |
| | | |

| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | Strongly disagree | |
|--|----------------------|---|
| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | Strongly disagree | I am endorsing the Nelson Tasman Climate Forum's view . |
| 31710 Ms Angela Fitchett | Strongly disagree | Ref answer 22. |
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | Strongly disagree | It is unnecessary if the correct utilisation of our existing urban areas can be intensified. |
| 31726 Mr John Jackson | Strongly disagree | |
| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31736 Ms Carol Curtis | Strongly disagree | |
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | Strongly disagree | They are on productive soils, and encourage sprawl and commuter issues with no mitigating factors. |
| 31763 Susan Rogers | Strongly disagree | Survey is flawed from the beginning. You need to redesign this entire line of questioning. It leads only to answers desired by the maker of the survey. |
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | Strongly disagree | As above |
| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | Strongly disagree | |
| 31801 Joan Skurr | Strongly disagree | As above for Richmond. |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | Strongly disagree | History confirms that greenfields do not attain Net Enduring Restorative Outcomes and carrying capacity to the detriment of Te Taiao. Particularly in the context of commuting emissions. |
| | | |

| 31192 Ms Rebecca Patchett | Agree | Provided it is not productive land |
|--------------------------------|-------|--|
| 31257 Mr Kent Inglis | Agree | Areas for development in Motueka are a necessity |
| 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman | Agree | I think Motueka needs to look at managed retreat in the next twenty years. Mytton Heights and the poor soils of the Moutere gravels are a good housing area. |
| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | Agree | |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | Agree | |
| 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman | Agree | |
| 31360 Ms Thuy Tran | Agree | |
| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | Agree | |
| 31403 Mr Richard Deck | Agree | Infrastructure already in place. |
| 31405 Mr Doug Hattersley | Agree | |
| 31415 Mrs Zanahe Ruth Galloway | Agree | the increase of housing could only contribute to this lovely friendly thriving town. a sensible option away from the rising sea levels and possible flooding. |
| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors | Agree | It is one of our centres and there is some space, again done respectfully and with skill |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | Agree | Only if it is on low productive land classes, and dev is intensified multi story . |
| 31435 Mr Alan Eggers | Agree | |
| 31449 Mr John Chisholm | Agree | |
| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | Agree | We Support existing productive land to stay in production and look to re-zone marginal land for housing growth |
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | Agree | Motueka needs to become a bigger employment hub for the existing infrastructure. Motueka needs to be redesigned with less traffic and parking areas in town. it needs another bridge. |
| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | Agree | Agree. Please refer to our comments to Q5, Q14, Q22 & Q23. The Rural residential block is situated quite far from Motueka itself so again it is important that active transport links are established between the two areas. |
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | Agree | As per Q.20 response. |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | Agree | Somewhat grudgingly, in the sense that's on it's way to being it's own village and I think Atamai (for all |

| | | that it failed financially) is occupied by some really smart individuals who can help make that area a smarplace to live. |
|--------------------------------------|----------|--|
| 31647 Mrs Rebecca Parish | Agree | |
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | Agree | Waka Kotahi support intensification of existing urban areas that already have social and economic infrastructure in place, supporting moving away from a reliance on private vehicle transport. A town of this size is less likely to mean people commute long distances for employment e.g. Richmond and Nelson |
| 31667 barbara nicholas | Agree | |
| 31668 Mr Bruce & Corena Gillespie | Agree | |
| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | Agree | Need to allow further development in the Braeburn Block T-136. |
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | Agree | There should be far greater intensification, providing TDC is going to develop suitable coastal and floodwater protection |
| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | Agree | |
| 31718 Kathryn & Keith Quigley | Agree | |
| 31741 Mr Robert Stevenson | Agree | |
| 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert- Watene | Agree | |
| 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | Agree | |
| 31774 Mrs Jane Sutherland | Agree | |
| 31783 Mr Peter Jones | Agree | |
| 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward | Disagree | Don't lose productive land. |
| 31185 Myfanway James | Disagree | Limit greenfields development unless it is intensive. Only use these areas if there are no other options in Richmond to Wakefield or Mapua |
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | Disagree | |
| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | Disagree | See above |
| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | Disagree | I would prefer use of other means of intensification |
| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | Disagree | DISAgree as I feel we should only be working on the brownfield land. The green land / bare land should be protected and areas for restoration for planting, environmental protection and or public green space. |
| | | |

| | | Intensify by working with existing buildings and areas of housing |
|-------------------------------------|----------|---|
| 31318 Mrs Isobel Mosley | Disagree | There is not enough greenfield development allowed to meet the demand for housing in Motueka. |
| 31322 Mrs BARBARA AND TIM ROBSON | Disagree | |
| 31334 Diane Sutherland | Disagree | For all the reasons above |
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | Disagree | see comments above, including my wishes for higher density that you probably plan, and including giving up some high productive agricultural land, as you already have done in the recent past. |
| 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | Disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. I accept, however, that Motueka-South may have to be developed wisely to offer an alternative for areas of town that are at risk from sea level rise. The proposed rural residential developments only fragment our landscape and compromise rural productivity. There is no justification to provide for more of this. |
| 31346 Martin Hartman | Disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. I accept, however, that Motueka-South may have to be developed wisely to offer an alternative for areas of town that are at risk from sea level rise. The proposed rural residential developments only fragment our landscape and compromise rural productivity. There is no justification to provide for more of this. |
| 31349 Laurien Heijs | Disagree | See Q14 response |
| 31356 Stephen Williams | Disagree | Motueka has problems with flooding which will increase over time. It is surrounded by productive land. Growth could be managed with tiny home communities. These can be moved as the climate changes. |
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | Disagree | |
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | Disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, there is no need to turn the picturesque landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony |
| 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann | Disagree | Please see my previous comments on Motueka above. |
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | Disagree | |
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle | Disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. I accept, however, that Motueka-South may have to be developed wisely to offer an alternative for areas of town that are at risk from sea level rise. The proposed rural residential developments only fragment our landscape and compromise rural productivity. There is no justification to |
| | | |

| | | provide for more of this. |
|---|----------|---|
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin | Disagree | Some development will be required in Motueka, including because sea-level rise. However, the location of this needs to be carefully considered in order to avoid the requirement for increased vehicle use, and the destruction of horticultural lands. |
| 31416 Tim Leyland | Disagree | |
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | Disagree | Unnecessary development at the cost of local amenity, there are better options with intensification, increasing occupancy levels and change of use of current housing stock. |
| 31434 Mrs cushla Moorhead | Disagree | For all the same reason. Greenfield areas unless they are unproductive need to be kept and even then ;large areas need to be kept so that the towns aren't just concrete jungles. |
| 31441 Mr Chris Head | Disagree | |
| 31443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | Disagree | Again - sprawling with car dependency |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | Disagree | |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | Disagree | No greenfield housing area. Build higher and improve public transport. |
| 31481 Mrs Lucy Harrhy | Disagree | see above |
| 31485 Ms Robin Schiff | Disagree | Only if the planning starts from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
| 31488 Annette Starink | Disagree | See answer 22 |
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | Disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. I accept, however, that Motueka-South may have to be developed wisely to offer an alternative for areas of town that are at risk from sea level rise. The proposed rural residential developments only fragment our landscape and compromise rural productivity. There is no justification to provide for more of this. |
| 31492 Anton, Benni, Shalom, AJ Bank, Bonnin, Shalom Davis | Disagree | |

| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | Disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need more sprawl. I accept, however, that Motueka-South may have to be developed wisely to offer an alternative for areas of town that are at risk from sea level rise. See also answer on Q20. The proposed rural residential developments only fragment our landscape There is no justification to provide for more of this. |
|-------------------------------|----------|--|
| 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | Disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. I accept, however, that Motueka-South may have to be developed wisely to offer an alternative for area of town that are at risk from sea level rise. The proposed rural residential developments only fragment our landscape and compromise rural productivity. There is no justification to provide for more of this. |
| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless | Disagree | |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne | Disagree | Motueka also needs a green belt |
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | Disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, no more of our landscape should be turned into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. However, that Motueka-South may have to be developed wisely to offer an alternative for areas of town that are at risk from sea level rise. The proposed rural residential developments only fragment our landscape and compromise rural productivity. There is no justification t provide for more of this. |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | Disagree | |
| 31560 Ms Steph Watts | Disagree | |
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | Disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. I accept, however, that Motueka-South may have to be developed wisely to offer an alternative for areas of town that are at risk from sea-level rise. The proposed rural residential developments only fragment our landscape and compromise rural productivity. There is no justification to provide for more of this. |
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | Disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| | | I accept, however, that Motueka-South may have to be developed wisely to offer an alternative for areas of town that are at risk from sea level rise. |

| | | The proposed rural residential developments only fragment our landscape and compromise rural productivity. There is no justification to provide for more of this. |
|--------------------------|----------|--|
| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | Disagree | |
| 31580 Jenny Long | Disagree | I disagree with the location and the scale of the proposed greenfield housing areas in Motueka. We have ample scope for building upwards in our existing footprint. Destroying green spaces by allowing urban sprawl is a mistake that will send us backwards with regards to reducing carbon emissions, and negatively affect the wellbeing of individuals. |
| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | Disagree | Keep off good productive and environmentally useful land |
| 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | Disagree | Can we please stop turning our beautiful landscape into a concrete jungle. We need to show courage and change the status quo way of meeting demand. Motueka South is the more logical area to develop however it will take some vision to accomplish |
| 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | Disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. I accept, however, that Motueka-South may have to be developed wisely to offer an alternative for areas of town that are at risk from sea-level rise. The proposed rural residential developments only fragment our landscape and compromise rural productivity. There is no justification to provide for more of this. |
| 31593 Mr William Samuels | Disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| | | I accept, however, that Motueka-South may have to be developed wisely to offer an alternative for areas of town that are at risk from sea level rise. |
| | | The proposed rural residential developments only fragment our landscape and compromise rural productivity. There is no justification to provide for more of this. |

| 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner | Disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. And create further disconnect to our hardly exciting, lifeless centres. I accept, however, that Motueka-South may have to be developed wisely to offer an alternative for areas of town that are at risk from sea level rise. The proposed rural residential developments only fragment our landscape and compromise rural productivity. There is no justification to provide for more of this. |
|------------------------------------|----------|--|
| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | Disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. I accept, however, that Motueka-South may have to be developed wisely to offer an alternative for areas of town that are at risk from sea level rise. The proposed rural residential developments only fragment our landscape and compromise rural productivity. There is no justification to provide for more of this. |
| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | Disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. I accept, however, that Motueka-South may have to be developed wisely to offer an alternative for areas of town that are at risk from sea level rise. The proposed rural residential developments only fragment our landscape and compromise rural productivity. There is no justification to provide for more of this. |
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | Disagree | I accept that Motueka-South may have to be developed wisely to offer an alternative for areas of town that are at risk from sea level rise. The proposed rural residential developments only fragment our landscape and compromise rural productivity. There is no justification to provide for more of this. |
| 31608 Robbie Thomson | Disagree | There is a lot of cropping around Motueka. Development should be restricted to infil and intensification in the first instance. |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | Disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. I accept, however, that Motueka-South may have to be developed wisely to offer an alternative for areas of town that are at risk from sea-level rise. The proposed rural residential developments only fragment our landscape and compromise rural productivity. There is no justification to provide for more of this. |
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | Disagree | Some further development in Motueka may be beneficial but it nees to be well planned |
| | | |

| 31617 Ms steph jewell | Disagree | as 22 |
|--------------------------------|----------|---|
| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | Disagree | |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | Disagree | |
| 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin | Disagree | infill |
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | Disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | Disagree | Disagree For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. I accept, however, that Motueka-South may have to be developed wisely to offer an alternative for areas of town that are at risk from sea-level rise. The proposed rural residential developments only fragment our landscape and compromise rural productivity. There is no justification to provide for more of this. |
| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | Disagree | Disagree For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. I accept, however, that Motueka-South may have to be developed wisely to offer an alternative for areas of town that are at risk from sea-level rise. The proposed rural residential developments only fragment our landscape and compromise rural productivity. There is no justification to provide for more of this. |
| 31683 Richard Davies | Disagree | Motueka sits in the middle of fertile flat productive land. This land should be protected. |
| 31688 Gerard McDonnell | Disagree | Horticultural land should be preserved. |
| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | Disagree | Not horticultural land |
| 31704 Mr Paul Bucknall | Disagree | |
| 31710 Ms Angela Fitchett | Disagree | Ref 22. |
| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | Disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. I accept, however, that Motueka-South may have to be developed wisely to offer an alternative for areas of town that are at risk from sea level rise. The proposed rural residential developments only fragment our landscape and compromise rural productivity. There is no justification to provide for more of this. |
| | | |

| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | Disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. I accept, however, that Motueka-South may have to be developed wisely to offer an alternative for areas of town that are at risk from sea level rise. The proposed rural residential developments only fragment our landscape and compromise rural productivity. There is no justification to provide for more of this. |
|--|----------|--|
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | Disagree | We donlt need any more rural-residential developments. |
| 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | Disagree | |
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | Disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. I accept, however, that Motueka-South may have to be developed wisely to offer an alternative for areas of town that are at risk from sea level rise. The proposed rural residential developments only fragment our landscape and compromise rural productivity. There is no justification to provide for more of this. |
| 31775 Dr Thomas Carl | Disagree | |
| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | Disagree | See Q20 |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Disagree | To far from Motueka for alternative transport - not enough population to sustain public transport. |
| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | Disagree | A: No, this is a terrible option for Motueka, guaranteeing car dependency, traffic congestion and high carbon emissions both from the building of the subdivision and people living there (Note that even if they were all driving electric cars its still creates the same congestion as fossil cars, but also moving just a few people in a 2 tonne metal box is a very energy inefficient way of moving people. We can no longer afford to be profligate with our energy consumption, climate change demands we do more things with renewable electricity, but all new electricity generation comes at a carbon cost. It is better to avoid having to use cars by intensifying urban areas) |
| 31801 Joan Skurr | Disagree | If part of Motueka is threatened by sea level rise, then provision should be made for replacement housing. |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | Disagree | History confirms that greenfields do not attain Net Enduring Restorative Outcomes and carrying capacity to the detriment of Te Taiao. Particularly in the context of commuting emissions. But there must be opportunities for "Papakainga". |
| 31835 Mr Ian Wishart | Disagree | |
| | | |

| 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | Don't know | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------------|
| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | Don't know | |
| 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | Don't know | Don't know what Greenfield housing is |
| 31219 Mrs kate windle | Don't know | |
| 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | Don't know | |
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | Don't know | |
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | Don't know | |
| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | Don't know | |
| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley | Don't know | |
| 31278 Wendy Ross | Don't know | |
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | Don't know | |
| 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | Don't know | |
| 31355 Mr Barney Hoskins | Don't know | |
| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | Don't know | |
| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | Don't know | |
| | | |

| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | Don't know | |
|------------------------------------|---------------|-----------|
| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | Don't know | |
| 31406 Ms Floortje van Lierop | Don't know | See above |
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | Don't know | |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas Hollyman | Don't know | |
| 31431 Katerina Seligman | Don't know | |
| 31452 Mr David Bartle | Don't know | |
| 31473 Mr Andrew Downs | Don't know | |
| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | Don't know | |
| 31483 Debbie Hampson | Don't know | |
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | Don't know | |
| 31487 Ms Heather Spence | Don't know | As #22. |
| 31505 Cheryl Heten | Don't know | |
| 31508 Mr Roger Barlow | Don't know | |
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers | Don't know | |
| | | |

| 31521 Mrs Marie Waterhouse | Don't know | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| 24522 B. A. G. H. J. | | |
| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard | Don't know | |
| | | |
| 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery | Don't know | |
| 24552.44.6 | | |
| 31558 Mr Steve Jordan | Don't know | |
| 24550 D. L. C. H. L. | | |
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | Don't know | |
| | | |
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | Don't know | |
| | | |
| 31572 Mr David Todd | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins | Don't know | |
| | | |
| 31598 Mrs Nicola Worsfold | Don't know | |
| | | |
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | Don't know | I don't know enough about the possible impact of sea level rise in Motueka |
| | | |
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31641 Mr Stephen (Steve) Hayder | n Don't know | |
| 21612 | | |
| 31643 Inge Koevoet | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31651 Dr Patrick Conway | Don't | |
| | know | |

| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | Don't | |
|------------------------------|---------|---|
| | know | |
| 31693 Carolyn Rose | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31697 Robert King-Tenison | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | Don't | Not answering any of these leading questions |
| 31/23 Wil Tilli Bayley | know | Not answering any or these leading questions |
| 0.4755 0 0 0 1 | | |
| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31363 Mr Steve Cross | N/A | I reject the premise of this question |
| 31364 Mrs Christine Tuffnell | N/A | Best commented on by local people of that area |
| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling | N/A | Motueka needs to be very carefully planned because it will be vulnerable to sea level rise and flooding. |
| | | The agricultural land around Motueka needs to be protected from housing development. |
| 31430 Muriel Moran | N/A | See previous comment on Motueka. |
| 31623 Ms Lucy Charlesworth | N/A | I am wary of answering these questions as I cannot be sure of how they will be interpreted. So I will state - |
| | | I do not agree with developing green spaces. These spaces need to be reserved and protected to allow for |
| | | sustainable biodiversity and for future generations. Intensification within Nelson CBD needs to be a |
| | | priority. I do not agrees with building on Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. I do not agree with housing |
| | | development on green fields. There is a climate emergency. Remove these areas from the FDS. |
| 31673 Mike Drake | N/A | See Q18 |
| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | Neutral | |
| 31129 Mrs Gaynor Brooks | Neutral | |
| 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert | Neutral | |
| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | Neutral | |
| | | |

| 31173 Mr Roderick Watson | Neutral | |
|---|---------|--|
| 31174 Ms Alison Westerby | Neutral | |
| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | Neutral | |
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | Neutral | |
| 31227 Ms Lee Eliott | Neutral | |
| 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | Neutral | See answers above |
| 31240 Michael Markert | Neutral | |
| 31250 Mr Richard Wyles | Neutral | |
| 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan | Neutral | Provided that a mix of housing sizes is allowed to suit the needs of all people, would like to know that we could have access to better doctors services (there's no openings for new patients) It is a seasonal work community and tourist reliant and don't want that rural town feel taken away |
| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | Neutral | |
| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | Neutral | |
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | Neutral | |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | Neutral | |
| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | Neutral | |
| 31284 Mr Jarmo Saloranta | Neutral | |
| 31286 Mr David Short | Neutral | |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | Neutral | Did not answer multi-choice question: Please see attached: Have not had the opportunity to look at the area. However from the map it appears to be OK. |
| 31309 Mr & Mrs Rose & Phillip Windle | Neutral | |
| 31316 John Heslop | Neutral | |
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | Neutral | |
| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | Neutral | At least it is bound within the exisiting town footprint would favour more intesification |

| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | Neutral | |
|------------------------------|---------|---|
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | Neutral | |
| 31358 George Harrison | Neutral | |
| 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | Neutral | |
| 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer | Neutral | |
| 31423 Mr Roger Frost | Neutral | |
| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | Neutral | No comment |
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | Neutral | |
| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | Neutral | Only if the planning starts from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
| 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon | Neutral | |
| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | Neutral | |
| 31480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | Neutral | |
| 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | Neutral | |
| 31515 Geoffrey Vause | Neutral | Greenfield development south of Motueka will probably be needed given the flood hazard in much of Motueka. This will require a significant input from TDC planners to assure appropriate safety of developer activity. High quality urban planning will be essential. |
| 31520 Andrew Stirling | Neutral | |
| 31529 Mr Steven King-Turner | Neutral | |
| 31549 Mr Ian McComb | Neutral | |
| 31551 Mrs Jo Kitchen | Neutral | |
| 31554 Wendy Barker | Neutral | It's small |
| | | |

| 31563 Mrs Loretta Anne Hogg | Neutral | Within context. Create new self sufficient communities. Leave green in-beween and then create anothe comfortable community - schools biking, shops etc. Not everybody having to drive to the one big place. |
|-----------------------------|---------|---|
| 31574 Mr David Bolton | Neutral | |
| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | Neutral | As above Motueka does definitely not need to be 'intensified' it is semi-rural and should remain so. Nowhere in this region does. Slow natural growth can be supported. In a way maybe more so than Wakefield or Brightwater, Motueka can grow because people who want to live there want to live in a town. Unnatural fast growth is unnecessary and should not be encouraged. Low level expansion is acceptable to support local natural growth |
| 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz | Neutral | |
| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | Neutral | |
| 31604 Mr Peter Moot | Neutral | |
| 31606 Mr Trent Shepard | Neutral | |
| 31614 Mr mark Morris | Neutral | |
| 31622 Peter Butler | Neutral | |
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | Neutral | Refer 20 |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | Neutral | |
| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | Neutral | |
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | Neutral | I am not an expert and able to comment everything. Please listen to Joni Tomsett or Tim Neubauer. I think they represent my ideas. |
| 31656 Mr brad malcolm | Neutral | |
| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | Neutral | |
| 31681 Seev Oren | Neutral | Tasman Village can be part of the GreenFeild awa for motukea |
| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | Neutral | |
| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | Neutral | |
| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | Neutral | Only for that which is close to the existing centre, is intensified and is used primarily to relocate resident out of the areas that will be impacted by climate change. |
| 31692 Mr Alasdair Gardiner | Neutral | |

| 31703 Ms Paula Holden | Neutral | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31709 Ofer Ronen | Neutral | Agree |
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | Neutral | See attached submission. Summarised - no specific comments on this question, generally supports FDS. |
| 31716 Mr Alan hart | Neutral | |
| 31722 Trevor Chang | Neutral | |
| 31744 Mrs Lorna CRANE | Neutral | |
| 31752 Jill Pearson | Neutral | |
| 31759 Mr Damian Campbell | Neutral | |
| 31765 Mrs Lorna Ivy Cooper | Neutral | |
| 31769 Ms Jo Gould | Neutral | |
| 31771 Colleen Shaw | Neutral | I would like to minimize greenfield development as much as possible. Motueka is a very productive agricultural/ horticultural area and these spaces should be respected for their food growing potential. Once its gone its gone and we need to be prepare for food insecurity. |
| 31777 Mr David Lucas | Neutral | |
| 31787 Lilac Meir | Neutral | Tasman Village can be used as greenfield area. |
| 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | Strongly agree | |
| 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | Strongly agree | |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | Strongly agree | The opportunity for Te Awhina to create Papakainga on the land must be a given right. |
| 31457 Mr J Santa Barbara | Strongly agree | T-017 is well suited for rural residential (or more intensive) development. |
| 31706 Paul Donald Galloway | Strongly agree | Revive rebuild recreate new towns with reserves forest greenfield in between. Small towns are happy towns with relaxed people, a sense of security for parents for their children to walk bike to school to get to work easy access to parks, community gardens for a cohesive thriving community. |
| 31762 Mr Mark Hewetson | Strongly agree | For the past 18 months we have had ongoing challenges finding accommodation for staff, with a shortag across a range of needs, from basic flat to mid-range 4 bedroom home to lifestyle blocks |
| | | |

| | | This is despite our attempts to offer at or above market value remuneration. The type of problems are - existing staff finding the only options available to rent or purchase are at unaffordable values - Staff applying for positions to move into the area but unable to find any accommodation, and significan queues for anything that comes available - Staff leaving to cheaper districts as their accommodation becomes unaffordable Changes in personal circumstances leaving some staff in quite desperate positions due to lack of accommodation options |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | Strongly disagree | Motueka is to far out from Nelson - any growth will create more traffic and more GHGs and environmental impacts. That is counter to NCC's objectives. |
| 31114 Ms Jill Rogers | Strongly disagree | |
| 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS | Strongly disagree | |
| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | Strongly disagree | As mentioned above, I strongly oppose the development of the block of land T136 set out in the draft FDS Significant upgrades will be required to both roading and services to develop this property. There are absolutely no services, no water, no sewerage in that block. It will be an incredibly expensive undertaking and I believe there are better options available to the council. As the FDS states, this block is not required to meet the needs of housing requirements for the region and it will exceed the council's requirements. There is no public transport in the area and the development of this site will increase GHG emissions. |
| 31122 Mr Johan Thomas Wahlgren | Strongly disagree | Same argument |
| 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren | Strongly disagree | Leave any greenfield area alone |
| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson | Strongly disagree | As for 20. |
| 31171 Ms Sallie Griffiths | Strongly disagree | Build up not out |
| 31216 Ms Judith Holmes | Strongly disagree | Intensify. |
| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | Strongly disagree | Strongly disagree with ANY greenfield development because of climate change, as well as productive needs. |

| 31247 Mr yuri aristarco | Strongly disagree | no |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31279 Mr Jeremy Thompson | Strongly disagree | Answer 3 |
| 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | Strongly disagree | It's foolhardy to have greenfield housing areas. I agree neither with the intensification or the scale of the plan. |
| 31347 Ms Paula Baldwin | Strongly disagree | |
| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | Strongly disagree | Same. |
| 31384 Mr Jace Hobbs | Strongly disagree | |
| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling | Strongly disagree | This will just encourage more sprawl |
| 31410 Mr Scott Smithline | Strongly disagree | See 22 |
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | Strongly disagree | |
| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn Ball | Strongly disagree | Why not limited in Motueka? Make Motueka a viable township with a by pass. |
| 31472 Dr David Briggs | Strongly disagree | |
| 31484 Mr Gavin Brent Cook | Strongly disagree | I'm not sure how, infer structure is at it peak within the area and would need a lot to correct |
| 31491 Ms Annette Milligan | Strongly disagree | See 21 |
| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | Strongly disagree | I don't support greenfield development. |
| 31496 Mrs Petra Dekker | Strongly disagree | For all reasons pointed out above |
| | | |

| 31516 Mr Peter Lole | Strongly disagree | Absolute minimum of greenfield development though. |
|----------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31533 Wendy Trevett | Strongly disagree | |
| 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | Strongly disagree | See full submission. Summarised below (similar to NT2050 submission): singluar focus on growth, challenges underlying growth projections, insufficient consultation, misleading submission form (outcome questions), community feedback ignored, biased process, non-compliance with government directives. Recommends re-think of the draft. |
| 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett | Strongly disagree | |
| 31579 Jane Tate | Strongly disagree | I do not agree with greenfield housing areas. If this land is high quality (or even medium quality), it should be left for food production. |
| 31588 pene Greet | Strongly disagree | |
| 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | Strongly disagree | |
| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | Strongly disagree | |
| 31636 Joanna Santa Barbara | Strongly disagree | |
| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | Strongly disagree | As above |
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | Strongly disagree | No it creates too much dependancy on individual car travel |
| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. I accept, however, that Motueka-South may have to be developed wisely to offer an alternative for areas of town that are at risk from sea-level rise. The proposed rural residential developments only fragment our landscape and compromise rural productivity. There is no justification to provide for more of this. |
| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | Strongly disagree | No not enough. |
| | | |

| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | Strongly disagree |
|------------------------|---|
| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | Strongly I am endorsing the Nelson Tasman Climate Forum's view . disagree |
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | Strongly It is unnecessary if the correct utilisation of our existing urban areas can be intensified. disagree |
| 31726 Mr John Jackson | Strongly disagree |
| 31736 Ms Carol Curtis | Strongly disagree |
| 31763 Susan Rogers | Strongly Survey is flawed from the beginning. You need to redesign this entire line of questioning. It leads only to disagree answers desired by the maker of the survey. |

| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | Agree | There are nearby services in place to support this. |
|--------------------------------|-------|---|
| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | Agree | |
| 31185 Myfanway James | Agree | |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | Agree | Green field development is not on highly productive land |
| 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman | Agree | |
| 31347 Ms Paula Baldwin | Agree | |
| 31403 Mr Richard Deck | Agree | Infrastructure already in place. |
| 31415 Mrs Zanahe Ruth Galloway | Agree | the increase of housing could only contribute to this lovely friendly thriving town. a sensible option away from the rising sea levels and possible flooding. |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | Agree | Only if it is on low productive land classes, and dev is intensified multi story . |
| 31435 Mr Alan Eggers | Agree | |
| 31449 Mr John Chisholm | Agree | I agree with Greenfields development however more townhouses and multi-level housing should be considered |
| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | Agree | |
| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | Agree | Location yes - scale ? - see 21 |
| 31595 Gary Clark | Agree | It is assumed that this refers to Seaton Valley Flats |
| 31647 Mrs Rebecca Parish | Agree | |
| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | Agree | |
| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | Agree | |
| 31704 Mr Paul Bucknall | Agree | |
| 31722 Trevor Chang | Agree | |
| 31759 Mr Damian Campbell | Agree | |
| 31774 Mrs Jane Sutherland | Agree | |
| 31783 Mr Peter Jones | Agree | This would yield a great community. |

| 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | Disagree | Mapua is a lovely village. I think there has been enough residential expansion on green fields already. Let's avoid becoming a top of the south urban sprawl, and retain some character filled areas like this one, for recreation and enjoyment, otherwise our region will be totally without charm and individualism. |
|-------------------------------------|----------|---|
| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson | Disagree | As for 21. |
| 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward | Disagree | Don't lose productive land. |
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | Disagree | |
| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | Disagree | |
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | Disagree | |
| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | Disagree | there is already significant growth in Mapua. The place will lose the charm of a coastal village. |
| 31284 Mr Jarmo Saloranta | Disagree | |
| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | Disagree | |
| 31304 Mr Andrew Talijancich | Disagree | Consultation on the FDS proposals for greenfield residential development at Mapua needs to be seen in that light. (see question 21). |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | Disagree | Please see attached - summarised below: No to Greenfield development. T11 T42 T33 should remain low density small holdings. |
| 31322 Mrs BARBARA AND TIM ROBSON | Disagree | |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | Disagree | Mapua has had enough housing already. |
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | Disagree | |
| 31416 Tim Leyland | Disagree | |
| 31441 Mr Chris Head | Disagree | |
| 31443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | Disagree | Same as above |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | Disagree | Keep all the green areas in Māpua. |
| 31485 Ms Robin Schiff | Disagree | Only if the planning starts from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport |
| | | |

| | | -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
|---|----------|--|
| 31488 Annette Starink | Disagree | See answer 22 |
| 31492 Anton, Benni, Shalom, AJ Bank, Bonnin, Shalom Davis | Disagree | |
| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless | Disagree | |
| 31505 Cheryl Heten | Disagree | |
| 31554 Wendy Barker | Disagree | I don't want to see any more development at Mapua |
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | Disagree | Greenfield housing is missing the point. Taking yet more land away from production and conservation is ruining wildlife potential without providing benefits to humans. Housing has to be introduced with equal or greater parts of conservation land. |
| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | Disagree | |
| 31580 Jenny Long | Disagree | I disagree with the location and the scale of the proposed greenfield housing areas in Mapua. We have ample scope for building upwards in our existing footprint. Destroying green spaces by allowing urban sprawl is a mistake that will send us backwards with regards to reducing carbon emissions, and negatively affect the wellbeing of individuals. |
| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | Disagree | As above Māpua does definitely not need to be 'intensified' it is rural and should remain so. Nowhere in this region does. Slow natural growth can be supported. Unnatural fast growth is unnecessary and should not be encouraged. In Māpua low level expansion is acceptable to support local natural growth |
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | Disagree | Not enough jobs in Mapua for expansion without increasing commuting times and carbon emissions |
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | Disagree | Do we need more greenfield homes if we seek to intensify housing? This seems counterintuitive. |
| 31617 Ms steph jewell | Disagree | as 22 |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | Disagree | I don't find it to be clever and tightly integrated choice. But arguable bike access is possible. I can see it's a tough call in some ways. |
| | | Q: Does, and why does, Mapua need to grow residentially? It's industrial park is a cooked turkey (already has MHWS seawater in behind it at present) and will go under this century. It's albeit lovely waterfront is also at high risk of SLR and storms who are we building for? Should we not be focussing managed |
| | | |

| | | withdrawal further back into the Moutere? |
|-------------------------------|---------------|---|
| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | Disagree | |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | Disagree | |
| 31683 Richard Davies | Disagree | Intensification not expansion into fertile land. |
| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | Disagree | Not horticultural land |
| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | Disagree | No. We need to concentrate on intensification, not on green field developments. |
| 31716 Mr Alan hart | Disagree | Mapua is clearly in the coastal environment and should not be further intensified |
| 31718 Kathryn & Keith Quigley | Disagree | |
| 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | Disagree | Make better use of Rural 3 land. Rezone Rural 3 to Rural Residential |
| 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | Disagree | |
| 31775 Dr Thomas Carl | Disagree | |
| 31777 Mr David Lucas | Disagree | |
| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | Disagree | Please see attached - Determined Disagree from submission: No for the same reasons as Brightwater given |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | Disagree | History confirms that greenfields do not attain Net Enduring Restorative Outcomes and carrying capacity to the detriment of Te Taiao. Particularly in the context of commuting emissions. But there must be opportunities for "Papakainga". |
| 31809 Mr Andrew Spittal | Disagree | Oppose in part. The subject land at 49 Stafford Drive is not currently included in the draft FDS 2022 and it is submitted it should be. This site achieves many of the other key Outcomes and scores higher than other identified greenfield options. |
| 31820 Debbie Bidlake | Disagree | |
| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | Don't know | |
| 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | Don't know | Don't know what Greenfield housing is |
| 31219 Mrs kate windle | Don't know | |
| 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | Don't | |
| | | |

| | know | |
|--------------------------------|---------------|-----------|
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31278 Wendy Ross | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31316 John Heslop | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31355 Mr Barney Hoskins | Don't know | |
| 24267.14 | | |
| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | Don't know | |
| 24274 Dalass Balk | | |
| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | Don't know | |
| 21205 Mr Cardon Hamneson | Don't | |
| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | know | |
| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | Don't | |
| JI404 GARRICK DATTEN | know | |
| 31406 Ms Floortje van Lierop | Don't | See above |
| 51700 Mis Floorige vali Lielop | know | |
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | Don't | |
| OZ IZA INIS ICITY NOSSCI | know | |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas | Don't | |
| | • | |

| Hollyman | know | |
|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------------|
| 31431 Katerina Seligman | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31434 Mrs cushla Moorhead | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31452 Mr David Bartle | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31483 Debbie Hampson | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31508 Mr Roger Barlow | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31521 Mrs Marie Waterhouse | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31558 Mr Steve Jordan | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | Don't | Not fully cognisant of intent |
| | know | |
| 31572 Mr David Todd | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins | Don't | |
| | | |

| | know | |
|------------------------------|---------------|---|
| 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31606 Mr Trent Shepard | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31643 Inge Koevoet | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31651 Dr Patrick Conway | Don't know | |
| 21652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | Don't | |
| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | know | |
| 31693 Carolyn Rose | Don't | |
| 31033 Carolyn Nose | know | |
| 31697 Robert King-Tenison | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | Don't | Not answering any of these leading questions |
| | know | |
| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | Don't know | |
| 24442 Mr Day Floor | | Manualis to few out from Nology and growth will greate many traffic and grows CLICs and any income antal |
| 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | N/A | Mapuais to far out from Nelson - any growth will create more traffic and more GHGs and environmental impacts. That is counter to NCC's objectives. |
| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | N/A | DISAgree as I feel we should only be working on the brownfield land. The green land / bare land should be |
| | | protected and areas for restoration for planting, environmental protection and or public green space. Intensify by working with existing buildings and areas of housing |
| 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | N/A | It's foolhardy to have greenfield housing areas. I agree neither with the intensification or the scale of the |
| | | plan. |
| 31363 Mr Steve Cross | N/A | I reject the premise of this question |
| 31364 Mrs Christine Tuffnell | N/A | Best commented on by local people of that area |
| | | |

| 31430 Muriel Moran | N/A | Covered in earlier comment. |
|----------------------------|---------|--|
| 31623 Ms Lucy Charlesworth | N/A | I am wary of answering this question as I cannot be sure of how my answer will be interpreted. So I will state - I do not agree with developing green spaces. These spaces need to be reserved and protected to allow for sustainable biodiversity and for future generations. Intensification within Nelson CBD needs to be a priority. I do not agrees with building on Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. I do not agree with housing development on green fields. There is a climate emergency. Remove these areas from the FDS. |
| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | Neutral | |
| 31129 Mrs Gaynor Brooks | Neutral | |
| 31130 Trevor James | Neutral | |
| 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert | Neutral | |
| 31173 Mr Roderick Watson | Neutral | |
| 31174 Ms Alison Westerby | Neutral | |
| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | Neutral | |
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | Neutral | |
| 31227 Ms Lee Eliott | Neutral | |
| 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | Neutral | See answers above |
| 31240 Michael Markert | Neutral | |
| 31250 Mr Richard Wyles | Neutral | |
| 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan | Neutral | Mapua is high end real estate and is not close to services and employment |
| 31257 Mr Kent Inglis | Neutral | |
| 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman | Neutral | Some parts are OK, but there should be managed retreat from the area at the base of the old cliff in Ruby Bay and much of the lowest part of Mapua itself. |
| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | Neutral | |
| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | Neutral | |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | Neutral | |
| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | Neutral | |
| 31286 Mr David Short | Neutral | |

| 31309 Mr & Mrs Rose & Phillip Windle | Neutral | |
|---|---------|---|
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | Neutral | |
| 31358 George Harrison | Neutral | |
| 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | Neutral | |
| 31365 michael monti | Neutral | |
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | Neutral | |
| 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer | Neutral | |
| 31423 Mr Roger Frost | Neutral | I am concerned that this will generate much more private vehicle use, even though it may be needed to support better public transport. |
| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | Neutral | |
| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | Neutral | No comment |
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | Neutral | |
| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | Neutral | Only if the planning starts from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
| 31480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | Neutral | |
| 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | Neutral | |
| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | Neutral | Neutral. Please refer to our comments to Q5, Q22 & Q23. The intended greenfield development of Mapua will lead to a sprawled township. It is important that any large scale greenfield development is well supported with good transport links, and easy access to local services. |
| 31520 Andrew Stirling | Neutral | |
| | | |
| 31525 Murray Davis | Neutral | |

| 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery | Neutral | Personally I am very sad to see so much change but I also know that it is necessary. |
|---------------------------------|---------|--|
| 31549 Mr Ian McComb | Neutral | |
| 31551 Mrs Jo Kitchen | Neutral | |
| 31560 Ms Steph Watts | Neutral | |
| 31563 Mrs Loretta Anne Hogg | Neutral | Within context. Create new self sufficient communities. Leave green in-beween and then create another comfortable community - schools biking, shops etc. Not everybody having to drive to the one big place. |
| 31574 Mr David Bolton | Neutral | |
| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | Neutral | |
| 31604 Mr Peter Moot | Neutral | |
| 31608 Robbie Thomson | Neutral | Don't know enough of the activities in the area |
| 31614 Mr mark Morris | Neutral | |
| 31622 Peter Butler | Neutral | |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | Neutral | |
| 31641 Mr Stephen (Steve) Hayden | Neutral | The proposal for development of the Braeburn Road site would seem to meet many of the aspirations of the FDS |
| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | Neutral | |
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | Neutral | I am not an expert and able to comment everything. Please listen to Joni Tomsett or Tim Neubauer. I think they represent my ideas. |
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | Neutral | |
| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | Neutral | |
| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | Neutral | |
| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | Neutral | |
| 31692 Mr Alasdair Gardiner | Neutral | |
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | Neutral | Land is varied - for example high-value farm land (i.e. productive orchards) should stay as a source of food supply. |
| | | Much land in Mapua and Upper Moutere hills are former forestry, and of low agricultural potential, |
| | | |

| | | beyond grazing. These would appear to be more suitable for intensification of human activity. |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31703 Ms Paula Holden | Neutral | |
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | Neutral | See attached submission. Summarised - no specific comments on this question, generally supports FDS. |
| 31741 Mr Robert Stevenson | Neutral | |
| 31742 Mr tim manning | Neutral | |
| 31744 Mrs Lorna CRANE | Neutral | |
| 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert- Watene | Neutral | I am concerned of infrastructure in this area |
| 31752 Jill Pearson | Neutral | |
| 31765 Mrs Lorna Ivy Cooper | Neutral | |
| 31769 Ms Jo Gould | Neutral | |
| 31771 Colleen Shaw | Neutral | I would like to minimize greenfield development as much as possible but the proposed greenfield development here is minimal. |
| 31835 Mr Ian Wishart | Neutral | Don't care about Mapua |
| 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | Strongly agree | |
| 31211 Mrs Alison Pickford | Strongly agree | Is rural close to town / population hubs of past days? Much of rural residential land is underutilized and lost to future production as uneconomic units. As above - I think that a better use is for sports facilities, and recreational parks. Not everyone wants to - or is mobile enough - walk on the Barnicoat Ranges. |
| 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | Strongly agree | |
| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | Strongly agree | Perfect spot for it, couldn't be better. Just drove up there yesterday and commented to my wife how empty it was. |
| 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin | Strongly agree | Makes sense tallow more room for development here |
| 31706 Paul Donald Galloway | Strongly agree | Revive rebuild recreate new towns with reserves forest greenfield in between. Small towns are happy towns with relaxed people, a sense of security for parents for their children to walk bike to school to ge |
| | | |

| | | to work easy access to parks, community gardens for a cohesive thriving community . |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31114 Ms Jill Rogers | Strongly disagree | Have explained above |
| 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS | Strongly disagree | |
| 31122 Mr Johan Thomas Wahlgren | Strongly disagree | Same argument |
| 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren | Strongly disagree | Leave any greenfield area alone |
| 31171 Ms Sallie Griffiths | Strongly disagree | |
| 31192 Ms Rebecca Patchett | Strongly disagree | Undermines the character of the village, see reasons above. |
| 31194 Mr Todd Field | Strongly disagree | T042 needs to be limited to the hillside and areas to the South of the current slope to avoid heavily impacting on current residents outlook and property values. Medium density (as per webinar) is a huge stretch from current rural residential zoning - a scaled back to large lot or standard residential is more fitting with the current area. Greenfield development is far too much of the plan of how to manage Tasman district growth as 76%!!! |
| 31216 Ms Judith Holmes | Strongly disagree | See notes above. Productive greenfield's need to be retained around Mapua and more areas planted in native forests to rebuild our natural flora and fauna. House people near their jobs and services, don't "farm" people! |
| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | Strongly disagree | Strongly disagree with ANY greenfield development because of climate change, as well as productive needs. |
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | Strongly disagree | |
| 31242 Ms Suzie Ilina | Strongly disagree | Mapua needs to retain its village feeling with no more housing destroying the habitat of small animals and birds |
| 31247 Mr yuri aristarco | Strongly disagree | But why cant we build high like in the rest of the planet? This is just madness, everywhere else they go high, are we right and the rest of the world is wrong or are we wrong and the other 7 billions are right? Try to find the answer yourself |
| 31279 Mr Jeremy Thompson | Strongly | Answer 3 |
| | | |

| | disagree | |
|------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | Strongly disagree | Green areas should be preserved for public recreation in intensified communities. |
| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | Strongly disagree | Leave green, green. |
| 31325 Dr Ann Briggs | Strongly disagree | I oppose any greenfield expansion, for the reasons given in Item 21. |
| 31334 Diane Sutherland | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons above |
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | Strongly disagree | |
| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | Strongly disagree | Ridiculously large areas that will be expensive to maintain |
| 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | Strongly disagree | I oppose turning more of our landscape into suburbs and commuter zones. We have enough of these already and need to preserve our rural and productive land. |
| 31346 Martin Hartman | Strongly disagree | I oppose turning more of our landscape into suburbs and commuter zones. We have enough of these already and need to preserve our rural and productive land. |
| 31349 Laurien Heijs | Strongly disagree | See Q14 response |
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | Strongly disagree | |
| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | Strongly disagree | Same, even stronger. Maximum disagree. UP only, on higher land only, and less cars. |
| 31356 Stephen Williams | Strongly disagree | People living in Mapua will be driving to work in Motueka and Richmond. This creates an unnecessary transportation burden. |
| 31360 Ms Thuy Tran | Strongly disagree | |
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, there is no need to turn the picturesque landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony |
| 31384 Mr Jace Hobbs | Strongly | |
| | | |

| disagree | |
|----------------------|--|
| Strongly disagree | Same arguments here!! |
| Strongly disagree | |
| Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| Strongly disagree | This will just encourage more sprawl |
| Strongly disagree | See 22 |
| Strongly disagree | Not enough work for more growth. We need to protect our agricultural land from more housing development. |
| Strongly disagree | No more urban sprawl |
| Strongly disagree | No, it just creates a urban sprawl and our roads heading in either direction are not capable of dealing with that many more vehicle movements |
| Strongly disagree | Unnecessary development at the cost of local amenity, there are better options with intensification, increasing occupancy levels and change of use of current housing stock |
| Strongly disagree | |
| Strongly disagree | Mapua does not have the services to support the proposed development. 70% growth will alter the village character of Mapua forever. |
| Strongly disagree | No greenfield expansion in this area. Focus on expanding existing areas with med density mixed use. |
| Strongly disagree | As already stated, you are destroying Mapua as a place to live. It's becoming a disjointed sprawl of poor quality houses (black, architecturally sterile buildings surrounded by high wooden fences). The village facilities (school, medical centre, main shops) are already under huge strain; the visual character of the village is being destroyed by excessive use of concrete. Noise, traffic, street lighting are all becoming worse. The small areas of semi-natural green space (e.g. Aranui Park) are being damaged by developers even before they get permission to develop. This is another example of how not to plan and develop. |
| | Strongly disagree |

| | | Please, please, please, stop this archaic way of developing; take hold of the process and PLAN villages in ways that enhance their character and livability. Stop selling our heritage and our environment to developers. |
|----------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31473 Mr Andrew Downs | Strongly disagree | There are not enough jobs here and over intensification will destroy what makes Mapua special. We don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon | Strongly disagree | |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | Strongly disagree | |
| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | Strongly disagree | My feelings on this area are very similar to those based on future development in Tasman and Moutere Hills. |
| 31481 Mrs Lucy Harrhy | Strongly disagree | see above. |
| 31484 Mr Gavin Brent Cook | Strongly disagree | These areas are great growing and animal based areas which once lost could never be replaced ever, loss of horticulture- natural grass growing areas for stock is not good for the rural working community |
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | Strongly disagree | There has been enough already. |
| 31487 Ms Heather Spence | Strongly disagree | As #22. |
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony and add to more cars and car movements. Mapua will lose is character which is what helps attract tourists to the area. |
| 31491 Ms Annette Milligan | Strongly disagree | See 21 |
| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | Strongly disagree | I don't support greenfield development. |
| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, in particular my response to Q21. |
| 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| | | |

| 31496 Mrs Petra Dekker | Strongly disagree | contradiction with the Zero Carbon Act. |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | Strongly disagree | Mapua needs more jobs first and more affordable housing for current locals. |
| 31515 Geoffrey Vause | Strongly disagree | Classifying rural residential to residential is misappropriation of the concept of intensification for most of the land being proposed is currently not developed, thus any development will be greenfield. Any plan should favour intensification within the existing residential zone and green field is only necessary when intensification has been completed. |
| 31516 Mr Peter Lole | Strongly disagree | Absolute minimum of greenfield development though. |
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | Strongly disagree | For the same reasons given for Q22. |
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | Strongly disagree | As per Q.21 response. |
| 31533 Wendy Trevett | Strongly disagree | |
| 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | Strongly disagree | See full submission. Summarised below (similar to NT2050 submission): singluar focus on growth, challenges underlying growth projections, insufficient consultation, misleading submission form (outcome questions), community feedback ignored, biased process, non-compliance with government directives. Recommends re-think of the draft. |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | Strongly disagree | |
| 31562 Grant palliser | Strongly disagree | Make it easy to infill existing developed areas remove expensive levies. BUT preserve our skyline and access to sunshine, Vista and sense of space. Address methods of connectivity with all residents. People people people are what is missing from so much of this survey. Identify the lifestyle that attracts people, but do not destroy it in the process if providing somewhere for them to live. Poor social engineeringrather than thoughtful community development. |
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |

| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett | Strongly disagree | |
| 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham | Strongly disagree | Greenfield is contrary to guidelines that encourage intensified village centres not expanding greenfield sites. There is no necessity for more additional greenfield areas in Māpua. The areas currently proposed were initially confirmed in the 2019 FDS. The draft 2022 FDS is seeking a re-confirmation of the need for these areas in Māpua now proposed for plan change. This implies a preparedness from TDC to review their position. I sincerely hope that this is true. I understand that the prediction used for the region and in this case more importantly for Māpua are too high and not justified. Hiding behind a report undertaken by an external consultant as we were told in one of the webinars, doesn't justify the plan change. Looking at the maps, the footprint of Māpua in the future looks to be about 5 times the current footprint. It is hard to see why there is so much more greenfield space required and why so quickly as this is the basis for the plan change. This will result in disproportional growth and loss of character for Māpua. C. There is already (greenfield) capacity in Māpua. Māpua has a currently a number of not-yet-developed greenfield sites that are zoned as 'deferred residential'. Last year the 'deferred' was lifted by TDC following infrastructure upgrades in the area. This has created additional greenfield capacity. If the rules in these areas would be changed to require a variety of housing types, including 1-2 bedroom options this capacity would be further increased and meet the needs of the local community. This type of change should also be applied to areas around the village centre. It is sad to see that people from the community that wish to downscale and with no options in Māpua or young families from our community that would like to stay here have no options and need leave our community. It is disturbing to see that TDC is considering this types of changes as part of a full review of their planning which could take many years. The opportunity and need is now! Priority should be given to these |
| 31579 Jane Tate | Strongly disagree | I do not agree with greenfield housing areas. If this land is high quality (or even medium quality), it should be left for food production. |
| 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | Strongly | Can we please stop turning our beautiful landscape into a concrete jungle. We need to show courage and |
| | | |

| | disagree | change the status quo way of meeting demand. |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 31588 pene Greet | Strongly disagree | |
| 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | Strongly disagree | or all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31593 Mr William Samuels | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. And create further disconnect to our hardly exciting, lifeless centres. The development in recent years have already taken away the charmdo we need to repeat? |
| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31598 Mrs Nicola Worsfold | Strongly disagree | |
| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. Consider also how this will ever meet the outcomes. |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | Strongly disagree | |
| 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | Strongly disagree | |
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | Strongly disagree | |
| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | Strongly disagree | |
| 31636 Joanna Santa Barbara | Strongly | |
| | | |

| | disagree | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31637 Ms Frances Kemble Welch | Strongly disagree | |
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | Strongly disagree | As above |
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | Strongly disagree | Strongly disagree For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | Strongly disagree | |
| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | Strongly disagree | Strongly disagree For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31673 Mike Drake | Strongly disagree | See Q21 |
| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. |
| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | Strongly disagree | Māpua residents (based on our 2022 Residents Survey) have significant concerns regarding the scale and pace of development within the Māpua and neighbouring communities. We would also like to express our disappointment that TDC has chosen to conduct Public Consultation on both the FDS and Growth Plan Change at the same time – this has been confusing and/or overwhelming for many residents. It has also resulted in "a mad scramble" in an attempt to conduct the required community discussions, prepare submissions / provide feedback within an extremely tight deadline. On top of this, TDC launched yet another Public Consultation on the 2022/23 Annual Plan – a very important document with significant ratepayer implications. MDCA strongly opposed this rushed approach to changes that have potentially transformational impacts on our community and neighbouring districts. Multiple greenfield residential and/or urban intensification developments are either in-progress or |

| | | under consideration for the Māpua region. Therefore, there is an urgent need for meaningful community consultation by not only the TDC and also potential developers to avoid piecemeal housing / commercial / infrastructure developments that do not destroy the look, feel, livability and functionality of our coastal communities. Prior to any decisions regarding rezoning and/or residential growth, an Updated Spatial Plan (per the Urban Provisions process) and additional community consultation are required so that all residents / stakeholders have a clear understanding of both the scale, design and inter-relationship of the many proposed developments and associated infrastructure, allowing them to provide informed feedback to key decision-makers. SEE ATTACHED |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31688 Gerard McDonnell | Strongly disagree | Too congested |
| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | Strongly disagree | As above |
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | Strongly disagree | Growth should be restricted to areas that have already been identified for growth |
| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | Strongly disagree | I am endorsing the Nelson Tasman Climate Forum's view . |
| 31710 Ms Angela Fitchett | Strongly disagree | Ref answer 22. |
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | Strongly disagree | It is unnecessary if the correct utilisation of our existing urban areas can be intensified. |
| 31726 Mr John Jackson | Strongly disagree | |
| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | Strongly disagree | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| 31736 Ms Carol Curtis | Strongly disagree | |
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | Strongly disagree | See comments above. |
| | | |

| 31763 Susan Rogers | Strongly disagree | Survey is flawed from the beginning. You need to redesign this entire line of questioning. It leads only to answers desired by the maker of the survey. |
|--|----------------------|---|
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | Strongly disagree | As for 23. |
| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | Strongly disagree | See above Q21 |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Strongly disagree | Keep more development out of Mapua. Primary production should be priority. |
| 31801 Joan Skurr | Strongly disagree | This would encourage commuting unless sufficient employment is available locally. |

29 Do you think we have got the balance right in our core proposal between intensification and greenfield development? (Approximately half intensification, half greenfield for the combined Nelson Tasman region.)?

| 31257 Mr Kent Inglis | Agree |
|-----------------------------|-------|
| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | Agree |
| 31278 Wendy Ross | Agree |
| 31286 Mr David Short | Agree |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | Agree |
| 31358 George Harrison | Agree |
| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | Agree |
| 31435 Mr Alan Eggers | Agree |
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers | Agree |
| 31529 Mr Steven King-Turner | Agree |
| 31537 Mrs Juliana Trolove | Agree |
| 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery | Agree |
| 31551 Mrs Jo Kitchen | Agree |
| 31558 Mr Steve Jordan | Agree |
| 31574 Mr David Bolton | Agree |
| 31614 Mr mark Morris | Agree |
| 31620 Mr Paul Baigent | Agree |
| 31622 Peter Butler | Agree |
| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | Agree |
| 31647 Mrs Rebecca Parish | Agree |
| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | Agree |
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | Agree |
| 31656 Mr brad malcolm | Agree |
| | |

| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | Agree |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | Agree |
| 31754 Ms Joanna Hopkinson | Agree |
| 31759 Mr Damian Campbell | Agree |
| 31774 Mrs Jane Sutherland | Agree |
| 31783 Mr Peter Jones | Agree |
| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | Disagree |
| 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren | Disagree |
| 31130 Trevor James | Disagree |
| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson | Disagree |
| 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward | Disagree |
| 31174 Ms Alison Westerby | Disagree |
| 31185 Myfanway James | Disagree |
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | Disagree |
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | Disagree |
| 31219 Mrs kate windle | Disagree |
| 31225 Mrs Beverley Diane Trengrove | Disagree |
| 31227 Ms Lee Eliott | Disagree |
| 31247 Mr yuri aristarco | Disagree |
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | Disagree |
| 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman | Disagree |
| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | Disagree |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | Disagree |
| 31279 Mr Jeremy Thompson | Disagree |
| | |

| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | Disagree |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | Disagree |
| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | Disagree |
| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | Disagree |
| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | Disagree |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | Disagree |
| 31316 John Heslop | Disagree |
| 31339 Ms Karen Berge | Disagree |
| 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman | Disagree |
| 31356 Stephen Williams | Disagree |
| 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | Disagree |
| 31364 Mrs Christine Tuffnell | Disagree |
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | Disagree |
| 31400 Miss Heather Wallace | Disagree |
| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | Disagree |
| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling | Disagree |
| 31415 Mrs Zanahe Ruth Galloway | Disagree |
| 31416 Tim Leyland | Disagree |
| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors | Disagree |
| 31423 Mr Roger Frost | Disagree |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas Hollyman | Disagree |
| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn Ball | Disagree |
| 31441 Mr Chris Head | Disagree |
| 31457 Mr J Santa Barbara | Disagree |
| | |

| 31472 Dr David Briggs | Disagree |
|------------------------------|----------|
| 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon | Disagree |
| 31480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | Disagree |
| 31488 Annette Starink | Disagree |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne | Disagree |
| 31522 Marilyn Davis | Disagree |
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | Disagree |
| 31533 Wendy Trevett | Disagree |
| 31549 Mr Ian McComb | Disagree |
| 31553 Mr Wim van Dijk | Disagree |
| 31563 Mrs Loretta Anne Hogg | Disagree |
| 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett | Disagree |
| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | Disagree |
| 31588 pene Greet | Disagree |
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | Disagree |
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | Disagree |
| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | Disagree |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | Disagree |
| 31631 Mrs Joy Shackleton | Disagree |
| 31632 Ms Jacquetta Bell QSM | Disagree |
| 31633 Ms Jacquetta Bell QSM | Disagree |
| 31634 Ms Josephine Markert | Disagree |
| 31644 Murray Poulter | Disagree |
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | Disagree |
| 31668 Mr Bruce & Corena | Disagree |
| | |

| Gillespie | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | Disagree |
| 31688 Gerard McDonnell | Disagree |
| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | Disagree |
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | Disagree |
| 31703 Ms Paula Holden | Disagree |
| 31704 Mr Paul Bucknall | Disagree |
| 31706 Paul Donald Galloway | Disagree |
| 31713 Mrs Debora Scholl Dos Santos | Disagree |
| 31716 Mr Alan hart | Disagree |
| 31722 Trevor Chang | Disagree |
| 31726 Mr John Jackson | Disagree |
| 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert- Watene | Disagree |
| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | Disagree |
| 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | Disagree |
| 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | Disagree |
| 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | Disagree |
| 31769 Ms Jo Gould | Disagree |
| 31775 Dr Thomas Carl | Disagree |
| 31777 Mr David Lucas | Disagree |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Disagree |
| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | Disagree |
| 31809 Mr Andrew Spittal | Disagree |
| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | Don't |
| | |

| | know |
|--------------------------------|---------------|
| 31186 Mr Gary Scott | Don't |
| | know |
| 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | Don't |
| | know |
| 31240 Michael Markert | Don't |
| | know |
| 31318 Mrs Isobel Mosley | Don't |
| | know |
| 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | Don't |
| | know |
| 31403 Mr Richard Deck | Don't know |
| | |
| 31406 Ms Floortje van Lierop | Don't know |
| 31430 Muriel Moran | Don't |
| 31430 Mullel Morall | know |
| 31431 Katerina Seligman | Don't |
| 0 | know |
| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | Don't |
| | know |
| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless | Don't |
| | know |
| 31521 Mrs Marie Waterhouse | Don't |
| | know |
| 31560 Ms Steph Watts | Don't |
| | know |
| 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart | Don't |
| | know |
| 31641 Mr Stephen (Steve) Hayde | en Don't |
| | |

| | know |
|---|---------------|
| 31643 Inge Koevoet | Don't |
| | know |
| 31651 Dr Patrick Conway | Don't |
| | know |
| 31693 Carolyn Rose | Don't |
| | know |
| 31697 Robert King-Tenison | Don't know |
| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | Don't |
| 31/23 Wil Tilli Bayley | know |
| 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | Neutral |
| 31129 Mrs Gaynor Brooks | Neutral |
| 31173 Mr Roderick Watson | Neutral |
| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | Neutral |
| 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | Neutral |
| 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | Neutral |
| 31250 Mr Richard Wyles | Neutral |
| 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan | Neutral |
| 31261 Mr John Weston | Neutral |
| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | Neutral |
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | Neutral |
| 31280 Jenny Knott | Neutral |
| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | Neutral |
| 31284 Mr Jarmo Saloranta | Neutral |
| 31309 Mr & Mrs Rose & Phillip Windle | Neutral |

| 31355 Mr Barney Hoskins | Neutral |
|-------------------------------|---------|
| 31360 Ms Thuy Tran | Neutral |
| 31365 michael monti | Neutral |
| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | Neutral |
| 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer | Neutral |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | Neutral |
| 31449 Mr John Chisholm | Neutral |
| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | Neutral |
| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | Neutral |
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | Neutral |
| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | Neutral |
| 31505 Cheryl Heten | Neutral |
| 31508 Mr Roger Barlow | Neutral |
| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | Neutral |
| 31520 Andrew Stirling | Neutral |
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | Neutral |
| 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz | Neutral |
| 31604 Mr Peter Moot | Neutral |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | Neutral |
| 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin | Neutral |
| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | Neutral |
| 31692 Mr Alasdair Gardiner | Neutral |
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | Neutral |
| 31718 Kathryn & Keith Quigley | Neutral |
| 31744 Mrs Lorna CRANE | Neutral |
| | |

| 31765 Mrs Lorna Ivy Cooper | Neutral |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | Strongly agree |
| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | Strongly agree |
| 31623 Ms Lucy Charlesworth | Strongly agree |
| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | Strongly agree |
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | Strongly agree |
| 31762 Mr Mark Hewetson | Strongly agree |
| 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | Strongly disagree |
| 31114 Ms Jill Rogers | Strongly disagree |
| 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS | Strongly disagree |
| 31118 Ms Sarah Varey | Strongly disagree |
| 31122 Mr Johan Thomas Wahlgren | Strongly disagree |
| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | Strongly disagree |
| 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert | Strongly disagree |
| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | Strongly disagree |
| 31171 Ms Sallie Griffiths | Strongly |
| | |

| | disagree |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 31192 Ms Rebecca Patchett | Strongly disagree |
| 31194 Mr Todd Field | Strongly disagree |
| 31200 Mrs Jo Watson | Strongly disagree |
| 31216 Ms Judith Holmes | Strongly disagree |
| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | Strongly disagree |
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | Strongly disagree |
| 31242 Ms Suzie Ilina | Strongly disagree |
| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | Strongly disagree |
| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley | Strongly disagree |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | Strongly disagree |
| 31298 Mr Duncan Macnab | Strongly disagree |
| 31322 Mrs BARBARA AND TIM ROBSON | Strongly disagree |
| 31325 Dr Ann Briggs | Strongly disagree |
| 31328 Ms Karen du Fresne | Strongly disagree |
| | |

| | disagree |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | Strongly disagree |
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | Strongly disagree |
| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | Strongly disagree |
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | Strongly disagree |
| 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | Strongly disagree |
| 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | Strongly disagree |
| 31346 Martin Hartman | Strongly disagree |
| 31347 Ms Paula Baldwin | Strongly disagree |
| 31349 Laurien Heijs | Strongly disagree |
| 31350 Ms Janet Tavener | Strongly disagree |
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | Strongly disagree |
| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | Strongly disagree |
| 31366 Ms Maree Sharland | Strongly disagree |
| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | Strongly disagree |
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | Strongly |
| | |

| | disagree |
|-----------------------------|----------|
| 31373 Ms Jenny Daniell | Strongly |
| | disagree |
| 31384 Mr Jace Hobbs | Strongly |
| | disagree |
| 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann | Strongly |
| | disagree |
| 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett | Strongly |
| | disagree |
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | Strongly |
| | disagree |
| 31405 Mr Doug Hattersley | Strongly |
| | disagree |
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle | Strongly |
| | disagree |
| 31410 Mr Scott Smithline | Strongly |
| | disagree |
| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling | Strongly |
| | disagree |
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin | Strongly |
| | disagree |
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | Strongly |
| | disagree |
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | Strongly |
| | disagree |
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | Strongly |
| | disagree |
| 31443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | Strongly |
| | disagree |
| 31452 Mr David Bartle | Strongly |
| | |

| | disagree |
|---|----------------------|
| 31462 Mr Graham Watson | Strongly disagree |
| 31473 Mr Andrew Downs | Strongly disagree |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | Strongly disagree |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | Strongly disagree |
| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | Strongly disagree |
| 31481 Mrs Lucy Harrhy | Strongly disagree |
| 31483 Debbie Hampson | Strongly disagree |
| 31484 Mr Gavin Brent Cook | Strongly disagree |
| 31485 Ms Robin Schiff | Strongly disagree |
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | Strongly disagree |
| 31487 Ms Heather Spence | Strongly disagree |
| 31491 Ms Annette Milligan | Strongly disagree |
| 31492 Anton, Benni, Shalom, AJ Bank, Bonnin, Shalom Davis | Strongly disagree |
| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | Strongly disagree |

| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | Strongly disagree |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|
| 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | Strongly disagree |
| 31499 Ms Jane Fisher | Strongly disagree |
| 31500 Ms Suzan Van Wijngaarden | Strongly disagree |
| 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | Strongly disagree |
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | Strongly disagree |
| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | Strongly disagree |
| 31514 Ms Helen Black | Strongly disagree |
| 31515 Geoffrey Vause | Strongly disagree |
| 31516 Mr Peter Lole | Strongly disagree |
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | Strongly disagree |
| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard | Strongly disagree |
| 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | Strongly disagree |
| 31554 Wendy Barker | Strongly disagree |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | Strongly disagree |
| | |

| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | Strongly disagree |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 31562 Grant palliser | Strongly disagree |
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | Strongly disagree |
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | Strongly disagree |
| 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham | Strongly disagree |
| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | Strongly disagree |
| 31579 Jane Tate | Strongly disagree |
| 31580 Jenny Long | Strongly disagree |
| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | Strongly disagree |
| 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | Strongly disagree |
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins | Strongly disagree |
| 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | Strongly disagree |
| 31593 Mr William Samuels | Strongly disagree |
| 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner | Strongly disagree |
| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | Strongly disagree |
| | |

| 31598 Mrs Nicola Worsfold | Strongly disagree |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|
| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | Strongly disagree |
| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | Strongly disagree |
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | Strongly disagree |
| 31608 Robbie Thomson | Strongly disagree |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | Strongly disagree |
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | Strongly disagree |
| 31617 Ms steph jewell | Strongly disagree |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | Strongly disagree |
| 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | Strongly disagree |
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | Strongly disagree |
| 31628 Mr Daniel Levy | Strongly disagree |
| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | Strongly disagree |
| 31636 Joanna Santa Barbara | Strongly disagree |
| 31637 Ms Frances Kemble Welch | Strongly disagree |
| | |

| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | Strongly disagree |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|
| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | Strongly disagree |
| 31657 Mrs Andrea Hay | Strongly disagree |
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | Strongly disagree |
| 31667 barbara nicholas | Strongly disagree |
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | Strongly disagree |
| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | Strongly disagree |
| 31673 Mike Drake | Strongly disagree |
| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | Strongly disagree |
| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | Strongly disagree |
| 31683 Richard Davies | Strongly disagree |
| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | Strongly disagree |
| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | Strongly disagree |
| 31705 Mr Lindsay Wood | Strongly disagree |
| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | Strongly disagree |
| | |

| 31710 Ms Angela Fitchett | Strongly disagree |
|--|----------------------|
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | Strongly disagree |
| 31720 Ms Rainna Pretty | Strongly disagree |
| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | Strongly disagree |
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | Strongly disagree |
| 31736 Ms Carol Curtis | Strongly disagree |
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | Strongly disagree |
| 31739 Philippa Hellyer | Strongly disagree |
| 31747 Mr (Tom) Neil BRETT | Strongly disagree |
| 31752 Jill Pearson | Strongly disagree |
| 31763 Susan Rogers | Strongly disagree |
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | Strongly disagree |
| 31771 Colleen Shaw | Strongly disagree |
| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | Strongly disagree |
| 31801 Joan Skurr | Strongly disagree |
| | |

| 31805 Ian Shapcott | Strongly disagree |
|---------------------|-------------------|
| 31830 K.M. McDonald | Strongly disagree |

| 31114 Ms Jill Rogers | Less greenfield expansion |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert | Less greenfield expansion |
| 1171 Ms Sallie Griffiths | Less greenfield expansion |
| 1186 Mr Gary Scott | Less greenfield expansion |
| 1189 Ms Marlene Alach | Less greenfield expansion |
| 1192 Ms Rebecca Patchett | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31194 Mr Todd Field | Less |
| | |

| | greenfield |
|----------------------------|------------|
| | expansion |
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | Less |
| | greenfield |
| | expansion |
| 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | Less |
| | greenfield |
| | expansion |
| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | Less |
| | greenfield |
| | expansion |
| 31242 Ms Suzie Ilina | Less |
| | greenfield |
| | expansion |
| 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan | Less |
| | greenfield |
| | expansion |
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | Less |
| | greenfield |
| | expansion |
| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | Less |
| | greenfield |
| | expansion |
| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | Less |
| | greenfield |
| | expansion |
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | Less |
| | greenfield |
| | expansion |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | Less |
| | greenfield |
| | expansion |
| | |

| 31279 Mr Jeremy Thompson | Less greenfield expansion |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31325 Dr Ann Briggs | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31349 Laurien Heijs | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | Less greenfield |

| | expansion |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 31373 Ms Jenny Daniell | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31384 Mr Jace Hobbs | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31400 Miss Heather Wallace | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31423 Mr Roger Frost | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn Ball | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31452 Mr David Bartle | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31454 Mrs Tracey Koole | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31457 Mr J Santa Barbara | Less |
| | |

| | greenfield expansion |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 31462 Mr Graham Watson | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31472 Dr David Briggs | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31473 Mr Andrew Downs | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31484 Mr Gavin Brent Cook | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | Less greenfield expansion |
| | |

| 31499 Ms Jane Fisher | Less greenfield expansion |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 31500 Ms Suzan Van Wijngaarden | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31514 Ms Helen Black | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31522 Marilyn Davis | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31560 Ms Steph Watts | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31563 Mrs Loretta Anne Hogg | Less greenfield |

| | expansion |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 31579 Jane Tate | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31580 Jenny Long | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31604 Mr Peter Moot | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31608 Robbie Thomson | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31617 Ms steph jewell | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31623 Ms Lucy Charlesworth | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | Less |
| | |

| | greenfield expansion |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 31628 Mr Daniel Levy | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31636 Joanna Santa Barbara | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31637 Ms Frances Kemble Welch | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31683 Richard Davies | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31688 Gerard McDonnell | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31692 Mr Alasdair Gardiner | Less greenfield expansion |
| | |

| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | Less greenfield expansion |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31703 Ms Paula Holden | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31718 Kathryn & Keith Quigley | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31726 Mr John Jackson | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31736 Ms Carol Curtis | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert- Watene | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31751 Hazel Pearson | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31752 Jill Pearson | Less greenfield expansion |
| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | Less greenfield |

| | expansion |
|------------------------------|-----------------|
| 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | Less |
| | greenfield |
| | expansion |
| 31771 Colleen Shaw | Less |
| | greenfield |
| | expansion |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Less |
| | greenfield |
| | expansion |
| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson | Less |
| | intensification |
| 31145 Ms Maggie Sweetman | Less |
| 311 13 Waggie 3Weetinan | intensification |
| 244.74 Ma Aliana Mastaubu | |
| 31174 Ms Alison Westerby | Less |
| | intensification |
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | Less |
| | intensification |
| 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | Less |
| | intensification |
| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | Less |
| | intensification |
| 31296 Dr Elspeth Macdonald | Less |
| ollow by Lispetti Masasilala | intensification |
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | Less |
| 51545 IVII SLEVE AIIUEISUII | intensification |
| | |
| 31347 Ms Paula Baldwin | Less |
| | intensification |
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | Less |
| , | intensification |
| 31358 George Harrison | Less |
| | |

| | intensification |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | Less intensification |
| 31415 Mrs Zanahe Ruth Galloway | Less intensification |
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | Less intensification |
| 31483 Debbie Hampson | Less intensification |
| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless | Less intensification |
| 31505 Cheryl Heten | Less intensification |
| 31522 Marilyn Davis | Less intensification |
| 31525 Murray Davis | Less intensification |
| 31572 Mr David Todd | Less intensification |
| 31634 Ms Josephine Markert | Less intensification |
| 31668 Mr Bruce & Corena Gillespie | Less intensification |
| 31716 Mr Alan hart | Less intensification |
| 31720 Ms Rainna Pretty | Less intensification |
| 31739 Philippa Hellyer | Less intensification |
| 31741 Mr Robert Stevenson | Less |
| | |

| | intensification |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 31747 Mr (Tom) Neil BRETT | Less intensification |
| 31753 Mr Gerald Thomas | Less intensification |
| 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | Less intensification |
| 31777 Mr David Lucas | Less intensification |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Less intensification |
| 31830 K.M. McDonald | Less intensification |
| 31364 Mrs Christine Tuffnell | More greenfield expansion |
| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | More greenfield expansion |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas Hollyman | More greenfield expansion |
| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | More greenfield expansion |
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers | More greenfield expansion |
| 31574 Mr David Bolton | More greenfield expansion |

| 31638 Mr steve parker | More greenfield expansion |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 31643 Inge Koevoet | More greenfield expansion |
| 31656 Mr brad malcolm | More greenfield expansion |
| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | More greenfield expansion |
| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | More greenfield expansion |
| 31706 Paul Donald Galloway | More greenfield expansion |
| 31774 Mrs Jane Sutherland | More greenfield expansion |
| 31783 Mr Peter Jones | More greenfield expansion |
| 31809 Mr Andrew Spittal | More greenfield expansion |
| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | More intensification |
| 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | More intensification |
| 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS | More |
| | |

| | intensification |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | More intensification |
| 31118 Ms Sarah Varey | More intensification |
| 31122 Mr Johan Thomas Wahlgren | More intensification |
| 31130 Trevor James | More intensification |
| 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward | More intensification |
| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | More intensification |
| 31185 Myfanway James | More intensification |
| 31200 Mrs Jo Watson | More intensification |
| 31216 Ms Judith Holmes | More intensification |
| 31225 Mrs Beverley Diane Trengrove | More intensification |
| 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | More intensification |
| 31227 Ms Lee Eliott | More intensification |
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | More intensification |
| 31240 Michael Markert | More intensification |
| 31247 Mr yuri aristarco | More |
| | |

| | intensification |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 31261 Mr John Weston | More intensification |
| 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman | More intensification |
| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley | More intensification |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | More intensification |
| 31286 Mr David Short | More intensification |
| 31298 Mr Duncan Macnab | More intensification |
| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | More intensification |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | More intensification |
| 31316 John Heslop | More intensification |
| 31322 Mrs BARBARA AND TIM ROBSON | More intensification |
| 31328 Ms Karen du Fresne | More intensification |
| 31334 Diane Sutherland | More intensification |
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | More intensification |
| 31339 Ms Karen Berge | More intensification |
| 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman | More |
| | |

| | intensification |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | More intensification |
| 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | More intensification |
| 31346 Martin Hartman | More intensification |
| 31350 Ms Janet Tavener | More intensification |
| 31356 Stephen Williams | More intensification |
| 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | More intensification |
| 31366 Ms Maree Sharland | More intensification |
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | More intensification |
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | More intensification |
| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | More intensification |
| 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer | More intensification |
| 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann | More intensification |
| 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett | More intensification |
| 31400 Miss Heather Wallace | More intensification |
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | More |
| | |

| | intensification |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| 31405 Mr Doug Hattersley | More intensification |
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle | More intensification |
| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling | More intensification |
| 31410 Mr Scott Smithline | More intensification |
| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling | More intensification |
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin | More intensification |
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | More intensification |
| 31416 Tim Leyland | More intensification |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | More intensification |
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | More intensification |
| 31430 Muriel Moran | More intensification |
| 31435 Mr Alan Eggers | More intensification |
| 31441 Mr Chris Head | More intensification |
| 31443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | More intensification |
| 31449 Mr John Chisholm | More |
| | |

| | intensification |
|---|----------------------|
| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | More intensification |
| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | More intensification |
| 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon | More intensification |
| 31481 Mrs Lucy Harrhy | More intensification |
| 31485 Ms Robin Schiff | More intensification |
| 31487 Ms Heather Spence | More intensification |
| 31488 Annette Starink | More intensification |
| 31491 Ms Annette Milligan | More intensification |
| 31492 Anton, Benni, Shalom, AJ Bank, Bonnin, Shalom Davis | More intensification |
| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | More intensification |
| 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | More intensification |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne | More intensification |
| 31508 Mr Roger Barlow | More intensification |
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | More intensification |
| | intensification |

| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | More intensification |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|
| 31515 Geoffrey Vause | More intensification |
| 31516 Mr Peter Lole | More intensification |
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | More intensification |
| 31533 Wendy Trevett | More intensification |
| 31549 Mr Ian McComb | More intensification |
| 31554 Wendy Barker | More intensification |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | More intensification |
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | More intensification |
| 31562 Grant palliser | More intensification |
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | More intensification |
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | More intensification |
| 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett | More intensification |
| 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham | More intensification |
| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | More intensification |
| | |

| 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | More intensification |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 31588 pene Greet | More intensification |
| 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | More intensification |
| 31593 Mr William Samuels | More intensification |
| 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner | More intensification |
| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | More intensification |
| 31598 Mrs Nicola Worsfold | More intensification |
| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | More intensification |
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | More intensification |
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | More intensification |
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | More intensification |
| 31614 Mr mark Morris | More intensification |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | More intensification |
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | More intensification |
| 31622 Peter Butler | More intensification |
| | |

| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | More intensification |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | More intensification |
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | More intensification |
| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | More intensification |
| 31632 Ms Jacquetta Bell QSM | More intensification |
| 31633 Ms Jacquetta Bell QSM | More intensification |
| 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin | More intensification |
| 31644 Murray Poulter | More intensification |
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | More intensification |
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | More intensification |
| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | More intensification |
| 31657 Mrs Andrea Hay | More intensification |
| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | More intensification |
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | More intensification |
| 31667 barbara nicholas | More intensification |
| | |

| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | More intensification |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 31673 Mike Drake | More intensification |
| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | More intensification |
| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | More intensification |
| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | More intensification |
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | More intensification |
| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | More intensification |
| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | More intensification |
| 31704 Mr Paul Bucknall | More intensification |
| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | More intensification |
| 31710 Ms Angela Fitchett | More intensification |
| 31713 Mrs Debora Scholl Dos Santos | More intensification |
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | More intensification |
| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | More intensification |
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | More intensification |
| | |

| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | More intensification |
|--|----------------------|
| 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | More intensification |
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | More intensification |
| 31769 Ms Jo Gould | More intensification |
| 31775 Dr Thomas Carl | More intensification |
| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | More intensification |
| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | More intensification |
| 31801 Joan Skurr | More intensification |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | More intensification |
| 31820 Debbie Bidlake | More intensification |
| | |

31 Do you support the secondary part of the proposal for a potential new community near Tasman Village and Lower Moutere (Braeburn Road)? Please explain why.

| 31118 Ms Sarah Varey | Don't |
|----------------------------|-------|
| | know |
| 31122 Mr Johan Thomas | Don't |
| Wahlgren | know |
| 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | Don't |
| | know |
| 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren | Don't |
| | know |
| 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward | Don't |
| | know |
| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | Don't |
| | know |
| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | Don't |
| | know |
| 31171 Ms Sallie Griffiths | Don't |
| | know |
| 31174 Ms Alison Westerby | Don't |
| | know |
| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | Don't |
| | know |
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | Don't |
| | know |
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | Don't |
| | know |
| 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | Don't |
| | know |
| 31247 Mr yuri aristarco | Don't |
| | know |
| | |

| 31250 Mr Richard Wyles | Don't know | |
|---|---------------|---|
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | Don't know | |
| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | Don't know | |
| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley | Don't know | |
| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | Don't know | |
| 31309 Mr & Mrs Rose & Phillip Windle | Don't know | |
| 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman | Don't know | |
| 31347 Ms Paula Baldwin | Don't know | Depends on what the existing locals want. |
| 31355 Mr Barney Hoskins | Don't know | |
| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | Don't know | |
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | Don't know | |
| 31373 Ms Jenny Daniell | Don't know | |
| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | Don't know | |
| 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer | Don't know | |
| 31406 Ms Floortje van Lierop | Don't know | |
| | | |

| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | Don't know | |
|------------------------------------|---------------|---|
| 31416 Tim Leyland | Don't know | |
| 31423 Mr Roger Frost | Don't know | I am concerned that this will generate much more private vehicle use, even though it may be needed to support better public transport. |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas Hollyman | Don't know | |
| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | Don't know | |
| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | Don't know | |
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | Don't know | |
| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | Don't know | Only if the planning starts from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
| 31480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | Don't know | |
| 31483 Debbie Hampson | Don't know | |
| 31505 Cheryl Heten | Don't know | |
| 31508 Mr Roger Barlow | Don't know | |
| 31516 Mr Peter Lole | Don't know | Absolute minimum of greenfield development though. |

| 31520 Andrew Stirling | Don't | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|---|
| | know | |
| 31521 Mrs Marie Waterhouse | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31525 Murray Davis | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31529 Mr Steven King-Turner | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31537 Mrs Juliana Trolove | Don't | |
| 31337 Wild Juliana Holove | know | |
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | Don't | There is valuable bird habitat along both sides of the highway there. |
| 31339 Di Lou Gallagilei | know | We need to know what areas are being protected for local birdlife. |
| | KIIOW | Since the wetland estuary was ruined by forestry and apple orchard pesticides, there has been a recovery |
| | | to the area in terms of the numbers and variety of birds coming back there to fish and breed. Before |
| | | colonisation this area was filled with native and migratory birds. |
| | | The least we could do is offer them habitat protection in the next 20 years. |
| 31560 Ms Steph Watts | Don't | |
| · | know | |
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31572 Mr David Todd | Don't | |
| 31372 IVII David Todd | know | |
| 24574 Ma David Dalkan | | |
| 31574 Mr David Bolton | Don't know | |
| | | |
| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | Don't | Question 30 is faulty. I could only tick one options even though it says I can 'tick all that apply'. I would |
| | know | also like to have ticked ' less greenfield expansion' |
| 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31580 Jenny Long | Don't | |
| | | |

| | know | |
|--------------------------|------------------|---|
| 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31604 Mr Peter Moot | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31606 Mr Trent Shepard | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31628 Mr Daniel Levy | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31641 Mr Stephen (Steve) | | ts above - Our submission is mainly concerned with the proposed Braeburn Road |
| Hayden | know development | |
| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | | expert and able to comment everything. Please listen to Joni Tomsett or Tim Neubauer. I |
| | · · · | present my ideas. |
| 31647 Mrs Rebecca Parish | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31651 Dr Patrick Conway | Don't know | |
| | | |
| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | Don't know | |
| 24552 14 61 2 2 | - | |
| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | Don't | |

| | know | |
|------------------------------|-------|--|
| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31692 Mr Alasdair Gardiner | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31693 Carolyn Rose | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31697 Robert King-Tenison | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31713 Mrs Debora Scholl Dos | Don't | |
| Santos | know | |
| 31736 Ms Carol Curtis | Don't | assuming the idea of "new community" is different for "greenfield developments". |
| | know | |
| | | can NelsonTASMAN clearly define these terms in relation to the main OUTCOMES. |
| 31744 Mrs Lorna CRANE | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31765 Mrs Lorna Ivy Cooper | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Don't | Only accessible by car not sustainable for public transport. |
| | know | |
| 31363 Mr Steve Cross | N/A | I reject the premise of questions 29-31 |
| 31364 Mrs Christine Tuffnell | N/A | Best commented on by local people of that area |
| 31617 Ms steph jewell | N/A | Re Q30, you say tick all that apply but I can only tick one. Re Q31, unfair to lump Tasman Village and Braeburn road together, and throw Te Atiawa into the mix. I would likely support Te Atiawa because of the likelihood of their taking poorer people into account. And Tasman Village, yes because it could be intensified with very little greenfield destruction, unlike Braeburn road where it would mostly be greenfield destruction. |
| 31623 Ms Lucy Charlesworth | N/A | I am wary of answering this question as I cannot be sure of how my answer will be interpreted. So I will state - I do not agree with developing green spaces. These spaces need to be reserved and protected to |
| | | |

| | | allow for sustainable biodiversity and for future generations. Intensification within Nelson CBD needs to be a priority. I do not agrees with building on Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. I do not agree with housing development on green fields. There is a climate emergency. Remove these areas from the FDS. |
|------------------------|-----|--|
| 31763 Susan Rogers | N/A | Survey is flawed from the beginning. You need to redesign this entire line of questioning. It leads only to answers desired by the maker of the survey. |
| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | No | There are so many hubs already in existence, creating more is not the solution. Instead intensification wil allow the existing hubs to become more vibrant places full of life rather than silence. |
| 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | No | The new community would be to far out from Nelson - any growth will create more traffic and more GHGs and environmental impacts. That is counter to NCC's objectives. |
| 31114 Ms Jill Rogers | No | Strongly disagree as explained above - Notice this is a yes/no answer not a strongly agree/disagree - is this deliberate? If you add 3,200 houses - the infrastructure would not cope - water, schools, doctors and basic services would have to be upgraded and no one would want to visit as this area would become so crowded it would be another commuter town and not a village with community which it currently is. On the other hand the town of Motueka is in urgent need of upgrading for all the rural communities around and should be a place where more work opportunities are available. |
| 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS | No | PER ALL PREVIOUS COMMENTS THE INFRASTRUCTURE CANNOT COPE WITH FURTHER LARGE SCALE DEVELOPMENT. THERE WAS A PROPOSAL SOME YEARS BACK FOR A NEW VILLAGE WHICH WAS TURNED DOWN AND CORRECTLY SO. ALL YOU WOULD DO IS DEFEAT YOUR PRIMARY PURPOSE OF TRYING TO CUT GHG AS ANY NEW DEVELOPMENT THERE WOULD BE BOOSTING COMMUTER TRAFFIC EITHER TO RICHMOND/NELSON OR MOTUEKA. YOU WOULD NEED NEW SCHOOLS, NEW MEDICAL FACILITIES AND A FAR MORE INTENSE PUBLIC TRANSPORT SYSTEM. YOU WOULD THEN RUIN THE BASIC CHARACTER OF THE AREA AND START CREATING AN URBAN CORRIDOR RUNNING FROM RICHMOND TO MOTUEKA. KEEP THE GREEN SPACEKEEP THE AGRICULTURAL LANDKEEP THE CLEAN AIR THAT XISTS TODAY. |
| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | No | As mentioned above, I strongly oppose the development of the block of land T136 set out in the draft FDS. Significant upgrades will be required to both roading and services to develop this property. There are absolutely no services, no water, no sewerage in that block. It will be an incredibly expensive undertaking and I believe there are better options available to the council. As the FDS states, this block is not required to meet the needs of housing requirements for the region and it will exceed the council's requirements. There is no public transport in the area and the development of this site will increase GHG emissions. I strongly oppose this development. |
| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson | No | Please see attached for more detail - summarised below: |
| | | Strongly oppose the proposed housing development at Braeburn Rd. |

| | | - loss of agricultural land -No available untapped water resources |
|---------------------------|----|---|
| | | -Run's counter to the FDS Outcome 10 -Runs counter to the FDS Outcome of 'Urban form supports reductions in greenhouse gas emissions by integrating land use & transport' |
| 31185 Myfanway James | No | Limit greenfields development unless it is intensive. Only use these areas if there are no other options in Richmond to Wakefield or Mapua |
| 31192 Ms Rebecca Patchett | No | Too many cars on the road, housing will not be affordable (transport costs), productive land lost |
| 31200 Mrs Jo Watson | No | |
| 31216 Ms Judith Holmes | No | Intensify. |
| 31219 Mrs kate windle | No | |
| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | No | More research needed; do completely new communities work successfully? Past experience says no; too many problems- social problems for all ages, lack of jobs, transport problems, disconnection with main centres ect |
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | No | |
| 31240 Michael Markert | No | see 14, Planning 3200 houses in rural Tasman is not a "new village", this is a new town like Motueka (I don't know how many houses there are in Motueka but it must be close to it?), a new town with 3200 houses is 7000 to 10000 people, more than Motueka? needs a few petrol stations, big supermarkets, pharmacies, hairdressers, shops, doctors, schools, kindergarten etc, most importantly jobs, jobs, which industries please? This number of people shall not commute daily to Motueka or Richmond! Double lane highways would be needed, big traffic, etc, the opposite what the FDS is about. It makes you think of how TDC came up with this idea: these locations are earmarked for a possible future development in about (how many?) years? These location are owned by willing owners to develop their land right now, not later. Can't believe that they will put their money making plans on hold. The location are not connected but isolated to each other. So, planning a combined development of infrastructure is ridiculous. This looks like a no-brainer, just taking into account the hectares of willing developers divided 500sqm |
| | | and you have the numbers of houses needed to show the central government that we did our homework. Those landowners are most welcome to subdivide under current rules. On the land between Marriages |
| | | Road and Horton Road might be the possibility to create a small village with 50-100 houses with dense housing/apartments, something that fits under the original idea of Rural3. |
| | | |

| 31242 Ms Suzie Ilina | No | |
|----------------------------|----|--|
| 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan | No | I am responding to the Braeburn Road proposal being that it is in no way closely linked to Tasman village site. Productive farming land on our beautiful rolling Moutere hills is not something that makes sense to put into intense residential housing. For it's not even needed, there is not any infrastructure at all, it makes no sense to put a block of housing in the middle of nowhere so to speak with no health, transport and limited work options available without travelling a good distance to access these. Increased vehicles on insufficient roading creating more emissions and expense. Motueka is 10km away with basic services and this housing subdivision proposal would not provide the types of houses that are needed to cater for those that live in already built up areas. We need to protect our land and landscape and not put houses on land where growth is not required. |
| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | No | See attached. Summarised below: opposes Tasman Village proposal given HPL, servicing constraints Under section 15 Strategic Opportunities and Constraints it states "Highly productive land is a finite resource and should be protected from subdivision and development for urban uses." TCD admits development "requires significant loss of some highly productive land in Coastal Tasman". Most of the land is currently zoned Rural 3. The vagueness of the wording or rural 3 seems to suit TDC depending on which side of the fence they are sitting on. In 2016 a consent was granted for 96 houses. 72 hectares of land was to be preserved. Those 72 hectares are now included in land designated T166 in the FDS with the potential to build 1200 homes. Is this the way the TDC conducts business? We need to change our environment to be more efficient and lessen our footprint. Will the TDC sacrifice our "green and pleasant land" to pander to the wishes of a few landowners and increase their own coffers in the process or will they listen to the voices of the people. |
| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | No | Please see attachment - summarised below: opposes Tasman Village for protetction of Moutere Hills. Details how the proposal does not support each outcome - distance from Richmond/Nelson, lack of public transport, increased GHG emissoins, destruction of agricultural land and clay soils which add to resilience of region. |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | No | This is an example of how not to plan. The development does not cover any of the important points of my submission. It it not easy to service with public transport so will increase GHG emissions. It is on productive land. It does not add resilience. This appears to be a developer led idea rather than a strategy. |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | No | |
| 31279 Mr Jeremy Thompson | No | Answer 3 |
| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | No | No. Overall I think the core FDS is fine, however I strongly disagree with the secondary plan for T-166 |
| | | |

| | | Tasman Bay Village. This option seems almost an after thought in response to landowners offering to develop the area. Clearly any landowner is likely to be motivated by the opportunity for financial gain. It is clear that the FDS core plan meets expected growth so this is needless expansion. |
|----------------------------|----|---|
| 31284 Mr Jarmo Saloranta | No | This is the most contentious and completely unnecessary idea. Couldn't be more opposed to it. |
| 31285 Dr Hamish Holland | No | Rural 3 zoned land along SH6 has been identified for potential development for many years. Rural 1 land was supposed to be protected from development. This would maintain a level of resilience in the face of climate change and natural hazard, as well as a level of assurance to the local population so that long term planning was feasible (domestically and agriculturally). The proposal to develop rural 1 land between Tasman View Road and the Moutere Highway at Braeburn has the following adverse aspects: there is no local concentration of job opportunities; creation of job opportunities would involve the loss of additional Rural 1 land; public transport in Nelson Tasman is scant, in this area virtually non-existent; Transport infrastructure is already under pressure, as seen by the Nelson Richmond corridor; additional water demands on the Moutere aquifer are already extremely restricted; there is a lot of potential greenfield expansion on Rural 3 land between Tasman View Road and the Coastal Highway, close to Tasman Village. |
| 31286 Mr David Short | No | Certainly not at the scale and intensification proposed. I believe that where residential development is required and supported by our community, that it should be planned around existing communities and not based around land availability from willing sellers/developers which may result in scattered rural settlements with no cohesive identity or community amenities to sustain them into the future. |
| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | No | Leave green, green. |
| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | No | |
| 31298 Mr Duncan Macnab | No | If we keep on putting houses where we grow food we will have to import food and that is a green miles disaster |
| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | No | I DISAGREE with this plan. As I highlighted in a previous comment that Māpua is a perfect example of a rapidly growing area in the last few decades. so to make a new town in the middle of nowhere that is totally dependent on individuals needing to drive a cara GHG nightmare Employment in city or rural / agri areas, schools, further education and health services are NOT accessible by public transport and the time factor for commuting is not the way of the future. Waste water will be a nightmare, Storm water will be too and the existing Tasman village that is low lying |

| | | in a tidal area and has no waste water system is a sitting target for a disaster. The greenfield area in this area needs to be protected for environmental needs, NZ native tree planting and to protect and increase birdlife insects and wetland areas. This area is a gem for those who do live and work in Nelson and surrounding towns for their mental health and general well being. We will need it even more in the future for a place of rest and recreation. To build on any greenfield is to plant a single crop of houses but this is one everlasting crop that means green areas are lost forever and so another potential wonderful environmental space to heal the landscape is lost for ever |
|-------------------------------------|----|--|
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | No | Please see attached for further detail: Summarised: It should not go ahead as to expensive to service with Infrastructure, is not in alignment with reducing travel distances. Should remain a rural area. |
| 31316 John Heslop | No | |
| 31318 Mrs Isobel Mosley | No | It seems crazy to build a new community where there is no employment. All those people commuting to Motueka or elsewhere will generate more GHGs. The cost of infrastucture will be high and it also uses upagricultural land. Much better to allow more greenfield expansion immediately around Motueka. |
| 31322 Mrs BARBARA AND TIM ROBSON | No | Greenfields developments are major Emitters. They do not recognise in any way that there is a climate emergency and that the Zero Carbon act requires us to be at net Zero by 2050. Greenfield developments are car centred, urban infrastructures that are inefficient, cause traffic congestion, soil depletion and water pollution. Wide Greenfield development cannot be supported by effective public transport networks. The same would apply to Tasman Village - and anyway its need isn't anticipated unless growth is higher than anticipated. |
| 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | No | T136 at Braeburn road should not be approved for reasons previously stated. |
| 31325 Dr Ann Briggs | No | |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | No | These places are not suitable for new housing estates. |
| 31328 Ms Karen du Fresne | No | No - we don't need any more greenfield developments, when they would have all the disadvantages I've outlined earlier. |
| 31334 Diane Sutherland | No | For all the reasons above. This area is far away from jobs, it covers highly productive land, public transport will never work, the proposed densities will create more sprawl, not a compact village. This housing is not needed to meet Tasman's anticipated housing needs over the next 30 years. |

| | | It is also not supported by iwi. |
|----------------------------|----|---|
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | No | What a bad idea in terms of outcome 1. |
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | No | It is based solely on existing landowners' intentions, rather than proper planning for a new town. |
| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | No | such a community will just increase costs for a council that cannot afford its current infrastructure committments |
| 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | No | Too far away from work and town centres, covering highly productive land, creating more sprawl, more private traffic. Not supported by iwi. |
| 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | No | The village has all the problems for the environment that the other areas have. |
| 31346 Martin Hartman | No | Too far away from work and town centres, covering highly productive land, creating more sprawl, more private traffic. Not supported by iwi. |
| 31349 Laurien Heijs | No | Endorse NelsonTasman2050 submission. |
| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | No | |
| 31356 Stephen Williams | No | This proposal is driven entirely by property developers driven by making money. Water will need to be pumped from Motueka and the wastewater will need to be pumped back. Anyone living there will need to commute to work, thereby increasing our carbon emissions. The type of person living in a developer-driven community is unlikely to be using public transport. Creating an artificial town the size of Motueka is extremely unlikely to succeed at anything other than making money for a select few. |
| 31358 George Harrison | No | |
| 31360 Ms Thuy Tran | No | This is the absolutely worst idea in the entire FDS. I am submitting a supporting document. |
| | | SEE ATTACHMENT - summarised below: - object to secondary part of proposal - lack of infrastructure and services - lack of local employment - climate change, prtection of wetlands and loss of biodiversity - loss of HPL - general concern about over-development - various consenting/legal disputes over the years for development in this area that has been opposed becommunity. |

| | | In summary, there were not sufficient justifications in the original Harakeke development at the numbers of houses the developer proposed at the time seven years ago. The final verdict from TDC was to reduce the developer's proposal in the Aporo Road – Horton road area specifically from the original 122 houses to 38 houses as anymore than that was deemed over-development. The new proposal now begs an important question – How could a court verdict that represented a country's justice system be overturned without agreements from all parties involved? Seven years went by, and the only change was a different developer who now proposes 1200 houses in the same area, with the same infrastructure, amid global awareness of climate change and COVID-19 pandemic. NZ has the advantage of being a younger country, thus we should observe and learn from the mistakes of other developed nations – Over-development destroys natural environment, and it is as rampant as another pandemic, as it is driven by greed, out of touch of the present, has no respect for history, and takes no responsibilities for the future. We, as a united community, still have control and need to stop this urban-sprawling beast to save our next generations. |
|------------------------------|----|---|
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | No | For all the reasons pointed out above, there is no need to turn the picturesque landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony |
| 31386 David Short | No | See attached. Summarised below: - objection to secondary part of proposal - various questions regarding servicing of the development (including PT), provision of amenities within the development - concern about creating 'dormitory' communities - HPL TACA members have serious concerns about the scale and pace of development within the Tasman/Kina communities and in particular the secondary part of the FDS Proposal, a potential new community near Tasman Village. The new proposal is for 2200-3200 houses. This means a new town not a village. What happened to the original proposal of Mariri Hills with a thousand plus sections of the first FDS in 2019? There has been no consultation with TACA or the community from Council or developers and new we are confronted with this revised FDS. We are seriously concerned that the views of our community could be swamped by c90,000 residents who live in Nelson and Richmond etc. Where is the planning logic in just exchanging greenfield development in areas that have existing infrastructure for an area such as the proposed new community near Tasman Village that lacks all the infrastructure that would be required to support 7,500-10,000 people. TACA is mindful that site T-166 is land governed by the Harakeke Consent that has been 1/3rd completed. TACA feels that before the secondary proposal was included in the FDS it should have been |

| | | briefed on the current status of the Harakeke consent and the implications of the changes required to progress the secondary proposal. We feel that where residential development is required and supported by our community, that it should be planned around existing communities and not based around land availability. Our key concerns are: What provisions are being considered to allow for greenspace, walk and cycleways? What work is underway by Council to ensure that residents in new communities will have options to |
|-----------------------------|----|--|
| | | work in the immediate area? What plans are in place for better public transport? What provision as TDC made for future traffic management? What provision has been made for new schools, health and retail? What level of opposition would be required for Council to withdraw the secondary proposal from the FDS? |
| 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann | No | Please see my previous comments of this same idea/prposal. |
| 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett | No | |
| 31400 Miss Heather Wallace | No | Not Needed |
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | No | I am opposed to a new community near Tasman Village and Lower Moutere. Take care of future deman by intensification. |
| 31405 Mr Doug Hattersley | No | Refer to my attachment. Summarised below: Objection to Tasman Village proposal Various questions on the detailed typologies proposed in Tasman Village and servicing. |
| | | Reasons for objection: - expensive servicing - no detail of layout or typologies - only supporting landowners for their benefit - process of analysis used in the FDS - traffic impacts - highly productive land (disputes the assumption that T166 has low productive values) - support for existing RC consent at T166 for less intensive resi development (more rural res/lifestyle) |
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle | No | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |

| | | This area is far away from jobs, it covers highly productive land, public transport will never work, the proposed densities will create more sprawl, not a compact village. This housing is not needed to meet Tasman's anticipated housing needs over the next 30 years. It is also not supported by iwi. |
|----------------------------|----|--|
| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling | No | This will just encourage more sprawl. The proposal should be justified by a full cost-benefit analysis |
| 31410 Mr Scott Smithline | No | I oppose the proposed Tasman Village. Not needed in foreseeable future & violates my feelings about 'greenfield' development. Commit to intensification |
| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling | No | |
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin | No | More intensification, less urban sprawl and definitely no satellite towns. |
| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors | No | Tasman Village is a small village, its special character needs to be protected. The land is significant and important to Te Atiawa, any development there would be a further act of colonisation, leave it alone |
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | No | Unnecessary development at the cost of local amenity, there are better options with intensification, increasing occupancy levels and change of use of current housing stock |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | No | I I DO NOT AGREE WITH THE SECONDARY PART OF THE OF THE PROPOSAL!!!!!!!!!. to build a town near Tasman village flies in the face of good town planning and shows the lack of understanding by council to even include it in the proposal in the first place. |
| | | The Lower Moutere growth node does have some merit as it is closer to Motueka, soil class is low, is on a hill so is not going to flood in the future, and can be support by existing services. |
| 31420 Mr Jon Taylor | No | When you think of Strategy you think of a well thought out plan that has looked at multiple scenarios and worked through assorted out comes and different variables to agree on a final plan that would become your strategy. To have this word even associated with the document shows the lack of thought from the very beginning. As I looked through the FDS it was strangely amazing that this concept at best was even included. The conclusion that I drew from your own admission is these areas of land are of cultural significance, will require all new infrastructure, will require people to travel to other destinations for work and play, does not compliment already existing facilities with in existing communities, will use up productive land, is not needed by your own admission and so on and so on. In fact I and others I have asked, have struggled to come up with one positive outcome from this concept. It is plane to see you have simply done as requested by a couple of developers and used the excuse of housing shortage to help speed up there strategy and this is the final piece to give there dream some weight within our region. TDC should follow there own advice and work within existing communities to open up parcels of land that are already central and give all that own it the opportunity to grow the place they love as it will be done with that in mind. Services like water and sewer need to be installed in places that are lacking and have small sections first and fore most. I love my village of Tasman it is an established village that has |

| | | a community with longstanding members who live here and are passionate about this area, they deserve to be involved with how the region should grow and with the councils help of fulfilling past FDS's that have been neglected and overlooked TDC should be focusing on the existing village and how they can improve this so it can grow before you try and start something new, This is a strategy. |
|---------------------------------------|----|--|
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | No | This area of housing would be far away from jobs, schools, shops, amenities. It would create more commuting, traffic, greenhouse gases. |
| 31430 Muriel Moran | No | |
| 31434 Mrs cushla Moorhead | No | The infrastructure would not be cost affective for one as well as no public transport to speak of. |
| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn Ball | No | The proposed developments are separated by rural 3 zoned land and would not lead to a coherent development. |
| 31443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | No | That is sprawling again - First priority intensification - only if exhausted should this be considered |
| 31452 Mr David Bartle | No | This would destroy agricultural land a create a dormitory community with more commuting |
| 31454 Mrs Tracey Koole | No | |
| 31457 Mr J Santa Barbara | No | |
| 31472 Dr David Briggs | No | Because, as indicated in the plan, it's NOT a community. It's just an area of residential land. Where is the integrated transport and green space and all the other social and cultural facilities that are needed. And do we need it? That is: does the current population need it? |
| 31473 Mr Andrew Downs | No | There is more than enough development and new homes being built here already, anymore would completely ruin the landscape. At least the current developments are restricted by the rural zone 3 rules which are more in keeping with the location. There aren't enough jobs here for such a new community. There isn't the infrastructure, also there is no water and sewerage currently for this location. I am very disappointed that this secondary part of the proposal has even been added when it is clearly against many of the Councils own stated principals. |
| 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon | No | |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | No | Tasman Village does not have the infrastructure - like aporo road- to support further expansion after the already new developments on Deck road and Harley road. Existing residents do not want to have anothe increase in rates for additional infrastructure that they do no need and will not use. |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | No | Tasman village does not have the infrastructure to support such a high intensification of housing. Greenfield areas should stay green. It would be better to intensify the building in existing city centers lik Nelson, Richmond and Motueka by building higher (which could include 5-6 story apartment buildings for |
| | | |

| | | affordable housing). By concentrating the buildings in the already built up areas, green areas can be kept for agriculture and recreation. And by intensifying the urban centers, it will be easier to create good public transport. |
|----------------------------|----|---|
| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | No | Around 3200 houses / 9000 people needing infrastructure and jobs. Thousands more cars driving into Nelson and Motueka and back every day. The valley that Aporo Road runs down almost floods in heavy rain as it is. More roads and houses will only exacerbate runoff. Also, a hillside covered in houses out my window - not exactly what I moved here for. |
| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | No | I live within the Tasman Village / Ruby Bay / Mapua area so believe my thoughts on these areas are relevant. I think that the environment between Appleby and Motueka being intensified or having greenfield expansion would be a huge lose in terms of scenery, tourist attractions and having areas where people can easily escape built-up areas and enjoy rural environments, walking, the bike tracks, beaches, artisan stores and galleries. The area is special and valued by residents and tourists alike. Existing subdivisions within this area are relatively hidden from view. The Tasman Village area is experiencing some development currently, and has more planned within the next 5 years. However, I believe that it fits in with the current zoning being large sections where people residing there can enjoy a rural lifestyle within a small village and a close community. These larger sections hopefully will not change the outlook of the region in a big way. A town in Tasman will simply ruin and change the environment and the enjoyment that people have of the area. The proposed town on sites T166, 167 & 168 do not even meet up with the Tasman Village as it is. The area was left out of the last FDS and I wonder if the only reason it has been included this time is because wealthy landowners want to make even more money with no consideration of any one else - especially as it was them who approached council. The TDC has stated that the Tasman Village proposal is optional and not strictly needed to meet demand. Based on this alone I believe the proposal should be rejected. I accept that expansion is needed new homes need to be provided for an ever growing population. However, people also need and do see value in scenic areas, in the amenities that are already enjoyed in this area and having the privilege of being able to live in such a beautiful rural area. |
| 31481 Mrs Lucy Harrhy | No | Absolutely NOT. Again, people who live in this area do so because they've chosen to live in a rural residential area and have indeed, paid large sums of money for their properties. We do not need or want a whole new community development. We are happy with the Tasman store, we are happy driving to Mapua or to Mot - we enjoy looking out onto the fields, for its aesthetic appeal not to mention it's wildlife value. We do not want an 800 house plus amenities development. |
| 31484 Mr Gavin Brent Cook | No | This area has a great farming infer structure and has taken years to develop, I personally live in the area and see it as basically wasting good fertile green areas which in turn could never be replaced. Beautiful |

| | | with no benefit apart from a money gain from very limited land owners who which aren't even local to the area, my question is why bring town to a country community when there no benefit to the area within work, close to towns with no public transport and no infer structure to supply a tight community as in what has been suggested, please these grounds once gone can never be replaced |
|---------------------------|----|---|
| 31485 Ms Robin Schiff | No | No, I am fundamentally opposed to the proposed Tasman Village. It has all the downsides of other greenfields development, plus the document identifies it is not needed unless growth exceeds the high end of the scenarios and the other developments proceed too slowly, neither of which are justification for including it in the current strategy. |
| | | Only can support it if: the planning starts from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | No | I strongly oppose the secondary proposal with provision 'for new communities'. This proposal seems contrary to the aims of the FDS - a well functioning urban environment, good accessibility, reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, cultur concerns, loss of productive land and loss of unique character. |
| | | There is already an ongoing reasonable amount of development under the existing rural residential 3 zones which appear to be in keeping with this area. Within this many of us have a responsibility for our own sewage and potable water. Many people, myself included who have come to this area understand the need to take responsibility to reduce our carbon footprint and have chosen to come here because its rural not an urban environment. |
| | | The proposed development appears to be surplus to requirements, far from services and employment. Three thousand two hundred houses poorly connected and unlikely to develop into a compact community, proposed it seems by a willing landowners approach rather than a rigorous provision for a TDC's desired outcomes or the community who lives here already. Who will live in this area? Even in the FDS it states there is modest known demand. People need jobs and will need to leave this area for world intensification will only multiply emissions out of sight. There would be a huge requirement for |

| | | services and infrastructure whilst not only expensive and difficult to access would destroy more of the |
|---|----|---|
| | | natural environment which I and many others came to this area for. I believe this proposal would destroy the unique character and beauty of this area. |
| 24407.84 11 11 6 | | i believe this proposal would destroy the unique character and beauty of this area. |
| 31487 Ms Heather Spence | No | |
| 31488 Annette Starink | No | Keep all community building and expansion around Motueka, Richmond and Nelson areas |
| 31491 Ms Annette Milligan | No | Building a new village so far from the areas where people work and play will only increase the emission of GHGs. There is nothing in this idea to mitigate the effects of climate change. In my view, it is vial to respect the concerns of iwi who are opposed to this development. As the rights of tangata whenua have been largely ignored since 1842, I think it is way past time to respect and honour their very valid wishes and concerns. To decline to do so will add yet another shameful cahpter for subsequent generations to study and mourn. My view is that we should respect the wishes of Te Atiawa |
| 31492 Anton, Benni, Shalom, AJ Bank, Bonnin, Shalom Davis | No | Greenfields developments are a major contributor to an array of existing, well-documented problems (e.g. car-centric development; high emissions construction; diffuse pollution of waterways; loss of rural land; traffic congestion; loss of soil carbon; social dislocation; inefficient urban infrastructure). |
| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | No | I don't support greenfield development. |
| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | No | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need more sprawl. A wiling landowner approach is not a strategy and certainly not a strategy that aims to meet its objectives and legal requirements. It is disturbing to see that TDC is giving a higher priority to consider this development, to be intimidated by a few locals resisting change and not interested in prioritising the common good and meeting its own and legal objectives. This area is far away from jobs, it covers highly productive land, public transport will never work, the proposed densities will create more sprawl, it is not a compact village. This housing is not needed to meet Tasman's anticipated housing needs over the next 30 years. It is also not supported by iwi. |
| 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | No | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. This area is far away from jobs, it covers highly productive land, public transport will never work, the proposed densities will create more sprawl, not a compact village. This housing is not needed to meet Tasman's anticipated housing needs over the next 30 years. It is also not supported by iwi. |

| 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | No | |
|--------------------------------|----|---|
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | No | this area is far away from jobs, covers highly productive land, public transport will never work, no housing needed in this area, not supported by iwi |
| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | No | The proposed Tasman Village has all the downsides of other greenfield developments, and should not be included in the strategy. |
| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | No | No. NMH does not support this secondary proposal. NMH questions the need for further development in Tasman Village for the following reasons a. Te Atiawa have expressed significant concerns about this site and this does not align with the outcome listed above "to revive and enhance the mauri of Te Taiao" b. Expansion of this township will increase emissions as people will need to travel to employment and services. This does not align with the outcome listed above "The urban form supports reductions in greenhouse gas emissions". This could be mitigated by further investment of public and active transport however this may dilute other needed transport investment in the key towns along SH6. This is especially important as the consultation document already acknowledges that further investment in public transport frequency across existing urban area and to Wakefield is already required. c. That development in this area will require a significant loss of some highly productive land. This is again incompatible with the Outcome that "Nelson Tasman's highly productive land is prioritised for primary production" NMH again wishes to reiterate the importance of retaining highly productive land. This is especially important as the core proposal will lead to some reduction of highly productive land along SH6. Therefore it is important that other areas of the District can protect their productive land. d. Given the proximity of Motueka and Mapuā towns, intensification in and around Motueka and Mapuā |
| 31515 Geoffrey Vause | No | are highter priorities In catagorising one store, two artisan galleries and two schools as a village, the TDC will have to commit to significant commercial and infrastructure development if it is to develop this lower Moutere area. Any |
| | | such development will also by necessity be low density, greenfield and contradictory to FDS outcome 3. |
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers | No | seems costly |
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | No | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. This area is far away from jobs, it covers highly productive land, public transport will never work, the proposed densities will create more sprawl, not a compact village. This housing is not needed to meet Tasman's anticipated housing needs over the next 30 years. It is also not supported by iwi. |

| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | No | Please refer to my attachment - summarised below: Objects to Tasman Village for reasons related to infrastructure servicing (three waters), lack of employment opportunities and distance from centres, isn't needed under high growth scenario, HPL (evidenced in Harakeke Consent), high amenity area, flooding risk, impact on climate change, landbanking |
|-------------------------------|----|---|
| 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | No | You have this so wrong. Everything assumes growth for growth sake and is based on flawed economics. Perhaps you should ask people in Tasman - do they want growth? Do they think money and making money is the fundamental driver to their lives? You need to show some leadership on this before this Region is spoiled forever. |
| 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery | No | That is pushing in to productive land areas. Te Atiawa have expressed strong concern about cultural heritage sites. Water is seriously lacking in this area and would need to be piped in at great expense and against iwi wishes. It is currently a pleasant rural environment with perfectly accessible urban areas close by- Māpua and Motueka would be better suited to intensification and commercial development than Tasman. |
| 31549 Mr Ian McComb | No | Cost of infrastructure servicing and iwi concerns. |
| 31554 Wendy Barker | No | It just adds to the sprawl between Richmond and Motueka |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | No | No -enhance existing communities and infrastructures |
| 31562 Grant palliser | No | ' village' a misnomervillages grow over timehave history and a back storythey evolveare not artificially created. |
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | No | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. This area is far away from jobs, it covers highly productive land, public transport will never work, the proposed densities will create more sprawl, not a compact village. This housing is not needed to meet Tasman's anticipated housing needs over the next 30 years. It is also not supported by iwi. |
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | No | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. This area is far away from jobs, it covers highly productive land, public transport |
| | | will never work, the proposed densities will create more sprawl, not a compact village. |

| | | This housing is not needed to meet Tasman's anticipated housing needs over the next 30 years. |
|----------------------------|----|--|
| | | It is also not supported by iwi. |
| 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett | No | |
| 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham | No | Intensify the villages / centres we already have |
| 31579 Jane Tate | No | I do not agree with greenfield housing areas. If this land is high quality (or even medium quality), it should be left for food production. |
| | | Also, where is the infrastructure for so many houses coming from? Where is the water? The sewerage? Who is going to pay for this? The developers? Or will it be dumped on ratepayers? |
| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | No | As above; this plan is actively encouraging landowners and to move away from using highly productive land for growing into converting to housing so they, and the Council profit. Greed driven. Rural is rural. |
| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | No | This is driven by Landowners profit aspirations not a clearly defined housing need |
| 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | No | Can we please stop turning our beautiful landscape into a concrete jungle. We need to show courage and change the status quo way of meeting demand. This area is away from jobs jobs, it covers highly productive land, public transport will never work, the proposed densities will create more sprawl, not a compact village. This housing is not needed to meet Tasman's anticipated housing needs over the next 30 years. This option is purely developer driven. The question is very misleading - the potential "new community" will actually be the third largest town in Tasman according to the proposal. I stronly oppose this |
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins | No | No, I am fundamentally opposed to the proposed Tasman Village. It has all the downsides of other greenfields development, plus the document identifies it is not needed unless growth exceeds the high end of the scenarios and the other developments proceed too slowly, neither of which are justification for including it in the current strategy. |
| 31588 pene Greet | No | There is no water, no sewerage, no transport to town centres, no colleges, no jobs, and no commercial facilities to support a new community in this area. This is an unsustainable option and has been proposed purely because current owners want to make money from sale of their land. This land is agriculturally productive, or could be with appropriate management. What other areas have been considered for this development and by what criteria were this area chosen? |

| 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | No | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. This area is far away from jobs, it covers highly productive land, public transport will be a challenge, and the proposed densities will create more sprawl, not a compact village. This housing is not needed to meet Tasman's anticipated housing needs over the next 30 years. Most importantly, It is also not supported by iwi. |
|------------------------------------|----|--|
| 31593 Mr William Samuels | No | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. |
| | | This area is far away from jobs, it covers highly productive land, public transport will never work, the proposed densities will create more sprawl, not a compact village. |
| | | This housing is not needed to meet Tasman's anticipated housing needs over the next 30 years. It is also not supported by iwi. |
| 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner | No | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. This area is far away from jobs, it covers highly productive land, public transport will never work, the proposed densities will create more sprawl, not a compact village. This housing is not needed to meet Tasman's anticipated housing needs over the next 30 years. It is also not supported by iwi. |
| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | No | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. This area is far away from jobs, it covers highly productive land, public transport will never work, the proposed densities will create more sprawl, not a compact village. This housing is not needed to meet Tasman's anticipated housing needs over the next 30 years. It is also not supported by iwi. |
| 31598 Mrs Nicola Worsfold | No | These are rural areas which should focus on maintaining rural characteristics and enlarged natural green spaces and areas of current high productive primary production. Growth expansion into residential should remain close to existing urban centres where there is existing infrastructures that can be expanded on such as utilities, roading and public transport. Costs can be applied to higher volume densities than when they are isolated out in existing rural environments. There will be increased green house gas emissions from people travelling in private cars from rural to urban areas where there is higher levels of employment. |

| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | No | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. This area is far away from jobs, it covers highly productive land, public transport will never work, the proposed densities will create more sprawl, not a compact village. This housing is not needed to meet Tasman's anticipated housing needs over the next 30 years. It is also not supported by iwi. |
|------------------------------|----|---|
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | No | No, I am fundamentally opposed to the proposed Tasman Village. It has all the downsides of other greenfields development, plus the document identifies it is not needed unless growth exceeds the high end of the scenarios and the other developments proceed too slowly, neither of which are justification for including it in the current strategy. It is also not supported by iwi. Consider how this meets the outcomes. |
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | No | Not enough jobs in Tasman Village & Lower Moutere for expansion without increasing commuting times |
| , | | and carbon emissions |
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | No | |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | No | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. This area is far away from jobs, it covers highly productive land, public transport will be challenge, and the proposed densities will create more sprawl, not a compact village. This housing is not needed to meet Tasman's anticipated housing needs over the next 30 years. It is also not supported by iwi. |
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | No | This is valuable rural land and it will encourage car based transport and increase carbon emissions |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | No | Conditionally yes if intensification can be improved and high value jobs provided for in conjunction; and settlement reached with Iwi. I do in fact think it's about the right spacing from other centres, to start another. Upper Moutere, Mapua, Tasman, Lower Moutere, Motueka all a good distance by overseas historical standards. |
| | | BUT. But, for heavens sake get serious about compaction and density. Aim for really tight (up not out, integrated residential and commercial) hubs to these centres. No mile-long-main-streets. Tight infrastructure, preserved green belts surrounding, preserved productive land beyond. Integrated CHP (Combined heat and power) for residential, pulling biogas and biomass (wood) fuels from surrounding |

| | | farms at a date in the future where we have the scale to do so. |
|-----------------------------|----|---|
| | | It's not dreamy, it's not out of reach, it's just how far older and wiser nations than us are planning. |
| 31633 Ms Jacquetta Bell QSM | No | Backwards thinking that relies on private car use and loss of agricultural/horticultural land. |
| 31634 Ms Josephine Markert | No | I strongly disagree, see answer from question 2 |
| 31636 Joanna Santa Barbara | No | No, we strongly disagree with this part of the proposal and see it as exemplifying the opposite of the kind of development we need, as we have explained above. In addition it is unacceptable to local iwi. |
| 31643 Inge Koevoet | No | |
| 31644 Murray Poulter | No | The Tasman village and Lower Moutere proposal does not fit any criteria for sustainability, or community and economic development. |
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | No | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. This area is far away from jobs, it covers highly productive land, public transport will be a challenge, and the proposed densities will create more sprawl, not a compact village. This housing is not needed to meet Tasman's anticipated housing needs over the next 30 years. It is also not supported by iwi as it does not cater for their needs or socio-economic bracket. |
| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | No | It's a magical area and there is enough development in Mapua to meet residential needs. |
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | No | Waka Kotahi support intensification of existing urban areas that already have social and economic infrastructure in place, supporting moving away from a reliance on private vehicle transport. The next priority is greenfield development adjoining existing urban areas to allow for people to live near where they work, go to school etc. designed in a way to align with the NPS-UD and GPS for Land Transport. There appears to be provision to meet housing demand elsewhere as indicated in the FDS document, nearer to existing infrastructure and amenities. |
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | No | No For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. This area is far away from jobs, it covers highly productive land, public transport will be a challenge, and the proposed densities will create more sprawl, not a compact village. This housing is not needed to meet Tasman's anticipated housing needs over the next 30 years. It is also not supported by iwi. |

| 31667 barbara nicholas | No | see attached file. Summarised: generaly supports intensification and avoiding building on HPL, specific submission that 'no new community in Tasman should be possible unti AFTER intensification is well developed and if in the long term an additional community is required then it must be compact' |
|--------------------------------------|----|--|
| 31668 Mr Bruce & Corena Gillespie | No | The affect on the environment from the extensive housing proposed in Lover Moutere & Braeburn Road area. Lower Moutere already floods from the Moutere ditch. No locals will be able to afford to live there with the cost of infrastructure needed to set this up correctly. |
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | No | No this is committing people to small isolated community living with barely adequate services - the wors form of urban sprawl |
| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | No | No For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. This area is far away from jobs, it covers highly productive land, public transport will be a challenge, and the proposed densities will create more sprawl, not a compact village. This housing is not needed to meet Tasman's anticipated housing needs over the next 30 years. It is also not supported by iwi. |
| 31673 Mike Drake | No | See my answers re. Mapua. |
| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | No | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into inadequate housing sprawl. This area is far away from jobs, it covers highly productive land, public transport will be a challenge, and the proposed densities will create more sprawl, not a compact village. This housing is not needed to meet Tasman's anticipated housing needs over the next 30 years. It is also not supported by iwi. |
| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | No | Yes there will be massive demand for housing in the Tasman village but we should prioritise the demand that we need i.e. affordable housing in the existing urban centres and demand that will not clog up our highways. Upgrade the Motueka - Richmond highway to four lanes before getting started in Tasman. |
| 31683 Richard Davies | No | There are less fertile areas that would be more appropriate for building. |
| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | No | MDCA fully supports TACA in it opposition to these "orphan communities" whose location is simply being driven by land availability. |
| 31685 Chris A Freyberg | No | I do not support this proposal. i. By my analysis, this proposal detracts from seven of the draft FDS outcomes and is neutral to the remaining |

four. In terms of the stated outcomes, the proposal is neither necessary nor desirable.

ii. The Aporo/Tasman valley has an established and overwhelming aspect and character of rural-horticutural,

rural residential, and village with lots of green space, low noise and light levels, and plenty of trees. That this will

be destroyed by the proposed town/community is not mentioned in the pros and cons for the proposal in either

the technical report nor in the draft FDS – that consequence of the proposal clearly was not considered by the

planners. The need/desire for preservation of the established aspect and character of the valley has already been

recognised by the commissioners who heard the original Harakeke Development.

iii. A proposed intensification of housing in the Aporo/Tasman Valley as part of the Harakeke development was

strongly opposed by residents of the valley a few years ago and, in the end, was rejected by the commissioners

who heard the case.

iv. Consultation to date on the concept of a new town in the Aporo/Tasman valley has been manifestly inadequate. I estimate that there are well over 300 residences already in the Aporo/Tasman valley, yet it seems

that only 3 landowners/developers have been consulted in any detail. Why should the commercial desires of 1%

determine the future of the 99%?

v. If indeed it could be demonstrated that the construction of a new town on greenfield is highly desirable for

the district then, for a decision of this magnitude, I would expect a number of possible sites to be evaluated so as

to arrive at the best possible outcome for everyone. For example, both the area around and east of Upper

Moutere, and an area including Bronte, Hoddy, and Matahua peninsulars and the valleys between them would

seem to have advantages over Aporo/Tasman valley as a site for a new town, with no greater levels of disruption

and loss of enjoyment for existing residents.

vi. The idea that you can facilitate a new town and community by rezoning hilly Rural 3 land between Aporo/Tasman Valley and the block at Braeburn Road in the Lower Moutere to Rural Residential is

| | | ludicrous. For example, it takes less time to get from Tasman Village to Motueka by road than it does to get to Braeburn Road. (Refer section 9.1 "development of an integrated community" and "well-connected develop |
|--------------------------------|----|--|
| 31688 Gerard McDonnell | No | Coastal area (Appleby and Moutere Highways) too congested |
| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | No | For the reasons above. |
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | No | This destroys the village's character and charm, increases the traffic on the roads that negatively impact on climate change and does not meet most of the outcomes stated in the FDS |
| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | No | We should not be encouraging more settlements that require even more commuting |
| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | No | No, this is likely to just create another commuter community. |
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | No | Tasman Village is low-lying and would be a poor area to develop further community services infrastructure. The development proposed at Braeburn is far away from Tasman Village, with minimal services, and in a flood zone. |
| 31705 Mr Lindsay Wood | No | No, we are fundamentally opposed to the proposed Tasman Village. It has all the downsides of other greenfields development, plus the document identifies it is not needed unless growth exceeds the high end of the scenarios and the other developments proceed too slowly, both of which indicate a failure of other aspects of the strategy and neither of which is justification for including it in the current strategy. |
| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | No | I am endorsing the Nelson Tasman Climate Forum's view. No, we strongly disagree with this part of the proposal and see it as exemplifying the opposite of the kind of development we need, as we have explained above. In addition it is unacceptable to local iwi. |
| 31710 Ms Angela Fitchett | No | For reasons stated previously; and definitely not if iwi object. |
| 31718 Kathryn & Keith Quigley | No | 1) The area is zone rural 3. Intensive development of the area will degrade the quiet rural ambience and rural outlook, reasons why many people have chosen to live in this area. 2) SH60 is currently heavily traveled and unsafe in many areas. Development of the proposed Tasman Village will exacerbate these issues by more cars traveling between Tasman and Richmond. 3) Tasman rural towns are adequately provided for by services in Richmond/Nelson, Motueka and Mapua. There is no need for additional services in Tasman. |

| | | Additional services in Tasman would be a convenience only and would not be worth the trade-off of the large Tasman Village development. 4) The FDS report acknowledges the addition of the Tasman Village development significantly exceeds housing demand under both the medium and high-growth scenarios. Why despoil Tasman's rural character and ambience with a development that's not needed? 5) Past survey participants have not indicated a preference to live in the Tasman area. 6) Developing Tasman Village would result in the loss of some highly productive land in coastal Tasman. Productive land should be protected, not developed. 7) Developing Tasman Village would also require developing expensive infrastructure. This is an unnecessary expense as the development of Tasman Village exceeds housing demand under both the medium and high-growth scenarios. |
|--------------------------------------|----|--|
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | No | This is complete opposition to the objectives. |
| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | No | |
| 31726 Mr John Jackson | No | |
| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | No | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. This area is far away from jobs, it covers highly productive land, public transport will never work, the proposed densities will create more sprawl, not a compact village. This housing is not needed to meet Tasman's anticipated housing needs over the next 30 years. It is also not supported by iwi. |
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | No | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. This area is far away from jobs, it covers highly productive land, public transport will never work, the proposed densities will create more sprawl, not a compact village. This housing is not needed to meet Tasman's anticipated housing needs over the next 30 years. It is also not supported by iwi. |
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | No | No definitely not. It is just urban sprawl encouraging commuting (with all the attendant problems), and destroying good soil and rural landscapes. |
| 31739 Philippa Hellyer | No | This particular proposal needs to be removed immediately from the plan. It would only pander to the greed of the developers. Greed is a sin. |
| 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert- Watene | No | I believe the number of houses proposed in this area is too dense |
| 31752 Jill Pearson | No | |
| | | |

| 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | No | Expand Mapua, as there is already a good community there and existing infrastructure |
|--|----|---|
| | | The Mapua area should be the new Motueka. Mapua should have hundreds of more homes in the surrounding area. Plan for a High School across the road from the existing Primary School |
| 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | No | No, the proposed Tasman Village is a greenfields development. It does not appear to be needed unless the 'high growth' scenario occurs. |
| 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | No | |
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | No | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. This area is far away from jobs, it covers highly productive land, public transport will never work, the proposed densities will create more sprawl, not a compact village. This housing is not needed to meet Tasman's anticipated housing needs over the next 30 years. It is also not supported by iwi. |
| 31771 Colleen Shaw | No | I do not support policy that exploits the use of existing greenfield land especially used for agriculture which will accelerate greenhouse gas emissions with use of private vehicles, pollution of waterways, loss of soil carbon, traffic congestion. It was stated in the strategy that it is not needed now and therefore it should not be included just because there might be problems in providing housing in other ways. |
| 31775 Dr Thomas Carl | No | |
| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | No | See above |
| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | No | A: No this is the absolute worst form of sprawl. Perhaps you keep this up your sleeve for if the population increase in our area is greater than you predict |
| 31801 Joan Skurr | No | The land is needed for food production, and houses would encourage commuting. |
| 31809 Mr Andrew Spittal | No | No we do not support a village in Tasman, particularly if that involves taking valuable reticulated water supply away from Mapua. |
| 31820 Debbie Bidlake | No | Federated Farmers is strongly opposed to the establishment of a new community near Tasman Village. A the appendices demonstrate, several areas, including T136, T166 and T168 include high quality horticultural land (apples, pears, and grapes), and profitable sheep and beef farms. This food production potential will be lost the council allows it to be concreted over for housing. Future generations won't thank us for providing shelter and lovely views, but nowhere to grow food. Cabinet is expected to make decisions on the draft NPS on Highly Productive Land in May 2022. If approved, it will take effect from June 2022. The NPS-HPL directs councils to protect highly productive land for future generations, and |

| | | from inappropriate subdivision, use and development; and to recognise the values and benefits associated with its use for primary production. The secondary proposal does neither, it merely identifies |
|---------------------------------------|-----|--|
| | | "significant loss of some highly productive land in the Coastal Tasman Areas" as a disadvantage. Plonking a greenfield settlement in the Seaton Valley on prime production land makes no sense. It would fundamentally change the character and amenity of the existing rural |
| | | area. Area T168 is next to a fully functioning orchard and sheep farm owned by the Rush family. They must already deal with the reserve sensitivity effects of urban encroachment e.g., complaints about sprays, smoke, and animal smells and noises. These effects would increase exponentially with 3,200 new homes. The area would be expensive to develop from an infrastructure perspective; It has heavy clay soil so water and sewage would need to be piped from and to Motueka. And active transport infrastructure would need to be built to reduce GHG emissions. About the only thing this area |
| | | really has going for it from a development perspective, is an eager developer with profit, rather than the region's best interests, at heart. Just because it might be a "shovel ready" development option, does not make it a wise choice. If new settlements must be developed, there is an abundance of hilly cut over forestry land in the district that would be far better suited to housing. In our view, these areas need to be considered first. We note that new developments in the Tasman area are not needed to meet demand even under a high growth scenario. We question why it has been included in the FDS. Our community is already over consulted and there are so many disadvantages to developing th |
| 31130 Trevor James | Yes | |
| 31186 Mr Gary Scott | Yes | Who is Te Atiawa? A decentralized township along the lines of wakefield with all the amenities, such as a school, petrol and pub to support the development will be ok. |
| 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | Yes | Yes only if it impacts no current home owners |
| 31225 Mrs Beverley Diane Trengrove | Yes | |
| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | Yes | |
| 31287 Ms Suzanne Bateup | Yes | |
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | Yes | |
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | Yes | |

| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | Yes | It will help create a balance of economic benefit towards Motueka. I think the intensification target is more vulnerable than greenfields - council is more able to influence greenfields than intensification because of scale - intensification has to be advanced lot by lot, whereas greenfields are a batch operati |
|-----------------------------|-----|---|
| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | Yes | |
| 31403 Mr Richard Deck | Yes | Area of generally fragmentated development, lower productive values. Mostly good for apples, forestrand grazing. |
| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | Yes | A new urban centre would support both Motueka and Richmond with reduced negative effects, and minimise projected loss of high value soils in the Waimea Basin. It also offers the opportunity for imaginative and gradual Urban Development |
| 31435 Mr Alan Eggers | Yes | The Lower Moutere (Braeburn Road) site provides an ideal opportunity to create potential new community that meet the FDS outcomes. |
| 31449 Mr John Chisholm | Yes | Climate change as it will detrimentally influence future growth in and around Motueka Good roading networks nearby Sunny north facing land A development here would be relatively secluded and therefore not detrimentally effect landscape perspectives/views from other areas Restricted productive capability on the land without irrigation Potential for enhanced biodiversity by planting and restoration of waterways |
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | Yes | For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need to turn any more of our landscape into concrete and tarmac covered monotony. This area is far away from jobs, it covers highly productive land, public transport will never work, the proposed densities will create more sprawl, not a compact village. This housing is not needed to meet Tasman's anticipated housing needs over the next 30 years. It is also not supported by iwi. As stated on the Zoom meeting the calculation for uptake of public transport was guess work (at best!) Concern about impact of Tasman Village development on dark sky; light pollution. |
| 31533 Wendy Trevett | Yes | |
| 31551 Mrs Jo Kitchen | Yes | |
| 31558 Mr Steve Jordan | Yes | |
| 31563 Mrs Loretta Anne Hogg | Yes | Yes new communities. Green spaces between communities. Local shops, hairdressers, butchers, schools, doctors, cafes, horticulture, biking, etc etc |

| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | Yes | |
|-------------------------------|-----|--|
| 31614 Mr mark Morris | Yes | |
| 31622 Peter Butler | Yes | |
| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | Yes | |
| 31631 Mrs Joy Shackleton | Yes | |
| 31637 Ms Frances Kemble Welch | Yes | |
| 31656 Mr brad malcolm | Yes | |
| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | Yes | The likely shortfall of intensification in providing long term housing needs will mean that Braeburn Road secondary development are needs to be part of the Primary Future Growth Areas. See attached document. Summarised - supports inclusion of T136 as part of the core proposal, thinks that disadvantages of wider Tasman Village sites (T166-168) have been applied to T136 when they don't relate, intensification rates is unlikely to occur so proposal will need T136 to provide for capacity. |
| 31681 Seev Oren | Yes | Creates larger community of the main highway. |
| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | Yes | .growth requires council to provide serviced land . Maori grievences on private land are unwelcome and should be dismissed immediately. Council staff time should not be wasted on Maori spiritual and cultural nonsense!!!Focus on consenting and delivering Projects for the good of all NewZealanders Council must deliver for the Ratepayers |
| 31704 Mr Paul Bucknall | Yes | We aren't in a position to say no to the development of all the suggested areas. Especially if we are not going to speed up the process of intensification to offset this restriction. Some have suggested a development agency for Nelson and Richmond to try and do this and some form of catalyst and strategic planning body is required to get intensification to happen fast enough to make a difference. Allied to this, I think the development of a new settlement or two is probably a sensible thing to explore. I think many environmental impacts will be possible to mitigate within the timescale of this FDS so we should be exploring innovative technologies to minimise the environmental negatives of the development of a new town. I also agree that council needs to plan for the managed retreat from low lying areas at high risk from rising sea levels. This aspect of the secondary proposal is significant and should be applauded. Taking the decision now to phase the transition to this more elevated site is a good move and shifting the focus for infrastructure development towards this makes sense too. I think someone in a webinar talked about the work required for sewage treatment in Motueka and being able to factor in this new settlement as part of that work presents opportunities for efficiency and therefore lessening the negatives to this option. |

| 31706 Paul Donald Galloway | Yes | Revive rebuild recreate new towns with reserves forest greenfield in between. Small towns are happy towns with relaxed people, a sense of security for parents for their children to walk bike to school to get to work with easy access to parks with community gardens for a cohesive thriving community . |
|----------------------------|--|---|
| 31709 Ofer Ronen | Yes | Support, Create jobs, Reovce Prices, provide commercial Central area |
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | Yes | See attached submission. Summarised - no specific comments on this question, generally supports FDS. |
| 31722 Trevor Chang | Yes | |
| 31760 Andrew John Guy | Yes | Residential sections near Motueka township. |
| 31762 Mr Mark Hewetson | Yes | We support the secondary proposal of a new community near Tasman village and the Lower Moutere area near Braeburn Rd, especially due to the ongoing restrictions being placed on development in the Motueka township from sea level and flood risk limits, which we consider to be a crisis situation that needs urgent resolution |
| 31774 Mrs Jane Sutherland | Yes | Given the limitations of expansion in Motueka I think the secondary part of the proposal of a new community in Tasman village is the way forward. To me expansion of the Tasman village area makes more sense than too much intensification of Nelson & Richmond as it is a lovely area to live, near the water & with easy access to Kaiteri and Golden Bay and a multitude of outdoor activities. All things that Kiwis value highly and will value more so as intensification of Nelson & Richmond increases. The Tasman village area also has pretty easy access into Richmond and Nelson. While I agree with some the intensification of Nelson & Richmond, it would be great overall to be able to provide enough housing that Kiwis can have the more traditional houses (with a backyard) at affordable prices. Something I appreciated growing up and appreciate even more having lived 20 years overseas. |
| 31777 Mr David Lucas | Yes | |
| 31783 Mr Peter Jones | Yes | |
| 31787 Lilac Meir | Yes | A new community near Tasman Village will create a connection between Mapua and the existing Tasman Village. |
| 31835 Mr Ian Wishart | Yes | Please see attached. |
| 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | Yes provided agreement can be reached with Te | No point pushing development in an culturally sensitive area. It is insensitive and creates unnecessary conflict. |

| | Atiawa | |
|--------------------------|-----------|-------------------|
| 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert | Yes | |
| | provided | |
| | agreement | |
| | can be | |
| | reached | |
| | with Te | |
| | Atiawa | |
| 31165 Mr Vincent Dickie | Yes | |
| | provided | |
| | agreement | |
| | can be | |
| | reached | |
| | with Te | |
| | Atiawa | |
| 31173 Mr Roderick Watson | Yes | |
| | provided | |
| | agreement | |
| | can be | |
| | reached | |
| | with Te | |
| | Atiawa | |
| 31227 Ms Lee Eliott | Yes | |
| | provided | |
| | agreement | |
| | can be | |
| | reached | |
| | with Te | |
| | Atiawa | |
| 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | | See answers above |
| | provided | |
| | agreement | |
| | can be | |
| | | |

| | with Te | |
|-----------------------------|-----------|--|
| | Atiawa | |
| 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | Yes | |
| c c | provided | |
| | agreement | |
| | can be | |
| | reached | |
| | with Te | |
| | Atiawa | |
| 31257 Mr Kent Inglis | Yes | |
| <u> </u> | provided | |
| | agreement | |
| | can be | |
| | reached | |
| | with Te | |
| | Atiawa | |
| 31261 Mr John Weston | Yes | Only if absolutely necessary. |
| | provided | |
| | agreement | |
| | can be | |
| | reached | |
| | with Te | |
| | Atiawa | |
| 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman | Yes | The less productive land here is an ideal place for a new community. |
| | provided | |
| | agreement | |
| | can be | |
| | reached | |
| | with Te | |
| | Atiawa | |
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | Yes | |
| | provided | |
| | agreement | |
| | can be | |

| | reached | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|---|
| | with Te | |
| | Atiawa | |
| 31278 Wendy Ross | Yes | |
| | provided | |
| | agreement | |
| | can be | |
| | reached | |
| | with Te | |
| | Atiawa | |
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | Yes | |
| | provided | |
| | agreement | |
| | can be | |
| | reached | |
| | with Te | |
| | Atiawa | |
| 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | Yes provided agreement | If the development includes effective infrastructure that avoids the community becoming a satellite of Richmond - adding to traffic congestion and increased use of highly productive land. |
| | can be | |
| | reached with Te | |
| | Atiawa | |
| | | |
| 31415 Mrs Zanahe Ruth Galloway | | |
| | provided | |
| | agreement can be | |
| | reached | |
| | with Te | |
| | Atiawa | |
| 21.121 Vatarina Caliaman | | |
| 31431 Katerina Seligman | Yes provided | |
| | agreement | |
| | agreement | |

| | can be reached with Te Atiawa | |
|--------------------------|--|--|
| 31441 Mr Chris Head | | I have no Maori heritage, but believe it is imperative that any development is done with the full support of the original owners of the land. |
| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless | Yes provided agreement can be reached with Te Atiawa | |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne | Yes provided agreement can be reached with Te Atiawa | |
| 31608 Robbie Thomson | | This area has good potential for expansion over lower class land,and if agreement can be reached with Te Atiawa,this area is well connected by roading to Motueka and Richmond. |
| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | Yes provided | |

| | agreement | |
|--------------------------|-----------|---|
| | can be | |
| | reached | |
| | with Te | |
| | Atiawa | |
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | Yes | As a managed retreat plan for Mot it kind of makes sense. |
| | provided | |
| | agreement | |
| | can be | |
| | reached | |
| | with Te | |
| | Atiawa | |
| 31703 Ms Paula Holden | Yes | |
| | provided | |
| | agreement | |
| | can be | |
| | reached | |
| | with Te | |
| | Atiawa | |
| 31716 Mr Alan hart | Yes | |
| | provided | |
| | agreement | |
| | can be | |
| | reached | |
| | with Te | |
| | Atiawa | |
| 31759 Mr Damian Campbell | Yes | |
| | provided | |
| | agreement | |
| | can be | |
| | reached | |
| | with Te | |
| | Atiawa | |
| 31769 Ms Jo Gould | Yes | |

| | provided agreement can be reached with Te Atiawa |
|--------------------|--|
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | Yes Other issues remain to be resolved with the restoration of Te Taiao - viz: 1 Net Enduring Restorative provided Outcomes; 2 carrying capacity. Significant sites for Te Ātiawa - see generic submission - this is one agreement aspect. can be reached with Te Atiawa |

| 31130 Trevor James | Agree | |
|-------------------------------------|-------|--|
| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | Agree | |
| 31165 Mr Vincent Dickie | Agree | I support more village industry: Places where people can earn a livelihood, thereby reducing traffic / commuter congestion on existing infrastructure. |
| 31185 Myfanway James | Agree | |
| 31227 Ms Lee Eliott | Agree | |
| 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan | Agree | There's no room left in Nelson and Richmond is the obvious choice |
| 31257 Mr Kent Inglis | Agree | |
| 31261 Mr John Weston | Agree | Strong controls required about size and the effects on people's lives. |
| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | Agree | |
| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | Agree | |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | Agree | Close to the transport corridor |
| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | Agree | Seem to be located in suitable areas. |
| 31284 Mr Jarmo Saloranta | Agree | |
| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | Agree | |
| 31298 Mr Duncan Macnab | Agree | |
| 31316 John Heslop | Agree | Important to not under estimate how much land is required. Needs to be established prior to increase in housing within the surrounding areas. |
| 31322 Mrs BARBARA AND TIM ROBSON | Agree | Yes because these are close to proposed areas of intensification |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | Agree | |
| 31347 Ms Paula Baldwin | Agree | Mostly agree |
| 31358 George Harrison | Agree | |
| 31360 Ms Thuy Tran | Agree | |
| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | Agree | |

| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | Agree | |
|---|-------|--|
| 31435 Mr Alan Eggers | Agree | |
| 31441 Mr Chris Head | Agree | Again, residential development and transport infrastructure need to go hand-in-hand with areas of existing and planned business growth. |
| 31449 Mr John Chisholm | Agree | |
| 31492 Anton, Benni, Shalom, AJ Bank, Bonnin, Shalom Davis | Agree | because these are close to the proposed area of intensification |
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | Agree | along SH6 (Hope) it makes sense to create more jobs for the future residents |
| 31525 Murray Davis | Agree | |
| 31529 Mr Steven King-Turner | Agree | |
| 31551 Mrs Jo Kitchen | Agree | |
| 31604 Mr Peter Moot | Agree | |
| 31608 Robbie Thomson | Agree | These activities need to be on flattish land, and be accessible to users. The areas quoted are not huge, and the jobs and economics make sense. |
| 31622 Peter Butler | Agree | |
| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | Agree | |
| 31636 Joanna Santa Barbara | Agree | Agree; these areas are close to intended areas for intensified residential living. |
| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | Agree | |
| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | Agree | Need a Lower Moutere Commercial area on Flett Road. See attached document. Summarised - supports inclusion of T136 in the core proposal and extension to the site as per Appendix 1 to provide fo commercial development. |
| 31688 Gerard McDonnell | Agree | |
| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | Agree | |
| 31703 Ms Paula Holden | Agree | |
| 31704 Mr Paul Bucknall | Agree | |

| Agree Agree Agree Agree Agree Agree Disagree | rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. |
|--|--|
| Agree Agree Agree Agree Disagree | environmentally sensitive way would have a better outcome With the caveat of "informed limits to growth" - Net Enduring Restorative Outcomes and carrying capacity. We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. |
| Agree Agree Agree Disagree | environmentally sensitive way would have a better outcome With the caveat of "informed limits to growth" - Net Enduring Restorative Outcomes and carrying capacity. We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. |
| Agree Agree Agree Disagree | environmentally sensitive way would have a better outcome With the caveat of "informed limits to growth" - Net Enduring Restorative Outcomes and carrying capacity. We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. |
| Agree Agree Disagree | environmentally sensitive way would have a better outcome With the caveat of "informed limits to growth" - Net Enduring Restorative Outcomes and carrying capacity. We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. |
| Agree Disagree | environmentally sensitive way would have a better outcome With the caveat of "informed limits to growth" - Net Enduring Restorative Outcomes and carrying capacity. We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. |
| Disagree | capacity. We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. |
| | rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. |
| Disagree | |
| Disagree | We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise Hope will just feel like a bad suburb of Richmond, surrounded by car yards. |
| Disagree | We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise Hope will just feel like a bad suburb of Richmond, surrounded by car yards. |
| Disagree | Endorse NelsonTasman2050 submission. |
| Disagree | Yes but as discussed not to the extend as recommended for Tahunanui. I do however support the intensification up to 3 stories and in some cases 3-4 story low rise residential intensification (including mixed use) in Tahunanui not any higher due to impacts previously discussed around access, safety and community feel. Aesthetics also play into this as a desirable location for recreation. As NCC can no longer require developers to provide off street parking, this creates a large potential burden on the parking at |
| | |

| | | Tahunanui beach and will reduces access for visitors. |
|------------------------------|----------|---|
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | Disagree | More opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage. |
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle | Disagree | We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise Hope will just feel like a bad suburb of Richmond, surrounded by car yards. |
| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling | Disagree | We need to provide more opportunities in areas that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out light industrial along SH6 |
| 31416 Tim Leyland | Disagree | We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in rural towns, that a/ have a known employment shortage or b/ have employment but no local services. Eg. engineering services for the hop industry in Tapawera. |
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | Disagree | We do not want more light industrial development along SH6. It is very, very ugly and requires a commute. Provide opportunities in rural towns instead. |
| 31423 Mr Roger Frost | Disagree | |
| 31472 Dr David Briggs | Disagree | |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | Disagree | The Māpua, Ruby Bay and Tasman village areas are of great ecological importance. They should be kept as natural as possible. Building all over natural areas is detrimental to our environment. What will be left of the natural, clean and green image of NZ? |
| 31480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | Disagree | |
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | Disagree | We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise Hope will just feel like a bad suburb of Richmond, surrounded by car yards. |
| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | Disagree | Businesses should be located in towns where employment is needed |
| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | Disagree | We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light-industrial along SH6 in Hope. |
| | | |

| based on what I experienced in the Auckland area and in The Netherlands. As the land value goes up, business sowners and councils will be looking at better use of already available land. It is too east to snap up available urual land for commercial / industrial purposes and should be stopped A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect the productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise Hope will just feel like a bad suburb of Richmond, surrounded by car yards. 31495 Ms Mary Duncan Disagree We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proper in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Disagree Idon't think the 'light industrial' development near the Takaka airfield is a good idea. Disagree We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial slong SH6 in Hope. A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Disagree We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hop | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|----------|---|
| known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proportion in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma Disagree I don't think the 'light industrial' development near the Takaka airfield is a good idea. 31505 Cheryl Heten Disagree How will transport and distribution from commercial area to destination needs be shown in the plate of the providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). 31526 Elise Jenkin Disagree We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nua approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape as trengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise Hope could be like a bad suburt Richmond, surrounded by car yards. 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery Disagree Nothing allowed for in Māpua. 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk Disagree We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have | | | up, business owners and councils will be looking at better use of already available land. It is too easy to snap up available rural land for commercial / industrial purposes and should be stopped A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise Hope |
| 31505 Cheryl Heten Disagree How will transport and distribution from commercial area to destination needs be shown in the plate of the | 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | Disagree | A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fill in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive |
| 31515 Geoffrey Vause Disagree We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). 31526 Elise Jenkin Disagree We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more not approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape as strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise Hope could be like a bad suburt Richmond, surrounded by car yards. 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery Disagree Disagree Disagree We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more not approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a surface of the current proposal fills in any rural towns, that have a surface of the current proposal fills in any rural towns, that have a surface of the current proposal fills in any rural towns, that have a surface of the current proposal fills in any rural towns, that have a surface of the current proposal fills in any rural towns, that have a surface of the current proposal fills in any rural towns, that have a surface of the current proposal fills in any rural towns, that have a surface of the current proposal fills in any rural towns, that have a surface of the curre | 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | Disagree | I don't think the 'light industrial' development near the Takaka airfield is a good idea. |
| rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). 31526 Elise Jenkin Disagree We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that hav known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nua approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fills in any rur landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape a strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise Hope could be like a bad suburt Richmond, surrounded by car yards. 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery Disagree Nothing allowed for in Māpua. Golden Bay is inappropriate We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that hav | 31505 Cheryl Heten | Disagree | How will transport and distribution from commercial area to destination needs be shown in the plans? |
| known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more number of the current proposal fills in any run landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape a strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise Hope could be like a bad suburb Richmond, surrounded by car yards. 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery Disagree Nothing allowed for in Māpua. Disagree Golden Bay is inappropriate We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have | 31515 Geoffrey Vause | Disagree | rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and |
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones Disagree Golden Bay is inappropriate 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk Disagree We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that hav | 31526 Elise Jenkin | Disagree | We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise Hope could be like a bad suburb of Richmond, surrounded by car yards. |
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk Disagree We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have | 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery | Disagree | Nothing allowed for in Māpua. |
| | 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | Disagree | Golden Bay is inappropriate |
| | 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | Disagree | We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fill |

| | | in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise Hope will just feel like a bad suburb of |
|------------------------------------|----------|---|
| 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | Disagree | Richmond, surrounded by car yards. We need to find a new way of thinking when it comes to long term planning. We need to protect the productive landscape. |
| 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | Disagree | We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise, Hope is at risk of becoming a bad suburb of Richmond, surrounded by car yards. |
| 31593 Mr William Samuels | Disagree | We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. |
| | | A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise Hope will just feel like a bad suburb of Richmond, surrounded by car yards. |
| 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner | Disagree | We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise Hope will just feel like a bad suburb of Richmond, surrounded by car yards. Hope has currently its own character – don't repeat what has been done to Mapua in a different way, in Mapua increasing in the past on single home housing with tall fences in betweenin the case of Hope |
| 31595 Gary Clark | Disagree | repeat destroying what is there by filling in all gaps left for commercial and light industry. No new land in Mapua has been identified. T-125 can provide opportunities for new businesses. |
| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | Disagree | We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fills |

| | | in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise Hope will just feel like bad suburb of Richmond, surrounded by car yards. |
|---------------------------|----------|--|
| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | Disagree | We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise Hope will just feel like a bad suburb of Richmond, surrounded by car yards. |
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | Disagree | We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. |
| | | A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise Hope will just feel like a bad suburb of Richmond, surrounded by car yards. |
| | | Look at mixed use, multi storey (e.g. retail ground floor, middle floor commercial, apartments on top). It works everywhere else in the world where they have had to intensify their environments. Consider how this meets the outcomes. |
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | Disagree | We don't need more light industrial near Hope on SH6. There are other places within the region to build not destroy Hope's character. There needs to be more planning where this could go, not just taking a simplistic approach that destroys a village and ruins the house prices of the residents due to visual blight and industry sitting along side them. As well as the damage to the existing greenfields. Once these are gone, they're not coming back, destroying eco systems and habitats. |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | Disagree | We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural |

| | | landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise, Hope is at risk of becoming a bad suburb of Richmond, surrounded by car yards. |
|--------------------------------|----------|--|
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | Disagree | We also need more employment opportunities in Motueka and Brightwater and we need to protect the productive land in the Hope area |
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | Disagree | Simply promotes the continued concentration of traffic to specific locales. Spread it out a lot! |
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | Disagree | We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise, Hope is at risk of becoming a bad suburb of Richmond, surrounded by car yards. |
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | Disagree | Disagree We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise, Hope is at risk of becoming a bad suburb of Richmond, surrounded by car yards. |
| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | Disagree | Disagree We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise, Hope is at risk of becoming a bad suburb of Richmond, surrounded by car yards |
| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | Disagree | We need to keep this growth more intensive and stop the sprawl. |
| 31710 Ms Angela Fitchett | Disagree | Make use of opportunities within existing urban areas. |
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | Disagree | We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage |
| | | |

| landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise Hope will just feel lia a bad suburb of Richmond, surrounded by car yards. 31731 Ms Jessica Bell Disagree We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise Hope will just feel like a bad suburb of Richmond, surrounded by car yards. 31736 Ms Carol Curtis Disagree How is this really supported? better to encourage growth, shared resources and better use of existing land, "intensification" of commercial and light industry, and shared use, with residential. T-035 (Richmond South) no, as we should be protecting high quality soils T-108 (Wakefield) should be at the start of Pigeon Valley. For visual aspect, we do not want a business area at the entrance to Wakefield Village. T-148 (Murchison), should be in the Hotham Street area. For visual aspect, we do not want a business area at the entrance to Murchison Village We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nuance approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and | | | |
|---|-------------------------|----------|--|
| rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise Hope will just feel like a bad suburb of Richmond, surrounded by car yards. 31736 Ms Carol Curtis Disagree How is this really supported? better to encourage growth, shared resources and better use of existing land, "intensification" of commercial and light industry, and shared use, with residential. 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson Disagree T-035 (Richmond South) no, as we should be protecting high quality soils T-108 (Wakefield) should be at the start of Pigeon Valley. For visual aspect, we do not want a business area at the entrance to Wakefield Village. T-148 (Murchison), should be in the Hotham Street area. For visual aspect, we do not want a business area at the entrance to Murchison Village 31768 Ms Julie Cave Disagree We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nuance approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise Hope will just feel like a bad suburb Richmond, surrounded by car yards. | 31727 Mr Philip Jones | Disagree | known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise Hope will just feel like |
| land, "intensification" of commercial and light industry, and shared use, with residential. 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson Disagree T-035 (Richmond South) no, as we should be protecting high quality soils T-108 (Wakefield) should be at the start of Pigeon Valley. For visual aspect, we do not want a business area at the entrance to Wakefield Village. T-148 (Murchison), should be in the Hotham Street area. For visual aspect, we do not want a business area at the entrance to Murchison Village 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri Disagree We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nuance approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise Hope will just feel like a bad suburb Richmond, surrounded by car yards. 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Disagree We need to protect productive land. | 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | Disagree | rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise Hope will just |
| T-108 (Wakefield) should be at the start of Pigeon Valley. For visual aspect, we do not want a business area at the entrance to Wakefield Village. T-148 (Murchison), should be in the Hotham Street area. For visual aspect, we do not want a business area at the entrance to Murchison Village 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri Disagree We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nuance approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise Hope will just feel like a bad suburb Richmond, surrounded by car yards. 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Disagree We need to protect productive land. | 31736 Ms Carol Curtis | Disagree | |
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave Disagree We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nuance approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise Hope will just feel like a bad suburb Richmond, surrounded by car yards. 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Disagree We need to protect productive land. | 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | Disagree | T-108 (Wakefield) should be at the start of Pigeon Valley. For visual aspect, we do not want a business area at the entrance to Wakefield Village. T-148 (Murchison), should be in the Hotham Street area. For visual aspect, we do not want a business |
| known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nuance approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise Hope will just feel like a bad suburb Richmond, surrounded by car yards. 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Disagree We need to protect productive land. | 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | Disagree | |
| | 31768 Ms Julie Cave | Disagree | known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise Hope will just feel like a bad suburb of |
| | | Disagree | We need to protect productive land. |

| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | Disagree | Please see attached: A: We think there should be some more business areas identified around Brightwater, Wakefield, Motueka and Mapua but also in Nelson City so more of the existing residents might be able to get employment locally and avoid the need to travel |
|-----------------------------|---------------|--|
| 31801 Joan Skurr | Disagree | Commerce and light industry should be established near population hubs. The village of Hope needs to remain separate from Richmond, with strengthening employment sites. |
| 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | Don't know | |
| 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | Don't know | |
| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson | Don't know | |
| 31186 Mr Gary Scott | Don't know | |
| 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | Don't know | |
| 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | Don't know | Just dont ruin happy residential areas. Tahunanui has too much noise now. |
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | Don't know | |
| 31247 Mr yuri aristarco | Don't know | |
| 31250 Mr Richard Wyles | Don't know | |
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | Don't know | |
| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | Don't know | |
| 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman | Don't know | |
| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | Don't | |
| | | |

| | know | |
|----------------------------|---------------|--|
| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley | Don't know | |
| 31278 Wendy Ross | Don't know | don't have all the information needed for an opinion on this. |
| 31285 Dr Hamish Holland | Don't know | |
| 31286 Mr David Short | Don't know | |
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | Don't know | |
| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | Don't know | Don't know as I cannot imagine the way forward to plan the future 2052 !!! for new businesses commercial or light industry. What will the work / industry / life style be. where or how much will we need . too hard a question for me But all will this need the basics of energy, water, stormwater and waste infrastructure services, communication and transport connections. |
| 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | Don't know | |
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | Don't know | should be close to housing to minimise transport emissions and cost. |
| 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | Don't know | |
| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | Don't know | |
| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | Don't know | |
| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | Don't know | |
| 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett | Don't know | |
| 31400 Miss Heather Wallace | Don't | Unsure. |
| | | |

| | know | |
|---------------------------------|---------------|---|
| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31406 Ms Floortje van Lierop | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31410 Mr Scott Smithline | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31415 Mrs Zanahe Ruth Galloway | | |
| | know | |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas | Don't | |
| Hollyman | know | |
| 31430 Muriel Moran | Don't | I haven't studied this aspect of the proposal but viable work opportunities need to be available to where |
| | know | all housing is located limiting the need for travel. |
| 31431 Katerina Seligman | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31452 Mr David Bartle | Don't know | |
| 21.172 Ma Andrew Deven | | |
| 31473 Mr Andrew Downs | Don't know | |
| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | Don't | |
| 31478 IVII CHITIS KOOLE | know | |
| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | Don't | |
| 31479 Wits Aligela Dollalusoff | know | |
| 31483 Debbie Hampson | Don't | |
| 31403 Debbie Hampson | know | |
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | Don't | |
| 32 133 Wild 3036pilline 20 Wild | know | |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne | Don't | |
| 2227 Menatas Kempularite | know | |
| 31508 Mr Roger Barlow | Don't | |
| -0 | | |

| | know | | | |
|---|---------------|-------------------|--|--|
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers | Don't | | | |
| | know | | | |
| 31521 Mrs Marie Waterhouse | Don't | | | |
| | know | | | |
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | Don't | Haven't assessed. | | |
| | know | | | |
| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard | Don't | | | |
| | know | | | |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | Don't | | | |
| | know | | | |
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | Don't | | | |
| | know | | | |
| 31560 Ms Steph Watts | Don't | | | |
| | know | | | |
| 31562 Grant palliser | Don't know | | | |
| 24552.14 | | | | |
| 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett | Don't know | | | |
| 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham | Don't | | | |
| 212/2 IMI WHATEM DATHELLIAM | know | | | |
| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | Don't | | | |
| 272\0 IAII 10112 HHHIGHIGH2 | know | | | |
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins | Don't | | | |
| 31300 MIS CHAHOLLE MARKINS | know | | | |
| 31598 Mrs Nicola Worsfold | Don't | | | |
| 31330 IVII 3 IVICOID VVOI 310IU | know | | | |
| 31606 Mr Trent Shepard | Don't | | | |
| 5_556 IIII Trent Shepara | know | | | |
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | Don't | | | |
| , | | | | |

| | know | |
|---------------------------------|-------|--|
| 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31641 Mr Stephen (Steve) Hayden | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31643 Inge Koevoet | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31651 Dr Patrick Conway | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31697 Robert King-Tenison | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31713 Mrs Debora Scholl Dos | Don't | |
| Santos | know | |
| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | Don't | Not answering any of these leading questions |
| | know | |
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | Don't | |
| | know | |
| 31744 Mrs Lorna CRANE | Don't | Murchison areas for industrial/commercial growth seems ok. We have confined our attention to |
| | | |

| | know | Murchison. |
|----------------------------|---------------|---|
| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | Don't know | |
| 31759 Mr Damian Campbell | Don't know | |
| 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | Don't know | |
| 31363 Mr Steve Cross | N/A | I reject the premise of this question |
| 31623 Ms Lucy Charlesworth | N/A | I am wary of answering this question as I cannot be sure of how my answer will be interpreted. So I will state - I do not agree with developing green spaces. These spaces need to be reserved and protected to allow for sustainable biodiversity and for future generations. Intensification within Nelson CBD needs to be a priority. I do not agrees with building on Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. I do not agree with housing development on green fields. There is a climate emergency. Remove these areas from the FDS. |
| 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | Neutral | There could be more sites. Commercial areas currently don't cater well for businesses that are partially office related (commercial/business) and partially service related requiring a large amount of storage space for equipment (light industrial). Current areas don't cater for a mixed business activity. |
| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | Neutral | |
| 31114 Ms Jill Rogers | Neutral | |
| 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS | Neutral | WITHOUT EXPLAINING WHAT THE BUSINESS GROWTH THAT IS FORESEEN THIS IS NOT A QUESTION THAT CAN BE ANSWERED. WHAT ARE THE INDUSTRIES THAT ARE EXPECTED, WHAT TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT IS EXPECTED, WHAT ARE THE BUILDING NEEDS OF THE BUSINESSES FORESEEN COMING. ARE THESE BUSINESSES DEPENDENT ON WORKERS ON SITE OR ABLE TO WORK FROM HOME. I SENSE THAT THIS WHOLE EXPANSION PLAN IS IN PART BEING PUSHED BY CENTRAL GOVERMENT, S DEMANDS FOR PROVIDING MORE HOMES RATHER THAN LOOKING SPECIFRICALLY AT THE TASMAN REGION AND WORKING OUT WHAT IS IT THAT THE ECONOMY WILL BE SEEKING IN THE YEARS AHEAD AND WHAT ARE THE BUSINESS PRIORITIES OR ECONOMIC SECTORS THAT TASMAN COUNCIL WANT TO PRIORITISE. |
| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | Neutral | |
| 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren | Neutral | |

| 31129 Mrs Gaynor Brooks | Neutral | |
|---|---------|--|
| 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward | Neutral | |
| 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert | Neutral | |
| 31171 Ms Sallie Griffiths | Neutral | |
| 31173 Mr Roderick Watson | Neutral | |
| 31174 Ms Alison Westerby | Neutral | |
| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | Neutral | |
| 31192 Ms Rebecca Patchett | Neutral | |
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | Neutral | |
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | Neutral | |
| 31219 Mrs kate windle | Neutral | |
| 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | Neutral | See answers above |
| 31240 Michael Markert | Neutral | |
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | Neutral | |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | Neutral | |
| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | Neutral | |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | Neutral | Did not answer Multi-choice question - Some are OK others are not. |
| | | Summarised below: does not suppport further business sprawl along SH6 to Hope (T122, T135). Need to intensity business development like residential development. Communal office spaces. |
| 31309 Mr & Mrs Rose & Phillip Windle | Neutral | |
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | Neutral | |
| 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman | Neutral | |
| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | Neutral | |
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | Neutral | |
| | | |

| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | Neutral | These have to go somewhere close to centres, for jobs and servicing. |
|---------------------------------------|---------|---|
| 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | Neutral | |
| 31364 Mrs Christine Tuffnell | Neutral | As previously mentioned in this submission - I believe the past three years and experience with Covid halled to changes in how businesses will do business from now - huge growth in online purchasing and product delivery. |
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | Neutral | |
| 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer | Neutral | |
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | Neutral | |
| 31403 Mr Richard Deck | Neutral | |
| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling | Neutral | It is difficult to comment as it is impossible to predict business and light industrial growth in a highly changing technological world. E.g. remote work has been enabled by high speed internet conn |
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | Neutral | |
| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors | Neutral | |
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | Neutral | FDS is not focused on commercial / industrial land use planning. The plan is limited to put this land use along the SH6 corridor. |
| 31434 Mrs cushla Moorhead | Neutral | |
| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn Ball | Neutral | |
| 31443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | Neutral | |
| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | Neutral | |
| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | Neutral | |
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | Neutral | |
| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | Neutral | Only if the planning starts from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |

| 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon | Neutral | |
|--------------------------------|---------|---|
| 31481 Mrs Lucy Harrhy | Neutral | |
| 31484 Mr Gavin Brent Cook | Neutral | |
| 31485 Ms Robin Schiff | Neutral | |
| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless | Neutral | |
| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | Neutral | |
| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | Neutral | Neutral. NMH does not support the expansion of a light industrial area on highly productive land. |
| 31516 Mr Peter Lole | Neutral | Absolute minimum of greenfield development though. |
| 31520 Andrew Stirling | Neutral | |
| 31533 Wendy Trevett | Neutral | |
| 31549 Mr Ian McComb | Neutral | |
| 31554 Wendy Barker | Neutral | |
| 31558 Mr Steve Jordan | Neutral | |
| 31563 Mrs Loretta Anne Hogg | Neutral | |
| 31574 Mr David Bolton | Neutral | |
| 31580 Jenny Long | Neutral | |
| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | Neutral | Should be a natural progression to meet local demands and natural growth. The tail shouldn't wag the dog |
| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | Neutral | |
| 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz | Neutral | |
| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | Neutral | |
| 31614 Mr mark Morris | Neutral | |
| 31617 Ms steph jewell | Neutral | I haven't studied it but I bet some of the businesses would be able to go Up so I'm neutral, hoping it will be done with Carbon in mind and less asphalt. |
| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | Neutral | |
| | | |

| 31633 Ms Jacquetta Bell QSM | Neutral | It's not the location, it's the whole emphasis on growth that I dispute. |
|--------------------------------|---------|--|
| 31637 Ms Frances Kemble Welch | Neutral | |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | Neutral | |
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | Neutral | I am not an expert and able to comment everything. Please listen to Joni Tomsett or Tim Neubauer. I think they represent my ideas. |
| 31647 Mrs Rebecca Parish | Neutral | |
| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | Neutral | Business growth should only be areas of non productive land and ideally in current business growth areas |
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | Neutral | see site specific comment in the attached submission. Summarised below: Appendix 1 of submission, details growth sites along the SHs and how these may affect the network - quite specific comments at a safety level, broad level support for intensification sites. |
| 31656 Mr brad malcolm | Neutral | |
| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | Neutral | See attached - I have attached a plan showing an additional proposed commercial area on the plateau above stoke to service the adjacent residents. This will also provide a local destination through the proposed walkways and cycleways, promoting recreation activies. |
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | Neutral | I think more permission for expansion of business areas in or near Brightwater, Wakefield, Motueka and Mapua would be good as a source of work and income for nearby residents |
| 31673 Mike Drake | Neutral | Provided the growth does not create more commuter traffic. We need free public transport connecting areas of intensification. |
| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | Neutral | Appears as though we have sufficient growth allowance along Lower Queen Street in Richmond/Appleby |
| 31683 Richard Davies | Neutral | |
| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | Neutral | |
| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | Neutral | |
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | Neutral | |
| 31692 Mr Alasdair Gardiner | Neutral | |
| 31693 Carolyn Rose | Neutral | In support of T-182. The rest, well it has to go somewhere so long as land owners are in agreement. |
| 31706 Paul Donald Galloway | Neutral | |
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | Neutral | See attached submission. Supports T171 and T105 in Brightwater as industry land |

| 31716 Mr Alan hart | Neutral | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 31722 Trevor Chang | Neutral | |
| 31726 Mr John Jackson | Neutral | |
| 31739 Philippa Hellyer | Neutral | |
| 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert- Watene | Neutral | |
| 31752 Jill Pearson | Neutral | |
| 31765 Mrs Lorna Ivy Cooper | Neutral | |
| 31769 Ms Jo Gould | Neutral | |
| 31771 Colleen Shaw | Neutral | |
| 31775 Dr Thomas Carl | Neutral | |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Neutral | Seems to be a lot of commercial/industrial locations becoming vacant due to centralization of businesses out of the region or out of the city. |
| 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | Strongly agree | |
| 31356 Stephen Williams | Strongly agree | These could support sustainable growth by providing local employment. |
| 31705 Mr Lindsay Wood | Strongly agree | Definitely not. This is an appalling imbalance, likely perpetuating low-density greenfields developments that are a major contributor to an array of existing, well-documented problems (e.g. car-centric development; high-emissions construction; diffuse pollution of waterways; loss of rural land; traffic congestion; loss of soil carbon; social dislocation; inefficient urban economics and infrastructure). This trend is likely accelerated by the lack of a visionary policy to accelerate the promising urban intensification whose impact is rendered largely impotent by the feeble projected uptake. There should be a moratorium on any new unconsented greenfields developments, both to curb their negative impacts and to accelerate urban intensification, and greenfields sites already approved for development should be subject to new requirements preventing low density developments. The extent of intensification in Richmond especially needs expanding as well as accelerating so as to help drive the wholesale reduction of greenfields development. |
| | | SEE ATTACHED DOCUMENT - Summarised: |

FDS is inadequate for a climate-responsible future. No decarbonisation trajectory, gives climate minimal consideration and ignores changing energy, outdated models and doesn't take into account emissions associated with buildings, drivers of FDS are growth and low density subdivisions, urban intesification rates are too low, public transport needs to be anchor.

| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | Strongly disagree | The reclaimed Port land should be developed . Read 21 Lessons for the 21st Century by Yuval Noah Harari |
|---------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | Strongly disagree | Too much that is close to residential housing. And regarding Tahunanui, this will cause even worse traffic problems and fragmentation of the community. |
| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | Strongly disagree | 'Business' consumes energy, resources and humans. We cannot base our future on 'job creation'. Accessing a life via a 'job' will have to change. We do have some proposals in the form of a Resource Based Economy. |
| 31328 Ms Karen du Fresne | Strongly disagree | There are plenty of unused (and underused) commercial sites already. The emphasis needs to be on making better use of the spaces we already have, and on sustainability, not growth at all costs. |
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | Strongly disagree | Strongly oppose development in Stepneyville especially the Historic Precinct |
| 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann | Strongly disagree | I would like to use this quote here: "We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise Hope will just feel like a bad suburb of Richmond, surrounded by car yards." |
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin | Strongly disagree | We do not need more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. This highly productive land should not be used for industrial development. This is not the type of innovative thinking that we need in order to address climate change. |
| 31457 Mr J Santa Barbara | Strongly disagree | Energy descent suggests that there will be less business areas needed in the future. Existing space may be adequate. Please explore energy descent and its implications. |
| | | |

| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | Strongly disagree | This is a rural area not suitable for commercial and industrial development, with more traffic and trucks around schools and recreation areas and more destruction of the environment. Local residents are anyway going to Motueka or Richmond for shopping. Commercial activities in the area will not be sustainable. |
|------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | Strongly disagree | See full submission. Summarised below (similar to NT2050 submission): singluar focus on growth, challenges underlying growth projections, insufficient consultation, misleading submission form (outcome questions), community feedback ignored, biased process, non-compliance with government directives. Recommends re-think of the draft. |
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | Strongly disagree | We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. |
| | | A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of our |
| | | landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and |
| | | strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise Hope will just |
| | | feel like a bad suburb of Richmond, surrounded by car yards. |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | Strongly disagree | We need to be far more cognisant of the more evolved landscape in Europe and elsewhere. Yes it's not perfect, but we have many examples from times of less energy and ease (what we're heading back to but it needn't be a bad thing!) of how people arrange themselves for good efficient lives. |
| | | Hint: It isn't into giant strip suburbs and disparate employment/living arrangements. Rather a quite lovely set of dense hubs (business and industry off to one side a little), separate from each other and surrounded by outwards facing agri-hort and natural amenities. Linked by strong transport arteries. It's not rocket science, but NZ can't seem to see past it's young nose as a country and culture. |
| | | C/o - NF2050 We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including |
| | | rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. |
| | | A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of our |
| | | landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between |
| | | Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and |

| | | strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise Hope will just feel like a bad suburb of Richmond, surrounded by car yards. |
|---------------------|----------------------|---|
| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | Strongly disagree | We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage - not just roll out more light industrial along SH6 in Hope. A more nuanced approach is needed to preserve the character of our landscape. The current proposal fills in any rural landscape that's left between Hope and Richmond. We need to protect this productive landscape and strengthen Hope as a village (separate from Richmond). Otherwise, Hope is at risk of becoming a bad suburb of Richmond, surrounded by car yards. |
| 31763 Susan Rogers | Strongly disagree | Survey is flawed from the beginning. You need to redesign this entire line of questioning. It leads only to answers desired by the maker of the survey. |

33 Let us know if there are any additional areas that should be included for business growth or if there are any proposed areas that you consider are more or less suitable.

| 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | N/A | Richmond South- maybe more opportunities in Stoke or Richmond West. It would be ideal to have areas of mixed business/industry to allow greater freedom to businesses that do have mixed business |
|------------------------------|-----|---|
| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | N/A | The Port sits on \$480M worth of land and pays a divided (From borrowings) of 0.83% |
| 31186 Mr Gary Scott | N/A | Kaka valley is not suitable for any commercial operations. |
| 31247 Mr yuri aristarco | N/A | Havens road and the Nelson waterfront should become part of the city life with more hospitality business. |
| 31248 Mr Will Bosnich | N/A | Tahunanui needs a business sector that enables pedestrians to meet their needs locally (rather than driving to Nelson or Stoke), and further encourages local interaction and community networking. |
| 31261 Mr John Weston | N/A | As per your plan. |
| 31279 Mr Jeremy Thompson | N/A | Climate change friendly industries such as I.T. |
| 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | N/A | As per Q32, we should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage. |
| 31346 Martin Hartman | N/A | As per Q32, we should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage. |
| 31349 Laurien Heijs | N/A | See responses above. |
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | N/A | Develop the Port Land . This is a poorly managed asset. Develop housing here. This land is worth \$450M Should be developed into multi (Three floor) housing. See Central European models. |
| 31363 Mr Steve Cross | N/A | I reject the premise of this question |
| 31364 Mrs Christine Tuffnell | N/A | |
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | N/A | More opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage. |
| 31400 Miss Heather Wallace | N/A | Keep away from the coast. |
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | N/A | I suggest adding to the business and industrial areas that already exist. |
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle | N/A | As per Q32, we should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage |
| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling | N/A | n/a |
| | | |

| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling | N/A | See answer in 32 |
|---------------------------------------|-----|---|
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin | N/A | Business sites need to be located where they have a client base. There must be surely be data available, with recommended minimum population bases required in an area in order to sustain a new dairy or supermarket. |
| 31416 Tim Leyland | N/A | Tapawera. |
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | N/A | By redeveloping existing urban areas for commercial, industrial and housing there is reduced dependence on communing or travel, there is renewed urban energy and there is stronger community cohesion. The FDS must drive this because, if left to market forces, the expansion of cheaper out of town options will procede and dead and empty town centres will follow. |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | N/A | No Comment. |
| 31423 Mr Roger Frost | N/A | T148 (Murchison) is at the very entrance to Murchison on SH6. At this focal point it will say a lot about the character of the town to the travelling public. These uses are typically not particularly visually appealing. Unless very stringent amenity requirements are to be placed on any development it might be better to swap this designation with one of the other residential areas that have been identified, even at the expense of less direct access to SH6. |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas Hollyman | N/A | Like to see 'village' type expansion into Nelson North Hira area |
| 31430 Muriel Moran | N/A | None known. |
| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn Ball | N/A | Provide for business growth in Motueka (which doesn't have any new growth proposed) |
| 31457 Mr J Santa Barbara | N/A | We support more mixing of residential and commercial, especially for med density areas. |
| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | N/A | We enclose a area we wish to have considered in the 30 year strategy devolepment in Motueka/Moutere |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | N/A | Just concentrate on city centre or immediate vicinity. Ruby bay is not suitable for more commercial or light industrial development. |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | N/A | Concentrate the already existing city centers and keep as much green as possible. No business centers in green areas. |
| 31484 Mr Gavin Brent Cook | N/A | Please closer to townships where Bussiness is in higher demand |
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | N/A | As per Q32, we should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage, |
| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | N/A | Businesses should be located in towns where employment is needed |
| | | |

| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | N/A | As per Q32, we should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage |
|-------------------------------|-----|---|
| 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | N/A | As per Q32, we should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage |
| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless | N/A | The area around Motueka wharf could ? - provide some business growth with "barge tow " access to main port of Nelson to help keep freight & logging trucks off the highways |
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | N/A | more businesses in residential areas with employment shortages |
| 31515 Geoffrey Vause | N/A | As per Q32, we should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage. |
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | N/A | As for Q32, we should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage. |
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | N/A | Perhaps between Brightwater & Wakefield as part of a new town if that is considered necessary & desirable. |
| 31533 Wendy Trevett | N/A | N/A |
| 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | N/A | ${\sf NO-nor\ business\ growth\ .\ This\ is\ not\ the\ fundamental\ driver\ for\ our\ future.\ YOU\ HAVE\ THIS\ SO\ WRONG\ !}$ |
| 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery | N/A | Seaton Valley corner, along Māpua Drive and around the corner along the first part of Stafford Drive. (T125 in the technical document) |
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | N/A | close to town if possible on land not currently in productive state |
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | N/A | As per Q32, we should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage |
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | N/A | As per Q32, we should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage |
| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | N/A | Why is it necessary to encourage unnatural 'business growth'? Should be a natural progression to meet local demands and natural growth. The tail shouldn't wag the dog, Creating an unnecessary demand is short term, profit driven greed |
| 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | N/A | We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas that have a known employment shortage. |
| 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | N/A | As per Q32, we should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that |
| | | |

| | | have a known employment shortage |
|------------------------------------|-----|---|
| 31593 Mr William Samuels | N/A | As per Q32, we should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage |
| 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner | N/A | As per Q32, we should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage |
| 31595 Gary Clark | N/A | T-125 in Mapua. There are challenges with developing this area but it can be engineered to achieve some useable land as well as wetlands. Past issues have been flooding but with multiple landowners, this can be dealt with. The more recent issue only came to light in the recent webinar related to iwi. Initial discussions with iwi have shown this is not as significant as suggested by TDC. |
| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | N/A | As per Q32, we should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage |
| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | N/A | As per Q32, we should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage |
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | N/A | As per Q32, we should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage. |
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | N/A | Business growth should be linked to housing growth. if houses are built a long way from business growth areas it will lead to more commuting and higher emissions |
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | N/A | Not sure. Areas that need employment? |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | N/A | As per Q32, we should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage |
| 31617 Ms steph jewell | N/A | Decades ago I lived in a "modern" city with several multi-storey carparks (don't let's do that). They were joined at the top so you could drive up one, go round and enjoy the view and drive down a different way. Well! Let's join up a few apartment blocks so we can walk or cycle around at 3rd or 4th floor level (semi-sheltered for rainy days) like walking/cycling on revitalised old railways above ground in the USA. They got it from Hundertwasser! Let's have it too! And why not have a few shops and galleries up there too? People love the shopping malls of Singapore. Let's be a boutique version. |
| 31623 Ms Lucy Charlesworth | N/A | I am wary of answering these questions as I cannot be sure of how they will be interpreted. So I will state - I do not agree with developing green spaces. These spaces need to be reserved and protected to allow for sustainable biodiversity and for future generations. Intensification within Nelson CBD needs to be a priority. I do not agrees with building on Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. I do not agree with housing |
| | | |

| | | development on green fields. There is a climate emergency. Remove these areas from the FDS. |
|-------------------------|-----|--|
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | N/A | Upper Moutere seems conspicuously absent as a light industrial and business hub, given the development that has been allowed on the Moutere hill and that which is zoned for around Supplejack Valley Road. It's got the (unbridled) residential growth, proximity to "Limited productive land" if this wasn't being built over, and limitations around the town proper including limited rainfall which temper the value of the area for farming and crops. It would serve Dovedale, Rosedale and surrounds with employment - cutting 1hr+ commutes in half (along with ass emissions). |
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | N/A | How about turning some dormitory towns into a slightly more balanced community in terms of promoting local employment. |
| 31628 Mr Daniel Levy | N/A | Higher density/multi-story development for both business and residential development (mixed use) in a broad corridor linking Nelson city to the sea, including under utilized sites adjacent to the Nelson Marina on Akerston street. |
| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | N/A | I feel adjacent to Takaka airfield would provide some alternative light industrial areas for those not wishing to be in Takaka township and is on the western side of the waitapu bridge and Birds Hill. This would support the community on the collingwood side of the river in situations of road closures that we have seen in recent years. I have at times been approached by airport users wishing to develop support buildings for air traffic. |
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | N/A | I am not an expert and able to comment everything. Please listen to Joni Tomsett or Tim Neubauer. I think they represent my ideas. |
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | N/A | As per Q32, we should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage |
| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | N/A | As above |
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | N/A | see site specific comment in the attached submission. Appendix 1 of submission details growth sites along the SHs and how these may affect the network quite specific comments at a safety level, broad level support for intensification sites. |
| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | N/A | See attached - I have attached a plan showing an additional proposed commercial area on the plateau above stoke to service the adjacent residents. This will also provide a local destination through the proposed walkways and cycleways, promoting recreation activities. |
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | N/A | As per Q32, we should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that |
| | | |

| | | have a known employment shortage |
|--------------------------------|-----|---|
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | N/A | There are areas near Nelson airport, the pulp mill and even the car sales and service business in Central Nelson have the opportunity for development of 3-4 story buildings |
| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | N/A | As per Q32, we should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage |
| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | N/A | Need a Lower Moutere Commercial area on Flett Road. See attached document. Summarised - supports inclusion of T136 in the core proposal and extension to the site as per Appendix 1 to provide for commercial development. |
| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | N/A | As per Q32, we should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage |
| 31681 Seev Oren | N/A | Industrial and Commercial areas |
| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | N/A | Focus on those areas that have an employment shortage. Business growth should focus on community enterprises that support local employment and upskilling and that serve as a benefit to the environment and community. |
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | N/A | None |
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | N/A | We recommend that the (~6 – 8 Ha or more) area shaded in solid brown, in the image to the left, be considered for commercial, mixeduse, and/or other types of activities as would be found in a town center, for the reasons as follows: Mapua does not have any land to expand for commercial and mixed-use, and the prior FDS identified an area for commercial expansion which has since been lost to Residential development. All existing commercial activity in Mapua are situated in low-lying areas, and are subject to flooding, liquefaction, and sea-level rises. Having the proposed land herein, would allow for stable high-ground commercial service infrastructure to support the growing area surrounding and including Mapua. Ease of access Poor soil quailty Reduces carbon footprint by reducing travel to Richmond and Motueka for food/sundries. Truck traffic would not need to travel thru Mapua residential |

| | | areas to stock the businesses located herein. SEE ATTACHED. Summarised - new sites proposed. |
|--|-----|---|
| 31709 Ofer Ronen | N/A | Shops, Industrial, Commercial within the new proposed Tasman Village. |
| 31710 Ms Angela Fitchett | N/A | See 32 |
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | N/A | See attached submission. Summarised - no specific comments on this question, generally supports FDS. |
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | N/A | We should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage |
| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | N/A | As per Q32, we should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage |
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | N/A | As per Q32, we should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage |
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | N/A | In rural towns to encourage employment. |
| 31760 Andrew John Guy | N/A | Rural Industrial Zone Marchwood Park Road, Motueka. Lot 1 DP 2823 1.5580 hectares. The property is currently rural 1 and is next to industrial activity at Motueka Airport. |
| 31763 Susan Rogers | N/A | Survey is flawed from the beginning. You need to redesign this entire line of questioning. It leads only to answers desired by the maker of the survey. |
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | N/A | As per Q32, we should be providing more opportunities for businesses in areas, including rural towns, that have a known employment shortage |
| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | N/A | More business in rural towns that have known employment shortages. |
| 31787 Lilac Meir | N/A | Kindergarden near the church. Industrial land. |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | N/A | First need to look at what industries might be attracted to Nelson-Tasman that might determine what is required. |
| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | N/A | A: We haven't identified any, but that is not to say they don't exist |
| 31801 Joan Skurr | N/A | Businesses and industry should be established within current population areas if possible in order to provide work close to where people already live. |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | N/A | There must be opportunities for settled Māori/Iwi to develop sustainable businesses. Meet with our commercial portfolio holders. |
| | | |

| 34 Do you agree with the pr | roposed residential and business growth sites in Tākaka? |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | Agree |
| 31185 Myfanway James | Agree |
| 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | Agree |
| 31261 Mr John Weston | Agree |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | Agree |
| 31360 Ms Thuy Tran | Agree |
| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | Agree |
| 31435 Mr Alan Eggers | Agree |
| 31438 Aleisha Hosie | Agree |
| 31449 Mr John Chisholm | Agree |
| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | Agree |
| 31533 Wendy Trevett | Agree |
| 31558 Mr Steve Jordan | Agree |
| 31563 Mrs Loretta Anne Hogg | Agree |
| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | Agree |
| 31608 Robbie Thomson | Agree |
| 31622 Peter Butler | Agree |
| 31693 Carolyn Rose | Agree |
| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | Agree |
| 31703 Ms Paula Holden | Agree |
| 31706 Paul Donald Galloway | Agree |
| 31718 Kathryn & Keith Quigley | Agree |
| 31741 Mr Robert Stevenson | Agree |
| 31783 Mr Peter Jones | Agree |
| | |

| 31805 Ian Shapcott | Agree |
|------------------------------|----------|
| 31836 Paula M Wilks | Agree |
| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | Disagree |
| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | Disagree |
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | Disagree |
| 31219 Mrs kate windle | Disagree |
| 31250 Mr Richard Wyles | Disagree |
| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | Disagree |
| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | Disagree |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | Disagree |
| 31334 Diane Sutherland | Disagree |
| 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | Disagree |
| 31346 Martin Hartman | Disagree |
| 31349 Laurien Heijs | Disagree |
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | Disagree |
| 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer | Disagree |
| 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann | Disagree |
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle | Disagree |
| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling | Disagree |
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin | Disagree |
| 31443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | Disagree |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | Disagree |
| 31488 Annette Starink | Disagree |
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | Disagree |
| 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | Disagree |
| | |

| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | Disagree |
|------------------------------------|----------|
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | Disagree |
| 31554 Wendy Barker | Disagree |
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | Disagree |
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | Disagree |
| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | Disagree |
| 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | Disagree |
| 31593 Mr William Samuels | Disagree |
| 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner | Disagree |
| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | Disagree |
| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | Disagree |
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | Disagree |
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | Disagree |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | Disagree |
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | Disagree |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | Disagree |
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | Disagree |
| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | Disagree |
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | Disagree |
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | Disagree |
| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | Disagree |
| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | Disagree |
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | Disagree |
| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | Disagree |
| | |

| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | Disagree |
|--|---------------|
| 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | Disagree |
| 31779 Mrs Julie Sherratt | Disagree |
| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | Disagree |
| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | Disagree |
| 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | Don't know |
| 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS | Don't know |
| 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | Don't know |
| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson | Don't know |
| 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward | Don't know |
| 31171 Ms Sallie Griffiths | Don't know |
| 31186 Mr Gary Scott | Don't know |
| 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | Don't know |
| 31216 Ms Judith Holmes | Don't know |
| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | Don't know |
| 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | Don't know |
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | Don't know |
| | |

| 31247 Mr yuri aristarco | Don't |
|----------------------------|---------------|
| | know |
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | Don't |
| | know |
| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | Don't |
| | know |
| 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman | Don't |
| | know |
| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | Don't |
| | know |
| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | Don't know |
| 24272 14 51: 1 11 5 1 | |
| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley | Don't know |
| 31278 Wendy Ross | Don't |
| 31276 Welldy ROSS | know |
| 31285 Dr Hamish Holland | Don't |
| SILOS DI Hamisii Honana | know |
| 31286 Mr David Short | Don't |
| | know |
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | Don't |
| | know |
| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | Don't |
| | know |
| 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | Don't |
| | know |
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | Don't |
| | know |
| 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman | Don't |
| | know |

| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | Don't |
|-------------------------------|---------------|
| | know |
| 31355 Mr Barney Hoskins | Don't |
| | know |
| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | Don't |
| 31333 BI WINC / SIIBY | know |
| 24267 Mars IIII Countle au | |
| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | Don't know |
| | |
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | Don't |
| | know |
| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | Don't |
| | know |
| 31410 Mr Scott Smithline | Don't |
| 31410 Wil Scott Smithing | know |
| 24444 14 T | |
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | Don't |
| | know |
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | Don't |
| | know |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas | Don't |
| Hollyman | know |
| 31430 Muriel Moran | Don't |
| 31 130 Marier Moran | know |
| 24 424 - Katarina Caliana | |
| 31431 Katerina Seligman | Don't |
| | know |
| 31434 Mrs cushla Moorhead | Don't |
| | know |
| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn | Don't |
| Ball | know |
| 31452 Mr David Bartle | Don't |
| 31-32 Will David Daltie | know |
| | |

| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | Don't know |
|----------------------------|---------------|
| 31473 Mr Andrew Downs | Don't know |
| 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon | Don't know |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | Don't know |
| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | Don't know |
| 31483 Debbie Hampson | Don't know |
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | Don't know |
| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless | Don't know |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne | Don't know |
| 31508 Mr Roger Barlow | Don't know |
| 31515 Geoffrey Vause | Don't know |
| 31516 Mr Peter Lole | Don't know |
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers | Don't know |
| 31521 Mrs Marie Waterhouse | Don't know |
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | Don't know |
| | |

| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser Don't know 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher Don't know 31560 Ms Steph Watts Don't know 31562 Grant palliser Don't know 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett Don't know 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham Don't know 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans Don't know 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart Don't know 31580 Jenny Long Don't know Don't know Don't know Don't know Don't know | |
|--|--|
| 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser Don't know 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher Don't know 31560 Ms Steph Watts Don't know 31562 Grant palliser Don't know 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett Don't know 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham Don't know 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans Don't know 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart Don't know 31580 Jenny Long Don't know Don't know Don't know Don't know Don't know | |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser Don't know 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher Don't know 31560 Ms Steph Watts Don't know 31562 Grant palliser Don't know 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett Don't know 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham Don't know 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans Don't know 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart Don't know 31580 Jenny Long Don't know Don't know Don't know Don't know | |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser Don't know 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher Don't know 31560 Ms Steph Watts Don't know 31562 Grant palliser Don't know 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett Don't know 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham Don't know 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans Don't know 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart Don't know 31580 Jenny Long Don't know Don't know Don't know Don't know Don't know Don't know | |
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher 31560 Ms Steph Watts 31560 Ms Steph Watts 31562 Grant palliser Don't know 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett Don't know 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham Don't know 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans Don't know 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart Don't know 31580 Jenny Long Don't know Don't know Don't know | |
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher Don't know 31560 Ms Steph Watts Don't know 31562 Grant palliser Don't know 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett Don't know 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham Don't know 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans Don't know 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart Don't know 31580 Jenny Long Don't know Don't know Don't know Don't know Don't know Don't know | |
| 31560 Ms Steph Watts Don't know 31562 Grant palliser Don't know 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett Don't know 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham Don't know 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans Don't know 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart Don't know 31580 Jenny Long Don't know Don't know Don't know Don't know | |
| 31560 Ms Steph Watts Don't know 31562 Grant palliser Don't know 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett Don't know 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham Don't know 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans Don't know 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart Don't know 31580 Jenny Long Don't know Don't know Don't know Don't know Don't know | |
| know 31562 Grant palliser Don't know 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett Don't know 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham Don't know 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans Don't know 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart Don't know 31580 Jenny Long Don't know Don't know Don't know Don't know Don't know | |
| 31562 Grant palliser Don't know 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett Don't know 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham Don't know 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans Don't know 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart Don't know 31580 Jenny Long Don't know 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson Don't | |
| know 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett Don't know 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham Don't know 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans Don't know 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart Don't know 31580 Jenny Long Don't know 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson Don't | |
| 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett Don't know 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham Don't know 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans Don't know 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart Don't know 31580 Jenny Long Don't know 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson Don't | |
| know 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham Don't know 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans Don't know 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart Don't know 31580 Jenny Long Don't know 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson Don't | |
| 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham Don't know 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans Don't know 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart Don't know 31580 Jenny Long Don't know 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson Don't | |
| know 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans Don't know 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart Don't know 31580 Jenny Long Don't know 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson Don't | |
| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans Don't know 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart Don't know 31580 Jenny Long Don't know 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson Don't | |
| know 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart Don't know 31580 Jenny Long Don't know 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson Don't | |
| 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart Don't know 31580 Jenny Long Don't know 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson Don't | |
| know 31580 Jenny Long Don't know 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson Don't | |
| 31580 Jenny Long Don't know 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson Don't | |
| know 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson Don't | |
| 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson Don't | |
| | |
| know | |
| | |
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins Don't | |
| know | |
| 31598 Mrs Nicola Worsfold Don't | |
| know | |
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster Don't | |
| know | |

| 31617 Ms steph jewell | Don't |
|---------------------------------|---------------|
| | know |
| 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | Don't |
| | know |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | Don't |
| | know |
| 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin | Don't |
| | know |
| 31641 Mr Stephen (Steve) Hayden | |
| | know |
| 31643 Inge Koevoet | Don't |
| | know |
| 31651 Dr Patrick Conway | Don't |
| | know |
| 31656 Mr brad malcolm | Don't know |
| 24.000 Mar Islands Banks a | |
| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | Don't know |
| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | Don't |
| 31094 Wil Greg Bate | know |
| 31697 Robert King-Tenison | Don't |
| STOST NOSELE KING TELISON | know |
| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | Don't |
| | know |
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | Don't |
| | know |
| 31704 Mr Paul Bucknall | Don't |
| | know |
| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | Don't |
| | know |

| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | Don't |
|---------------------------|---------------|
| | know |
| 31736 Ms Carol Curtis | Don't |
| | know |
| 31744 Mrs Lorna CRANE | Don't |
| | know |
| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | Don't |
| | know |
| 31759 Mr Damian Campbell | Don't |
| | know |
| 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | Don't |
| 24225 44 4 447 4 | know |
| 31835 Mr Ian Wishart | Don't know |
| 21112 Na Alvia Doubles | |
| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | Neutral |
| 31114 Ms Jill Rogers | Neutral |
| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | Neutral |
| 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren | Neutral |
| 31129 Mrs Gaynor Brooks | Neutral |
| 31130 Trevor James | Neutral |
| 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert | Neutral |
| 31173 Mr Roderick Watson | Neutral |
| 31192 Ms Rebecca Patchett | Neutral |
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | Neutral |
| 31227 Ms Lee Eliott | Neutral |
| 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | Neutral |
| 31240 Michael Markert | Neutral |
| | |

| 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan | Neutral |
|--------------------------------|---------|
| 31257 Mr Kent Inglis | Neutral |
| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | Neutral |
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | Neutral |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | Neutral |
| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | Neutral |
| 31284 Mr Jarmo Saloranta | Neutral |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | Neutral |
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | Neutral |
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | Neutral |
| 31347 Ms Paula Baldwin | Neutral |
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | Neutral |
| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | Neutral |
| 31356 Stephen Williams | Neutral |
| 31358 George Harrison | Neutral |
| 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | Neutral |
| 31365 michael monti | Neutral |
| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | Neutral |
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | Neutral |
| 31403 Mr Richard Deck | Neutral |
| 31415 Mrs Zanahe Ruth Galloway | Neutral |
| 31416 Tim Leyland | Neutral |
| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors | Neutral |
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | Neutral |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | Neutral |
| | |

| 31441 Mr Chris Head | Neutral |
|--------------------------------|---------|
| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | Neutral |
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | Neutral |
| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | Neutral |
| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | Neutral |
| 31480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | Neutral |
| 31481 Mrs Lucy Harrhy | Neutral |
| 31484 Mr Gavin Brent Cook | Neutral |
| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | Neutral |
| 31505 Cheryl Heten | Neutral |
| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | Neutral |
| 31520 Andrew Stirling | Neutral |
| 31529 Mr Steven King-Turner | Neutral |
| 31549 Mr Ian McComb | Neutral |
| 31551 Mrs Jo Kitchen | Neutral |
| 31574 Mr David Bolton | Neutral |
| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | Neutral |
| 31604 Mr Peter Moot | Neutral |
| 31614 Mr mark Morris | Neutral |
| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | Neutral |
| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | Neutral |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | Neutral |
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | Neutral |
| 31647 Mrs Rebecca Parish | Neutral |
| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | Neutral |
| | |

| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | Neutral |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | Neutral |
| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | Neutral |
| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | Neutral |
| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | Neutral |
| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | Neutral |
| 31688 Gerard McDonnell | Neutral |
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | Neutral |
| 31692 Mr Alasdair Gardiner | Neutral |
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | Neutral |
| 31716 Mr Alan hart | Neutral |
| 31722 Trevor Chang | Neutral |
| 31726 Mr John Jackson | Neutral |
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | Neutral |
| 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert- Watene | Neutral |
| 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | Neutral |
| 31765 Mrs Lorna Ivy Cooper | Neutral |
| 31769 Ms Jo Gould | Neutral |
| 31771 Colleen Shaw | Neutral |
| 31775 Dr Thomas Carl | Neutral |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Neutral |
| 31801 Joan Skurr | Neutral |
| 31815 Peter Wilks | Neutral |
| 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | Strongly agree |
| | |

| 31390 Miss Anne Caddick | Strongly agree |
|---|----------------------|
| 31391 Anne Palmer | Strongly agree |
| 31392 D Gilbert | Strongly agree |
| 31393 F Young | Strongly agree |
| 31394 Jordan Graham | Strongly agree |
| 31396 Mrs M Foster | Strongly agree |
| 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett | Strongly agree |
| 31111 Mr Tony Reilly | Strongly disagree |
| 31174 Ms Alison Westerby | Strongly disagree |
| 31279 Mr Jeremy Thompson | Strongly disagree |
| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | Strongly disagree |
| 31309 Mr & Mrs Rose & Phillip Windle | Strongly disagree |
| 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | Strongly disagree |
| 31400 Miss Heather Wallace | Strongly disagree |
| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling | Strongly disagree |
| | |

| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | Strongly disagree |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|
| 31500 Ms Suzan Van Wijngaarden | Strongly disagree |
| 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | Strongly disagree |
| 31502 Ms Caroline Jones | Strongly disagree |
| 31504 Mr Michael Goetz | Strongly disagree |
| 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | Strongly disagree |
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | Strongly disagree |
| 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz | Strongly disagree |
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | Strongly disagree |
| 31683 Richard Davies | Strongly disagree |
| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | Strongly disagree |
| 31690 Mr Norman Matthews | Strongly disagree |
| 31752 Jill Pearson | Strongly disagree |
| 31763 Susan Rogers | Strongly disagree |
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | Strongly disagree |
| | |

| 31800 Helen & Graham Phillips | Strongly disagree |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|
|-------------------------------|----------------------|

| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | Agree |
|--------------------------------|-------|
| 31185 Myfanway James | Agree |
| 31261 Mr John Weston | Agree |
| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | Agree |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | Agree |
| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | Agree |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | Agree |
| 31415 Mrs Zanahe Ruth Galloway | Agree |
| 31435 Mr Alan Eggers | Agree |
| 31438 Aleisha Hosie | Agree |
| 31449 Mr John Chisholm | Agree |
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | Agree |
| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless | Agree |
| 31505 Cheryl Heten | Agree |
| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | Agree |
| 31533 Wendy Trevett | Agree |
| 31558 Mr Steve Jordan | Agree |
| 31563 Mrs Loretta Anne Hogg | Agree |
| 31608 Robbie Thomson | Agree |
| 31647 Mrs Rebecca Parish | Agree |
| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | Agree |
| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | Agree |
| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | Agree |
| 31703 Ms Paula Holden | Agree |

| 31706 Paul Donald Galloway | Agree |
|------------------------------------|---------------|
| 31718 Kathryn & Keith Quigley | Agree |
| 31741 Mr Robert Stevenson | Agree |
| 31744 Mrs Lorna CRANE | Agree |
| 31783 Mr Peter Jones | Agree |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | Agree |
| 31423 Mr Roger Frost | Disagree |
| 31443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | Disagree |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | Disagree |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | Disagree |
| 31488 Annette Starink | Disagree |
| 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner | Disagree |
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | Disagree |
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | Disagree |
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | Disagree |
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | Disagree |
| 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | Disagree |
| 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | Disagree |
| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | Disagree |
| 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | Don't know |
| 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS | Don't know |
| 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | Don't know |
| | |

| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson | Don't |
|--------------------------------|-------|
| | know |
| 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward | Don't |
| | know |
| | |
| 31171 Ms Sallie Griffiths | Don't |
| | know |
| 31186 Mr Gary Scott | Don't |
| SIIOO WII Gary Scott | know |
| | |
| 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | Don't |
| | know |
| 31216 Ms Judith Holmes | Don't |
| 31210 IVIS JUGICII FIORNIES | |
| | know |
| 31219 Mrs kate windle | Don't |
| | know |
| 21221 Mrs Joan Edwards | Don't |
| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | Don't |
| | know |
| 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | Don't |
| | know |
| 24225 24 2 2 1 | |
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | Don't |
| | know |
| 31247 Mr yuri aristarco | Don't |
| , | know |
| | |
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | Don't |
| | know |
| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | Don't |
| 51256 WIS VIVICH AIIII I CCC13 | know |
| | |
| 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman | Don't |
| | know |
| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | Don't |
| 51207 IVII DONAIU HUITI | |
| | know |
| | |

| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | Don't |
|------------------------------|-------|
| | know |
| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley | Don't |
| , | know |
| | |
| 31278 Wendy Ross | Don't |
| | know |
| 31285 Dr Hamish Holland | Don't |
| | know |
| 2420C Ma David Chart | |
| 31286 Mr David Short | Don't |
| | know |
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | Don't |
| | know |
| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | Don't |
| 51299 IVIS Gillian Gallacher | |
| | know |
| 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | Don't |
| | know |
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | Don't |
| 31333 Wil Gregorius Broawer | know |
| | |
| 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman | Don't |
| | know |
| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | Don't |
| 31341 DI Addill'I Helia | know |
| | |
| 31355 Mr Barney Hoskins | Don't |
| | know |
| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | Don't |
| , | know |
| | |
| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | Don't |
| | know |
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | Don't |
| | know |
| | |

| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | Don't |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|
| | know |
| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | Don't |
| | know |
| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | Don't |
| | know |
| 31410 Mr Scott Smithline | Don't |
| | know |
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin | Don't |
| | know |
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | Don't |
| | know |
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | Don't |
| | know |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas | Don't |
| Hollyman | know |
| 31430 Muriel Moran | Don't |
| | know |
| 31431 Katerina Seligman | Don't |
| | know |
| 31434 Mrs cushla Moorhead | Don't know |
| | |
| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn Ball | Don't know |
| | |
| 31452 Mr David Bartle | Don't know |
| 24.450 Ma Buth Nautan | |
| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | Don't know |
| 24.472. Mar Aradas - D | |
| 31473 Mr Andrew Downs | Don't know |
| | MILOW |

| 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon | Don't |
|----------------------------|-------|
| | know |
| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | Don't |
| | know |
| 24402 D. I.I.; III | |
| 31483 Debbie Hampson | Don't |
| | know |
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | Don't |
| | know |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne | Don't |
| 51507 Kenatus Kempthorne | |
| | know |
| 31508 Mr Roger Barlow | Don't |
| | know |
| 31515 Geoffrey Vause | Don't |
| 31313 Geoffiey Vadae | know |
| | |
| 31516 Mr Peter Lole | Don't |
| | know |
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers | Don't |
| | know |
| | |
| 31521 Mrs Marie Waterhouse | Don't |
| | know |
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | Don't |
| | know |
| 21522 Da Aonen Stelland | |
| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard | Don't |
| | know |
| 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery | Don't |
| | know |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | Don't |
| 21330 INIS ESTITE FAILISEL | know |
| | |
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | Don't |
| | know |
| | |

| 31560 Ms Steph Watts | Don't |
|----------------------------|-------|
| | know |
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | Don't |
| | know |
| 31562 Grant palliser | Don't |
| | know |
| 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett | Don't |
| | know |
| 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham | Don't |
| | know |
| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | Don't |
| | know |
| 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart | Don't |
| | know |
| 31580 Jenny Long | Don't |
| | know |
| 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | Don't |
| | know |
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins | Don't |
| | know |
| 31598 Mrs Nicola Worsfold | Don't |
| | know |
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | Don't |
| , | know |
| 31617 Ms steph jewell | Don't |
| . , | know |
| 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | Don't |
| | know |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | Don't |
| | know |
| | |

| 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin | Don't |
|---------------------------------|-------|
| | know |
| 31641 Mr Stephen (Steve) Hayden | Don't |
| | know |
| 31643 Inge Koevoet | Don't |
| 31043 Mgc Rocvoct | know |
| | |
| 31651 Dr Patrick Conway | Don't |
| | know |
| 31656 Mr brad malcolm | Don't |
| | know |
| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | Don't |
| | know |
| 21002 Dishard Davies | |
| 31683 Richard Davies | Don't |
| | know |
| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | Don't |
| | know |
| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | Don't |
| | know |
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | Don't |
| 31702 Wil Momas Dracii | know |
| | |
| 31704 Mr Paul Bucknall | Don't |
| | know |
| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | Don't |
| | know |
| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | Don't |
| | know |
| 2472C Ma Caual Courtin | |
| 31736 Ms Carol Curtis | Don't |
| | know |
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | Don't |
| | know |
| | |

| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | Don't |
|---------------------------|---------|
| | know |
| 31759 Mr Damian Campbell | Don't |
| | know |
| 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | Don't |
| • | know |
| 31835 Mr Ian Wishart | Don't |
| | know |
| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | Neutral |
| 31114 Ms Jill Rogers | Neutral |
| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | Neutral |
| 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren | Neutral |
| 31129 Mrs Gaynor Brooks | Neutral |
| 31130 Trevor James | Neutral |
| 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert | Neutral |
| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | Neutral |
| 31173 Mr Roderick Watson | Neutral |
| 31174 Ms Alison Westerby | Neutral |
| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | Neutral |
| 31192 Ms Rebecca Patchett | Neutral |
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | Neutral |
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | Neutral |
| 31227 Ms Lee Eliott | Neutral |
| 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | Neutral |
| 31240 Michael Markert | Neutral |
| 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan | Neutral |
| | |

| 31257 Mr Kent Inglis | Neutral |
|-----------------------------|---------|
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | Neutral |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | Neutral |
| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | Neutral |
| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | Neutral |
| 31316 John Heslop | Neutral |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | Neutral |
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | Neutral |
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | Neutral |
| 31347 Ms Paula Baldwin | Neutral |
| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | Neutral |
| 31356 Stephen Williams | Neutral |
| 31358 George Harrison | Neutral |
| 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | Neutral |
| 31365 michael monti | Neutral |
| 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer | Neutral |
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | Neutral |
| 31403 Mr Richard Deck | Neutral |
| 31416 Tim Leyland | Neutral |
| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors | Neutral |
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | Neutral |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | Neutral |
| 31441 Mr Chris Head | Neutral |
| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | Neutral |
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | Neutral |
| | |

| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | Neutral |
|--------------------------------|---------|
| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | Neutral |
| 31480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | Neutral |
| 31481 Mrs Lucy Harrhy | Neutral |
| 31484 Mr Gavin Brent Cook | Neutral |
| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | Neutral |
| 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | Neutral |
| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | Neutral |
| 31520 Andrew Stirling | Neutral |
| 31529 Mr Steven King-Turner | Neutral |
| 31549 Mr Ian McComb | Neutral |
| 31551 Mrs Jo Kitchen | Neutral |
| 31554 Wendy Barker | Neutral |
| 31574 Mr David Bolton | Neutral |
| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | Neutral |
| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | Neutral |
| 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz | Neutral |
| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | Neutral |
| 31604 Mr Peter Moot | Neutral |
| 31614 Mr mark Morris | Neutral |
| 31622 Peter Butler | Neutral |
| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | Neutral |
| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | Neutral |
| 31637 Ms Frances Kemble Welch | Neutral |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | Neutral |
| | |

| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | Neutral |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | Neutral |
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | Neutral |
| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | Neutral |
| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | Neutral |
| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | Neutral |
| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | Neutral |
| 31688 Gerard McDonnell | Neutral |
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | Neutral |
| 31692 Mr Alasdair Gardiner | Neutral |
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | Neutral |
| 31716 Mr Alan hart | Neutral |
| 31722 Trevor Chang | Neutral |
| 31726 Mr John Jackson | Neutral |
| 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert- Watene | Neutral |
| 31752 Jill Pearson | Neutral |
| 31765 Mrs Lorna Ivy Cooper | Neutral |
| 31769 Ms Jo Gould | Neutral |
| 31771 Colleen Shaw | Neutral |
| 31775 Dr Thomas Carl | Neutral |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Neutral |
| 31801 Joan Skurr | Neutral |
| 31815 Peter Wilks | Neutral |
| 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | Strongly agree |
| | |

| 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | Strongly agree |
|---------------------------|-------------------|
| 31244 Mrs Avalon Walker | Strongly agree |
| 31284 Mr Jarmo Saloranta | Strongly agree |
| 31306 Mr Jaye Barr | Strongly agree |
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | Strongly agree |
| 31360 Ms Thuy Tran | Strongly agree |
| 31523 Ms karen steadman | Strongly agree |
| 31679 T R Carmichael | Strongly agree |
| 31697 Robert King-Tenison | Strongly agree |
| 31711 Sara Flintoff | Strongly agree |
| 31712 Caroline Blommaert | Strongly agree |
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | Strongly agree |
| 31734 Eric Thomas | Strongly agree |
| 31748 Jo Brooks | Strongly agree |
| 31754 Ms Joanna Hopkinson | Strongly agree |
| | |

| 31756 Ronald Alfred & Phylis Kinzett | Strongly agree |
|---|----------------------|
| 31761 Karen Steadman | Strongly agree |
| 31836 Paula M Wilks | Strongly agree |
| 31250 Mr Richard Wyles | Strongly disagree |
| 31279 Mr Jeremy Thompson | Strongly disagree |
| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | Strongly disagree |
| 31334 Diane Sutherland | Strongly disagree |
| 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | Strongly disagree |
| 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | Strongly disagree |
| 31346 Martin Hartman | Strongly disagree |
| 31349 Laurien Heijs | Strongly disagree |
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | Strongly disagree |
| 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann | Strongly disagree |
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle | Strongly disagree |
| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling | Strongly disagree |
| | |

| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling | Strongly disagree |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|
| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | Strongly disagree |
| 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | Strongly disagree |
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | Strongly disagree |
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | Strongly disagree |
| 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | Strongly disagree |
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | Strongly disagree |
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | Strongly disagree |
| 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | Strongly disagree |
| 31593 Mr William Samuels | Strongly disagree |
| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | Strongly disagree |
| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | Strongly disagree |
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | Strongly disagree |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | Strongly disagree |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | Strongly disagree |
| | |

| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | Strongly disagree |
|--|-------------------|
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | Strongly disagree |
| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | Strongly disagree |
| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | Strongly disagree |
| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | Strongly disagree |
| 31717 Mr Frank Ryan | Strongly disagree |
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | Strongly disagree |
| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | Strongly disagree |
| 31730 Ms Sandy Armstrong | Strongly disagree |
| 31763 Susan Rogers | Strongly disagree |
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | Strongly disagree |
| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | Strongly disagree |

| | posed residential and business growth sites in Collingwood? |
|--------------------------------|---|
| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | Agree |
| 31185 Myfanway James | Agree |
| 31261 Mr John Weston | Agree |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | Agree |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | Agree |
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | Agree |
| 31360 Ms Thuy Tran | Agree |
| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | Agree |
| 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett | Agree |
| 31400 Miss Heather Wallace | Agree |
| 31415 Mrs Zanahe Ruth Galloway | Agree |
| 31435 Mr Alan Eggers | Agree |
| 31438 Aleisha Hosie | Agree |
| 31443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | Agree |
| 31449 Mr John Chisholm | Agree |
| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | Agree |
| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | Agree |
| 31533 Wendy Trevett | Agree |
| 31558 Mr Steve Jordan | Agree |
| 31563 Mrs Loretta Anne Hogg | Agree |
| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | Agree |
| 31695 Christine Horner | Agree |
| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | Agree |
| 31703 Ms Paula Holden | Agree |

| 31706 Paul Donald Galloway | Agree |
|------------------------------------|----------|
| 31718 Kathryn & Keith Quigley | Agree |
| 31783 Mr Peter Jones | Agree |
| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | Agree |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | Agree |
| 31836 Paula M Wilks | Agree |
| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | Disagree |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | Disagree |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | Disagree |
| 31484 Mr Gavin Brent Cook | Disagree |
| 31488 Annette Starink | Disagree |
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | Disagree |
| 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | Disagree |
| 31554 Wendy Barker | Disagree |
| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | Disagree |
| 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner | Disagree |
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | Disagree |
| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | Disagree |
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | Disagree |
| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | Disagree |
| 31726 Mr John Jackson | Disagree |
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | Disagree |
| 31741 Mr Robert Stevenson | Disagree |
| 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | Disagree |
| | |

| 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | Don't |
|-----------------------------|-------|
| | know |
| 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS | Don't |
| | know |
| 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | Don't |
| | know |
| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson | Don't |
| | know |
| 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward | Don't |
| | know |
| 31171 Ms Sallie Griffiths | Don't |
| | know |
| 31186 Mr Gary Scott | Don't |
| · | know |
| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | Don't |
| | know |
| 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | Don't |
| | know |
| 31216 Ms Judith Holmes | Don't |
| | know |
| 31219 Mrs kate windle | Don't |
| | know |
| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | Don't |
| | know |
| 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | Don't |
| | know |
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | Don't |
| 55511 5155 115. | know |
| 31247 Mr yuri aristarco | Don't |
| | know |
| | |

| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | Don't |
|----------------------------|---------------|
| | know |
| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | Don't |
| | know |
| 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman | Don't |
| | know |
| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | Don't |
| | know |
| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | Don't |
| | know |
| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley | Don't |
| | know |
| 31278 Wendy Ross | Don't know |
| | |
| 31285 Dr Hamish Holland | Don't know |
| 31286 Mr David Short | |
| 31286 IVIT DAVIG SHOFT | Don't know |
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | Don't |
| 31200 IVII'S Lealine Hough | know |
| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | Don't |
| | know |
| 31316 John Heslop | Don't |
| • | know |
| 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | Don't |
| | know |
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | Don't |
| | know |
| 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman | Don't |
| | know |
| | |

| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | Don't |
|---|---------------|
| | know |
| 31355 Mr Barney Hoskins | Don't |
| | know |
| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | Don't |
| • | know |
| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | Don't |
| 31307 14113 3111 300 (11011 | know |
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | Don't |
| 31370 MIS Deboran Knowler | know |
| | |
| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | Don't |
| | know |
| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | Don't |
| | know |
| 31410 Mr Scott Smithline | Don't |
| | know |
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin | Don't |
| | know |
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | Don't |
| , | know |
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | Don't |
| 31421 Rosie-Aime i iiiiey | know |
| 24.426. Mar Dovers Develop | |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas Hollyman | Don't know |
| | |
| 31430 Muriel Moran | Don't |
| | know |
| 31431 Katerina Seligman | Don't |
| | know |
| 31434 Mrs cushla Moorhead | Don't |
| | know |
| | |

| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn | Don't |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| Ball | know |
| 31452 Mr David Bartle | Don't |
| | know |
| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | Don't |
| | know |
| 31473 Mr Andrew Downs | Don't |
| | know |
| 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon | Don't |
| | know |
| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | Don't |
| | know |
| 31483 Debbie Hampson | Don't |
| | know |
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | Don't |
| | know |
| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless | Don't |
| | know |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne | Don't |
| | know |
| 31508 Mr Roger Barlow | Don't |
| | know |
| 31515 Geoffrey Vause | Don't |
| · | know |
| 31516 Mr Peter Lole | Don't |
| | know |
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers | Don't |
| 55 | know |
| 31521 Mrs Marie Waterhouse | Don't |
| | |

| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | Don't know |
|----------------------------|---------------|
| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard | Don't know |
| 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery | Don't know |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | Don't know |
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | Don't know |
| 31560 Ms Steph Watts | Don't know |
| 31562 Grant palliser | Don't know |
| 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett | Don't know |
| 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham | Don't know |
| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | Don't know |
| 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart | Don't know |
| 31580 Jenny Long | Don't know |
| 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | Don't know |
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins | Don't know |
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | Don't know |
| | |

| 31617 Ms steph jewell | Don't |
|---------------------------------|-------|
| | know |
| 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | Don't |
| | know |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | Don't |
| | know |
| 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin | Don't |
| | know |
| 31641 Mr Stephen (Steve) Hayden | Don't |
| | know |
| 31643 Inge Koevoet | Don't |
| | know |
| 31651 Dr Patrick Conway | Don't |
| | know |
| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | Don't |
| | know |
| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | Don't |
| | know |
| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | Don't |
| | know |
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | Don't |
| | know |
| 31704 Mr Paul Bucknall | Don't |
| | know |
| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | Don't |
| · | know |
| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | Don't |
| | know |
| 31744 Mrs Lorna CRANE | Don't |
| | know |
| | |

| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | Don't |
|---------------------------|---------------|
| | know |
| 31759 Mr Damian Campbell | Don't |
| | know |
| 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | Don't know |
| 24.025 Martin Mührent | · |
| 31835 Mr Ian Wishart | Don't know |
| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | Neutral |
| 31114 Ms Jill Rogers | Neutral |
| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | Neutral |
| | |
| 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren | Neutral |
| 31129 Mrs Gaynor Brooks | Neutral |
| 31130 Trevor James | Neutral |
| 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert | Neutral |
| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | Neutral |
| 31173 Mr Roderick Watson | Neutral |
| 31192 Ms Rebecca Patchett | Neutral |
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | Neutral |
| 31227 Ms Lee Eliott | Neutral |
| 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | Neutral |
| 31240 Michael Markert | Neutral |
| 31250 Mr Richard Wyles | Neutral |
| 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan | Neutral |
| 31257 Mr Kent Inglis | Neutral |
| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | Neutral |
| | |

| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | Neutral |
|-----------------------------|---------|
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | Neutral |
| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | Neutral |
| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | Neutral |
| 31284 Mr Jarmo Saloranta | Neutral |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | Neutral |
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | Neutral |
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | Neutral |
| 31347 Ms Paula Baldwin | Neutral |
| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | Neutral |
| 31356 Stephen Williams | Neutral |
| 31358 George Harrison | Neutral |
| 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | Neutral |
| 31365 michael monti | Neutral |
| 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer | Neutral |
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | Neutral |
| 31403 Mr Richard Deck | Neutral |
| 31416 Tim Leyland | Neutral |
| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors | Neutral |
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | Neutral |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | Neutral |
| 31441 Mr Chris Head | Neutral |
| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | Neutral |
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | Neutral |
| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | Neutral |
| | |

| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | Neutral |
|-------------------------------|---------|
| 31480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | Neutral |
| 31481 Mrs Lucy Harrhy | Neutral |
| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | Neutral |
| 31505 Cheryl Heten | Neutral |
| 31520 Andrew Stirling | Neutral |
| 31529 Mr Steven King-Turner | Neutral |
| 31549 Mr Ian McComb | Neutral |
| 31551 Mrs Jo Kitchen | Neutral |
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | Neutral |
| 31574 Mr David Bolton | Neutral |
| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | Neutral |
| 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz | Neutral |
| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | Neutral |
| 31604 Mr Peter Moot | Neutral |
| 31614 Mr mark Morris | Neutral |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | Neutral |
| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | Neutral |
| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | Neutral |
| 31637 Ms Frances Kemble Welch | Neutral |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | Neutral |
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | Neutral |
| 31647 Mrs Rebecca Parish | Neutral |
| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | Neutral |
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | Neutral |
| | |

| 31656 Mr brad malcolm | Neutral |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|
| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | Neutral |
| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | Neutral |
| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | Neutral |
| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | Neutral |
| 31688 Gerard McDonnell | Neutral |
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | Neutral |
| 31692 Mr Alasdair Gardiner | Neutral |
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | Neutral |
| 31716 Mr Alan hart | Neutral |
| 31722 Trevor Chang | Neutral |
| 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert- Watene | Neutral |
| 31752 Jill Pearson | Neutral |
| 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | Neutral |
| 31765 Mrs Lorna Ivy Cooper | Neutral |
| 31769 Ms Jo Gould | Neutral |
| 31771 Colleen Shaw | Neutral |
| 31775 Dr Thomas Carl | Neutral |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Neutral |
| 31801 Joan Skurr | Neutral |
| 31815 Peter Wilks | Neutral |
| 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | Strongly agree |
| 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | Strongly |

| 31622 Peter Butler | Strongly agree |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | Strongly disagree |
| 31279 Mr Jeremy Thompson | Strongly disagree |
| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | Strongly disagree |
| 31334 Diane Sutherland | Strongly disagree |
| 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | Strongly disagree |
| 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | Strongly disagree |
| 31346 Martin Hartman | Strongly disagree |
| 31349 Laurien Heijs | Strongly disagree |
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | Strongly disagree |
| 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann | Strongly disagree |
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle | Strongly disagree |
| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling | Strongly disagree |
| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling | Strongly disagree |
| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | Strongly disagree |
| | |

| 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | Strongly disagree |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | Strongly disagree |
| 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | Strongly disagree |
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | Strongly disagree |
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | Strongly disagree |
| 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | Strongly disagree |
| 31593 Mr William Samuels | Strongly disagree |
| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | Strongly disagree |
| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | Strongly disagree |
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | Strongly disagree |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | Strongly disagree |
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | Strongly disagree |
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | Strongly disagree |
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | Strongly disagree |
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | Strongly disagree |
| | |

| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | Strongly disagree |
|--|----------------------|
| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | Strongly disagree |
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | Strongly disagree |
| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | Strongly disagree |
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | Strongly disagree |
| 31763 Susan Rogers | Strongly disagree |
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | Strongly disagree |
| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | Strongly disagree |
| | |

| 31130 Trevor James | Agree |
|--------------------------------|-------|
| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | Agree |
| 31185 Myfanway James | Agree |
| 31186 Mr Gary Scott | Agree |
| 31261 Mr John Weston | Agree |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | Agree |
| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | Agree |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | Agree |
| 31316 John Heslop | Agree |
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | Agree |
| 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | Agree |
| 31415 Mrs Zanahe Ruth Galloway | Agree |
| 31435 Mr Alan Eggers | Agree |
| 31438 Aleisha Hosie | Agree |
| 31443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | Agree |
| 31449 Mr John Chisholm | Agree |
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | Agree |
| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | Agree |
| 31533 Wendy Trevett | Agree |
| 31554 Wendy Barker | Agree |
| 31558 Mr Steve Jordan | Agree |
| 31563 Mrs Loretta Anne Hogg | Agree |
| 31608 Robbie Thomson | Agree |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | Agree |

| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | Agree |
|------------------------------------|---------------|
| 31647 Mrs Rebecca Parish | Agree |
| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | Agree |
| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | Agree |
| 31703 Ms Paula Holden | Agree |
| 31706 Paul Donald Galloway | Agree |
| 31718 Kathryn & Keith Quigley | Agree |
| 31783 Mr Peter Jones | Agree |
| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | Agree |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | Agree |
| 31836 Paula M Wilks | Agree |
| 31416 Tim Leyland | Disagree |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | Disagree |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | Disagree |
| 31484 Mr Gavin Brent Cook | Disagree |
| 31488 Annette Starink | Disagree |
| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | Disagree |
| 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner | Disagree |
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | Disagree |
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | Disagree |
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | Disagree |
| 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | Disagree |
| 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | Disagree |
| 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | Don't know |
| | |

| 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS | Don't |
|------------------------------|--------|
| | know |
| 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | Don't |
| | know |
| | |
| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson | Don't |
| | know |
| 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward | Don't |
| 31137 Wis Chilissie Ward | know |
| | KIIUW |
| 31171 Ms Sallie Griffiths | Don't |
| | know |
| 21100 Ma Maylana Alash | Danila |
| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | Don't |
| | know |
| 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | Don't |
| | know |
| | |
| 31216 Ms Judith Holmes | Don't |
| | know |
| 31219 Mrs kate windle | Don't |
| 31213 Wild Nate Wildle | know |
| | |
| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | Don't |
| | know |
| 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | Don't |
| 31232 Wils Wargaret Weechang | |
| | know |
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | Don't |
| | know |
| 24247 Marriani anistana | Davila |
| 31247 Mr yuri aristarco | Don't |
| | know |
| 31250 Mr Richard Wyles | Don't |
| 52250 iiii iiioiiaia wyies | know |
| | |
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | Don't |
| | know |
| | |

| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | Don't |
|----------------------------|---------------|
| | know |
| 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman | Don't |
| | know |
| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | Don't |
| | know |
| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | Don't |
| | know |
| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley | Don't |
| | know |
| 31278 Wendy Ross | Don't know |
| | |
| 31285 Dr Hamish Holland | Don't know |
| 2420C Ma Dovid Chart | |
| 31286 Mr David Short | Don't know |
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | Don't |
| 31200 Will's Lealine Hough | know |
| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | Don't |
| | know |
| 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | Don't |
| | know |
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | Don't |
| | know |
| 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman | Don't |
| | know |
| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | Don't |
| | know |
| 31355 Mr Barney Hoskins | Don't |
| | know |

| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | Don't |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| | know |
| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | Don't |
| | know |
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | Don't |
| | know |
| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | Don't |
| | know |
| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | Don't |
| | know |
| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | Don't |
| | know |
| 31410 Mr Scott Smithline | Don't |
| | know |
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin | Don't |
| | know |
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | Don't |
| | know |
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | Don't |
| | know |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas | Don't |
| Hollyman | know |
| 31430 Muriel Moran | Don't |
| | know |
| 31431 Katerina Seligman | Don't |
| - | know |
| 31434 Mrs cushla Moorhead | Don't |
| | know |
| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn | Don't |
| Ball | know |
| | |

| 31452 Mr David Bartle Don't know 31459 Ms Ruth Newton Don't know 31473 Mr Andrew Downs Don't know 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon Don't know 31478 Mr Chris Koole Don't know 31483 Debbie Hampson Don't know 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs Don't know 31498 Ms Anne Kolless Don't know 31507 Renatus Kempthorne Don't know 31508 Mr Roger Barlow Don't know 31515 Geoffrey Vause Don't know |
|---|
| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton Don't know 31473 Mr Andrew Downs Don't know 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon Don't know 31478 Mr Chris Koole Don't know 31483 Debbie Hampson Don't know 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs Don't know 31498 Ms Anne Kolless Don't know 31498 Ms Anne Kolless Don't know 31507 Renatus Kempthorne Don't know 31507 Renatus Kempthorne Don't know 31508 Mr Roger Barlow Don't know 31515 Geoffrey Vause Don't |
| know31473 Mr Andrew DownsDon't know31474 Ms Margaret PidgeonDon't know31478 Mr Chris KooleDon't know31483 Debbie HampsonDon't know31486 Mrs Josephine DownsDon't know31498 Ms Anne KollessDon't know31507 Renatus KempthorneDon't know31508 Mr Roger BarlowDon't know31515 Geoffrey VauseDon't |
| 31473 Mr Andrew DownsDon't know31474 Ms Margaret PidgeonDon't know31478 Mr Chris KooleDon't know31483 Debbie HampsonDon't know31486 Mrs Josephine DownsDon't know31498 Ms Anne KollessDon't know31507 Renatus KempthorneDon't know31508 Mr Roger BarlowDon't know31515 Geoffrey VauseDon't know |
| know31474 Ms Margaret PidgeonDon't know31478 Mr Chris KooleDon't know31483 Debbie HampsonDon't know31486 Mrs Josephine DownsDon't know31498 Ms Anne KollessDon't know31507 Renatus KempthorneDon't know31508 Mr Roger BarlowDon't know31515 Geoffrey VauseDon't |
| 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon Don't know 31478 Mr Chris Koole Don't know 31483 Debbie Hampson Don't know 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs Don't know 31498 Ms Anne Kolless Don't know 31507 Renatus Kempthorne Don't know 31508 Mr Roger Barlow Don't know 31515 Geoffrey Vause Don't |
| know 31478 Mr Chris Koole Don't know 31483 Debbie Hampson Don't know 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs Don't know 31498 Ms Anne Kolless Don't know 31507 Renatus Kempthorne Don't know 31508 Mr Roger Barlow Don't know |
| 31478 Mr Chris Koole Don't know 31483 Debbie Hampson Don't know 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs Don't know 31498 Ms Anne Kolless Don't know 31507 Renatus Kempthorne Don't know 31508 Mr Roger Barlow Don't know Don't know Don't know Don't know Don't know Don't know |
| know 31483 Debbie Hampson Don't know 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs Don't know 31498 Ms Anne Kolless Don't know 31507 Renatus Kempthorne Don't know 31508 Mr Roger Barlow Don't know 31515 Geoffrey Vause Don't |
| 31483 Debbie Hampson Don't know 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs Don't know 31498 Ms Anne Kolless Don't know 31507 Renatus Kempthorne Don't know 31508 Mr Roger Barlow Don't know 31515 Geoffrey Vause Don't |
| know 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs Don't know 31498 Ms Anne Kolless Don't know 31507 Renatus Kempthorne Don't know 31508 Mr Roger Barlow Don't know Don't know Don't know Don't know |
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs Don't know 31498 Ms Anne Kolless Don't know 31507 Renatus Kempthorne Don't know 31508 Mr Roger Barlow Don't know 31515 Geoffrey Vause Don't |
| know31498 Ms Anne KollessDon't know31507 Renatus KempthorneDon't know31508 Mr Roger BarlowDon't know31515 Geoffrey VauseDon't |
| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless Don't know 31507 Renatus Kempthorne Don't know 31508 Mr Roger Barlow Don't know 31515 Geoffrey Vause Don't |
| know31507 Renatus KempthorneDon't know31508 Mr Roger BarlowDon't know31515 Geoffrey VauseDon't |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne Don't know 31508 Mr Roger Barlow Don't know 31515 Geoffrey Vause Don't |
| know 31508 Mr Roger Barlow Don't know 31515 Geoffrey Vause Don't |
| 31508 Mr Roger Barlow Don't know 31515 Geoffrey Vause Don't |
| know 31515 Geoffrey Vause Don't |
| 31515 Geoffrey Vause Don't |
| |
| know |
| |
| 31516 Mr Peter Lole Don't |
| know |
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers Don't |
| know |
| 31521 Mrs Marie Waterhouse Don't |
| know |
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement Don't |
| know |

| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard | Don't |
|----------------------------|-------|
| | know |
| 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery | Don't |
| | know |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | Don't |
| | know |
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | Don't |
| 31333 Di Lou Ganagnei | know |
| 215CO Ma Starb Watta | Don't |
| 31560 Ms Steph Watts | know |
| | |
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | Don't |
| | know |
| 31562 Grant palliser | Don't |
| | know |
| 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett | Don't |
| | know |
| 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham | Don't |
| | know |
| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | Don't |
| | know |
| 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart | Don't |
| 31377 Will's Jarria Sinarc | know |
| 24500 | |
| 31580 Jenny Long | Don't |
| | know |
| 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | Don't |
| | know |
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins | Don't |
| | know |
| 31598 Mrs Nicola Worsfold | Don't |
| | know |
| | |

| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | Don't |
|---|-------|
| | know |
| 31617 Ms steph jewell | Don't |
| 31017 Wis stepin jewen | know |
| | KIOW |
| 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | Don't |
| , | know |
| | |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | Don't |
| | know |
| | |
| 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin | Don't |
| | know |
| 24.6.44. N.A.: 64-1-4-1-1 (64-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1 | Doub |
| 31641 Mr Stephen (Steve) Hayden | |
| | know |
| 31643 Inge Koevoet | Don't |
| 31043 lilge koevoet | |
| | know |
| 31651 Dr Patrick Conway | Don't |
| 31031 Di l'attick conway | know |
| | KIIOW |
| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | Don't |
| | know |
| | |
| 31683 Richard Davies | Don't |
| | know |
| | |
| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | Don't |
| | know |
| 24704 M I I D I D I : | |
| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | Don't |
| | know |
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | Don't |
| 21/02 IVII THOIHAS DIACH | |
| | know |
| 31704 Mr Paul Bucknall | Don't |
| 31/04 IVII FAUI BUCKIIAII | |
| | know |
| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | Don't |
| - , | know |
| | N.O. |

| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | Don't |
|----------------------------|---------------|
| | know |
| 31736 Ms Carol Curtis | Don't |
| | know |
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | Don't |
| | know |
| 31744 Mrs Lorna CRANE | Don't |
| | know |
| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | Don't know |
| 2177211 2 1 1 1 | |
| 31759 Mr Damian Campbell | Don't know |
| 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | Don't |
| 31/04 IVII Dylali IVIackie | know |
| 31835 Mr Ian Wishart | Don't |
| 0.2000 | know |
| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | Neutral |
| 31114 Ms Jill Rogers | Neutral |
| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | Neutral |
| 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren | Neutral |
| 31129 Mrs Gaynor Brooks | Neutral |
| 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert | Neutral |
| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | Neutral |
| 31173 Mr Roderick Watson | Neutral |
| 31174 Ms Alison Westerby | Neutral |
| 31192 Ms Rebecca Patchett | Neutral |
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | Neutral |
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | Neutral |
| | |

| 31227 Ms Lee Eliott | Neutral |
|-----------------------------|---------|
| 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | Neutral |
| 31240 Michael Markert | Neutral |
| 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan | Neutral |
| 31257 Mr Kent Inglis | Neutral |
| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | Neutral |
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | Neutral |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | Neutral |
| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | Neutral |
| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | Neutral |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | Neutral |
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | Neutral |
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | Neutral |
| 31347 Ms Paula Baldwin | Neutral |
| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | Neutral |
| 31356 Stephen Williams | Neutral |
| 31365 michael monti | Neutral |
| 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer | Neutral |
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | Neutral |
| 31403 Mr Richard Deck | Neutral |
| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors | Neutral |
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | Neutral |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | Neutral |
| 31441 Mr Chris Head | Neutral |
| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | Neutral |
| | |

| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | Neutral |
|--------------------------------|---------|
| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | Neutral |
| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | Neutral |
| 31480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | Neutral |
| 31481 Mrs Lucy Harrhy | Neutral |
| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | Neutral |
| 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | Neutral |
| 31505 Cheryl Heten | Neutral |
| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | Neutral |
| 31520 Andrew Stirling | Neutral |
| 31529 Mr Steven King-Turner | Neutral |
| 31549 Mr Ian McComb | Neutral |
| 31551 Mrs Jo Kitchen | Neutral |
| 31574 Mr David Bolton | Neutral |
| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | Neutral |
| 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz | Neutral |
| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | Neutral |
| 31604 Mr Peter Moot | Neutral |
| 31614 Mr mark Morris | Neutral |
| 31622 Peter Butler | Neutral |
| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | Neutral |
| 31637 Ms Frances Kemble Welch | Neutral |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | Neutral |
| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | Neutral |
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | Neutral |

| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | Neutral |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | Neutral |
| 31656 Mr brad malcolm | Neutral |
| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | Neutral |
| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | Neutral |
| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | Neutral |
| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | Neutral |
| 31688 Gerard McDonnell | Neutral |
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | Neutral |
| 31692 Mr Alasdair Gardiner | Neutral |
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | Neutral |
| 31716 Mr Alan hart | Neutral |
| 31722 Trevor Chang | Neutral |
| 31726 Mr John Jackson | Neutral |
| 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert- Watene | Neutral |
| 31752 Jill Pearson | Neutral |
| 31765 Mrs Lorna Ivy Cooper | Neutral |
| 31769 Ms Jo Gould | Neutral |
| 31771 Colleen Shaw | Neutral |
| 31775 Dr Thomas Carl | Neutral |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Neutral |
| 31801 Joan Skurr | Neutral |
| 31815 Peter Wilks | Neutral |
| 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | Strongly agree |
| | |

| 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | Strongly agree |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| 31284 Mr Jarmo Saloranta | Strongly agree |
| 31360 Ms Thuy Tran | Strongly agree |
| 31279 Mr Jeremy Thompson | Strongly disagree |
| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | Strongly disagree |
| 31334 Diane Sutherland | Strongly disagree |
| 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | Strongly disagree |
| 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | Strongly disagree |
| 31346 Martin Hartman | Strongly disagree |
| 31349 Laurien Heijs | Strongly disagree |
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | Strongly disagree |
| 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann | Strongly disagree |
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle | Strongly disagree |
| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling | Strongly disagree |
| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling | Strongly disagree |
| | |

| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | Strongly disagree |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|
| 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | Strongly disagree |
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | Strongly disagree |
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | Strongly disagree |
| 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | Strongly disagree |
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | Strongly disagree |
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | Strongly disagree |
| 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | Strongly disagree |
| 31593 Mr William Samuels | Strongly disagree |
| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | Strongly disagree |
| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | Strongly disagree |
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | Strongly disagree |
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | Strongly disagree |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | Strongly disagree |
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | Strongly disagree |
| | |

| 31665 Mr Grant SmithiesStrongly disagree31671 Ms Josephine CachemailleStrongly disagree31677 Mr Mathew HayStrongly disagree31689 Mrs Karen DriverStrongly disagree31719 Mr Chris PyemontStrongly disagree31727 Mr Philip JonesStrongly disagree31731 Ms Jessica BellStrongly disagree31763 Susan RogersStrongly disagree31768 Ms Julie CaveStrongly disagree31768 Ms Julie CaveStrongly disagree31769 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner OrtnerStrongly disagree | | |
|--|--------------------------------|-----|
| 13677 Mr Mathew HayStrongly disagree31689 Mrs Karen DriverStrongly disagree31719 Mr Chris PyemontStrongly disagree31727 Mr Philip JonesStrongly disagree31731 Ms Jessica BellStrongly disagree31763 Susan RogersStrongly disagree31768 Ms Julie CaveStrongly disagree31786 Friedrich Mahrla andStrongly disagree | 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | |
| disagree 31689 Mrs Karen Driver Strongly disagree 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont Strongly disagree 31727 Mr Philip Jones Strongly disagree 31731 Ms Jessica Bell Strongly disagree 31763 Susan Rogers Strongly disagree 31768 Ms Julie Cave Strongly disagree 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Strongly | 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | = : |
| disagree31719 Mr Chris PyemontStrongly disagree31727 Mr Philip JonesStrongly disagree31731 Ms Jessica BellStrongly disagree31763 Susan RogersStrongly disagree31768 Ms Julie CaveStrongly disagree31786 Friedrich Mahrla andStrongly | 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | |
| disagree 31727 Mr Philip Jones Strongly disagree 31731 Ms Jessica Bell Strongly disagree 31763 Susan Rogers Strongly disagree 31768 Ms Julie Cave Strongly disagree 31768 Friedrich Mahrla and Strongly | 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | |
| disagree 31731 Ms Jessica Bell Strongly disagree 31763 Susan Rogers Strongly disagree 31768 Ms Julie Cave Strongly disagree 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Strongly | 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | = : |
| disagree31763 Susan RogersStrongly disagree31768 Ms Julie CaveStrongly disagree31786 Friedrich Mahrla andStrongly | 31727 Mr Philip Jones | |
| disagree 31768 Ms Julie Cave Strongly disagree 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Strongly | 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | |
| disagree 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Strongly | 31763 Susan Rogers | |
| • . | 31768 Ms Julie Cave | = : |
| | | |

| | posed residential and business growth sites in St Arnaud? |
|--------------------------------|---|
| 31139 Mr Craig Allen | Agree |
| 31261 Mr John Weston | Agree |
| 31284 Mr Jarmo Saloranta | Agree |
| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | Agree |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | Agree |
| 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | Agree |
| 31415 Mrs Zanahe Ruth Galloway | Agree |
| 31438 Aleisha Hosie | Agree |
| 31443 Dr Monika Clark-Grill | Agree |
| 31449 Mr John Chisholm | Agree |
| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | Agree |
| 31519 Mr Jamie Eggers | Agree |
| 31563 Mrs Loretta Anne Hogg | Agree |
| 31656 Mr brad malcolm | Agree |
| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | Agree |
| 31703 Ms Paula Holden | Agree |
| 31706 Paul Donald Galloway | Agree |
| 31718 Kathryn & Keith Quigley | Agree |
| 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | Agree |
| 31783 Mr Peter Jones | Agree |
| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | Agree |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | Agree |
| 31836 Paula M Wilks | Agree |
| 31295 Mr Brent Johnson | Disagree |

| 31360 Ms Thuy Tran | Disagree |
|------------------------------------|---------------|
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin | Disagree |
| 31439 Mr Bruce Gilkison | Disagree |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | Disagree |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | Disagree |
| 31484 Mr Gavin Brent Cook | Disagree |
| 31488 Annette Starink | Disagree |
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | Disagree |
| 31520 Andrew Stirling | Disagree |
| 31533 Wendy Trevett | Disagree |
| 31554 Wendy Barker | Disagree |
| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | Disagree |
| 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | Disagree |
| 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner | Disagree |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | Disagree |
| 31636 Joanna Santa Barbara | Disagree |
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | Disagree |
| 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | Disagree |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | Disagree |
| 31113 Mr Roy Elgar | Don't know |
| 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS | Don't know |
| 31123 Mrs Lindsay Powdrell | Don't |

| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson | Don't |
|-----------------------------|-------|
| | know |
| 31137 Ms Chrissie Ward | Don't |
| 51157 Wis emissie ward | know |
| | NIOW |
| 31171 Ms Sallie Griffiths | Don't |
| | know |
| | |
| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | Don't |
| | know |
| 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | Don't |
| 31213 Wil Gleff Falsons | |
| | know |
| 31216 Ms Judith Holmes | Don't |
| | know |
| | |
| 31219 Mrs kate windle | Don't |
| | know |
| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | Don't |
| 51251 Wils Jean Luwarus | |
| | know |
| 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | Don't |
| ğ ğ | know |
| | |
| 31235 Mr Scott Stocker | Don't |
| | know |
| 21247 Mr. writerians | Don't |
| 31247 Mr yuri aristarco | |
| | know |
| 31250 Mr Richard Wyles | Don't |
| | know |
| | |
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | Don't |
| | know |
| 24250 14 1/2 : 1 1 1 1 1 | |
| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | Don't |
| | know |
| 31263 Mrs Jean Gorman | Don't |
| 51205 IVII 3 Jean Goillian | know |
| | NIUW |
| | |

| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | Don't |
|----------------------------|-------|
| | know |
| 31271 Mr Matt Taylor | Don't |
| | know |
| | |
| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley | Don't |
| | know |
| 31278 Wendy Ross | Don't |
| 31270 Wellay Noss | know |
| | |
| 31286 Mr David Short | Don't |
| | know |
| 31288 Mrs Leanne Hough | Don't |
| 31288 IVITS Learnie Hough | |
| | know |
| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | Don't |
| | know |
| 24224 14 2 1 | |
| 31324 Mr Brian Hawthorne | Don't |
| | know |
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | Don't |
| S | know |
| | |
| 31340 Mr Kerry Bateman | Don't |
| | know |
| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | Don't |
| 313 II Bi Addii i iiciid | know |
| | |
| 31355 Mr Barney Hoskins | Don't |
| | know |
| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | Don't |
| 21272 DI MIKE AZIINA | |
| | know |
| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | Don't |
| | know |
| 24205 M C | |
| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | Don't |
| | know |
| | |

| 31404 GARRICK BATTEN | Don't |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| | know |
| 31410 Mr Scott Smithline | Don't |
| | know |
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | Don't |
| | know |
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | Don't |
| | know |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas | Don't |
| Hollyman | know |
| 31430 Muriel Moran | Don't |
| | know |
| 31431 Katerina Seligman | Don't |
| | know |
| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn | Don't |
| Ball | know |
| 31452 Mr David Bartle | Don't |
| | know |
| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | Don't |
| | know |
| 31473 Mr Andrew Downs | Don't |
| | know |
| 31474 Ms Margaret Pidgeon | Don't |
| | know |
| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | Don't |
| | know |
| 31483 Debbie Hampson | Don't |
| · | know |
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | Don't |
| | know |
| | |

| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless | Don't |
|----------------------------|-------|
| | know |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne | Don't |
| | know |
| 31508 Mr Roger Barlow | Don't |
| | know |
| 31515 Geoffrey Vause | Don't |
| | know |
| 31516 Mr Peter Lole | Don't |
| | know |
| 31521 Mrs Marie Waterhouse | Don't |
| | know |
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | Don't |
| | know |
| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard | Don't |
| | know |
| 31542 Mrs Melanie Drewery | Don't |
| | know |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | Don't |
| | know |
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | Don't |
| | know |
| 31560 Ms Steph Watts | Don't |
| | know |
| 31561 Mrs Ann Jones | Don't |
| | know |
| 31562 Grant palliser | Don't |
| | know |
| 31569 Ms Joni Tomsett | Don't |
| | know |
| | |

| 31575 Mr Andrew Damerham | Don't |
|---------------------------------------|-------|
| | know |
| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | Don't |
| 31370 Will Johns Fillinemans | know |
| | KIIOW |
| 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart | Don't |
| | know |
| | |
| 31580 Jenny Long | Don't |
| | know |
| | |
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins | Don't |
| | know |
| 24500 Mar Ni - I- Mar - f-I- | Doub. |
| 31598 Mrs Nicola Worsfold | Don't |
| | know |
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | Don't |
| 31010 IVIS IVIALY LATICASTEL | |
| | know |
| 31617 Ms steph jewell | Don't |
| 31017 Wis Stephi Jewen | know |
| | KIIOW |
| 31626 Mr Shalom Levy | Don't |
| , | know |
| | |
| 31629 Dr Sally Levy | Don't |
| | know |
| | |
| 31639 Mr Jonathan Martin | Don't |
| | know |
| 24.5.44. N. Charles - (Stave) Haveler | Doub. |
| 31641 Mr Stephen (Steve) Hayden | |
| | know |
| 31643 Inge Koevoet | Don't |
| 31043 ilige koevoet | |
| | know |
| 31651 Dr Patrick Conway | Don't |
| 51051 Di l'attick Collway | |
| | know |
| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | Don't |
| | know |
| | |

| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | Don't |
|---------------------------|---------|
| | know |
| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | Don't |
| | know |
| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | Don't |
| | know |
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | Don't |
| | know |
| 31704 Mr Paul Bucknall | Don't |
| | know |
| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | Don't |
| | know |
| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | Don't |
| | know |
| 31736 Ms Carol Curtis | Don't |
| | know |
| 31744 Mrs Lorna CRANE | Don't |
| | know |
| 31755 Dr Gwen Struk | Don't |
| | know |
| 31759 Mr Damian Campbell | Don't |
| | know |
| 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | Don't |
| | know |
| 31835 Mr Ian Wishart | Don't |
| | know |
| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | Neutral |
| 31114 Ms Jill Rogers | Neutral |
| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | Neutral |
| 31124 Ms Malin Wahlgren | Neutral |
| | |

| 31129 Mrs Gaynor Brooks | Neutral |
|---------------------------|---------|
| 31130 Trevor James | Neutral |
| 31140 Ms Karen Gilbert | Neutral |
| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | Neutral |
| 31173 Mr Roderick Watson | Neutral |
| 31174 Ms Alison Westerby | Neutral |
| 31185 Myfanway James | Neutral |
| 31186 Mr Gary Scott | Neutral |
| 31192 Ms Rebecca Patchett | Neutral |
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | Neutral |
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | Neutral |
| 31227 Ms Lee Eliott | Neutral |
| 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | Neutral |
| 31240 Michael Markert | Neutral |
| 31253 Ms Karen Kernohan | Neutral |
| 31257 Mr Kent Inglis | Neutral |
| 31270 Mrs Emma Coles | Neutral |
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | Neutral |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | Neutral |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | Neutral |
| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | Neutral |
| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | Neutral |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | Neutral |
| 31337 Mr Del & Sue Trew | Neutral |
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | Neutral |
| | |

| 31347 Ms Paula Baldwin | Neutral |
|--------------------------------|---------|
| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | Neutral |
| 31356 Stephen Williams | Neutral |
| 31358 George Harrison | Neutral |
| 31365 michael monti | Neutral |
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | Neutral |
| 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer | Neutral |
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | Neutral |
| 31403 Mr Richard Deck | Neutral |
| 31416 Tim Leyland | Neutral |
| 31417 Ms Swantje Melchiors | Neutral |
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | Neutral |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | Neutral |
| 31434 Mrs cushla Moorhead | Neutral |
| 31435 Mr Alan Eggers | Neutral |
| 31441 Mr Chris Head | Neutral |
| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | Neutral |
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | Neutral |
| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | Neutral |
| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | Neutral |
| 31480 Ms Kahurangi Hippolite | Neutral |
| 31481 Mrs Lucy Harrhy | Neutral |
| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | Neutral |
| 31505 Cheryl Heten | Neutral |
| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | Neutral |
| | |

| 31529 Mr Steven King-Turner | Neutral |
|-------------------------------|---------|
| 31549 Mr Ian McComb | Neutral |
| 31551 Mrs Jo Kitchen | Neutral |
| 31558 Mr Steve Jordan | Neutral |
| 31574 Mr David Bolton | Neutral |
| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | Neutral |
| 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz | Neutral |
| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | Neutral |
| 31604 Mr Peter Moot | Neutral |
| 31614 Mr mark Morris | Neutral |
| 31622 Peter Butler | Neutral |
| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | Neutral |
| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | Neutral |
| 31637 Ms Frances Kemble Welch | Neutral |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | Neutral |
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | Neutral |
| 31647 Mrs Rebecca Parish | Neutral |
| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | Neutral |
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | Neutral |
| 31659 Mr Steven Parker | Neutral |
| 31674 Mr Steve Malcolm | Neutral |
| 31683 Richard Davies | Neutral |
| 31684 Mr Paul McIntosh | Neutral |
| 31687 Mr Michael Mokhtar | Neutral |
| 31688 Gerard McDonnell | Neutral |
| | |

| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | Neutral |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 31692 Mr Alasdair Gardiner | Neutral |
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | Neutral |
| 31716 Mr Alan hart | Neutral |
| 31722 Trevor Chang | Neutral |
| 31726 Mr John Jackson | Neutral |
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | Neutral |
| 31745 Mrs Johanna Markert- Watene | Neutral |
| 31752 Jill Pearson | Neutral |
| 31765 Mrs Lorna Ivy Cooper | Neutral |
| 31769 Ms Jo Gould | Neutral |
| 31771 Colleen Shaw | Neutral |
| 31775 Dr Thomas Carl | Neutral |
| 31801 Joan Skurr | Neutral |
| 31815 Peter Wilks | Neutral |
| 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | Strongly agree |
| 31226 Mr Dylan Menzies | Strongly agree |
| 31552 Mrs Rowena Smith | Strongly agree |
| 31279 Mr Jeremy Thompson | Strongly disagree |
| 31334 Diane Sutherland | Strongly disagree |
| 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | Strongly |
| | |

| | disagree |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|
| 31345 Ms Margaret Brewster | Strongly disagree |
| 31346 Martin Hartman | Strongly disagree |
| 31349 Laurien Heijs | Strongly disagree |
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | Strongly disagree |
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | Strongly disagree |
| 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann | Strongly disagree |
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle | Strongly disagree |
| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling | Strongly disagree |
| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling | Strongly disagree |
| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | Strongly disagree |
| 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | Strongly disagree |
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | Strongly disagree |
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | Strongly disagree |
| 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | Strongly disagree |
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | Strongly |
| | |

| | disagree |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | Strongly disagree |
| 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | Strongly disagree |
| 31593 Mr William Samuels | Strongly disagree |
| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | Strongly disagree |
| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | Strongly disagree |
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | Strongly disagree |
| 31608 Robbie Thomson | Strongly disagree |
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | Strongly disagree |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | Strongly disagree |
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | Strongly disagree |
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | Strongly disagree |
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | Strongly disagree |
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | Strongly disagree |
| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | Strongly disagree |
| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | Strongly |
| | |

| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | disagree Strongly disagree Strongly |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| | disagree Strongly |
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | |
| | disagree |
| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | Strongly disagree |
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | Strongly disagree |
| 31763 Susan Rogers | Strongly disagree |
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | Strongly disagree |
| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | Strongly disagree |

| growth needs for these to | | Takaka ranuiras an ingraasad ranga of rasidantial and must rasidantial davida masat sites the mississistant |
|---------------------------|-----|--|
| 31111 Mr Tony Reilly | N/A | Takaka requires an increased range of residential and rural residential development sites than indicated. Non productive land on Burnside Road should be considered for Rural Residential zoning. Iwi supported this area in 1995 Environment Court hearings and no historic lwi sites are included. This is contrary to page 81 of the Technical Report and no new evidence has been provided. This site is close to Takaka, on a main road with a cycleway, keeping a low carbon footprint. The very values that I understand TDC are trying to implement! |
| 31117 Mrs Miriam Lynh | N/A | As mentioned above, I strongly oppose the development of the block of land T136 set out in the draft FDS. Significant upgrades will be required to both roading and services to develop this property. There are absolutely no services, no water, no sewerage in that block. It will be an incredibly expensive undertaking and I believe there are better options available to the council. As the FDS states, this block is not required to meet the needs of housing requirements for the region and it will exceed the council's requirements. There is no public transport in the area and the development of this site will increase GHG emissions. |
| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | N/A | T139 although zoned residential many years ago is actually a natural drainage area and in normal heavy rain (not a flood event) becomes a large lake. This needs to be changed from its residential zoning to preferably to a wildlife reserve |
| 31210 Mr Tim Rhodes | N/A | See attached. Summarised: Takaka - Social housing is needed in Golden Bay. Collingwood residential rezoning near the school and McDonald place is a good option. Parapara - I do not favour the Parapara Valley Rural Residential zoning. |
| 31216 Ms Judith Holmes | N/A | Mapua areaNO growth! |
| 31219 Mrs kate windle | N/A | I cant believe you dont have Golden bay in its own section and youve put it in with Brightwater and St Arnaud? Golden bay is booming and we need areas to grow. We are builders but no sections for people to build on?? Come on TDC |
| 31227 Ms Lee Eliott | N/A | intensification is sensible within the current town boundaries. |
| 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | N/A | Let the residents tell you what THEY want. Meanwhile, educate them about the upsides AND the downsides of your proposals. |
| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | N/A | Residents of Nelson and Richmond cities/towns need a lot more information and knowledge about development in these areas, and about current residents' views on this, before we can make informed comment. |
| 31244 Mrs Avalon Walker | N/A | We will be moving to Murchison from Australia this year and support the release/changes to rural residential land development in the area. We are wanting to buy land and build a home. My husband has |

| | | a wealth of knowledge in the building/construction and glass industry to offer the area. We have not been able to find suitable land on which to build and look forward the the coming availability of residential rural property. |
|---|-----|--|
| 31250 Mr Richard Wyles | N/A | The answer to the housing crisis in Takaka shouldn't be to create new zones further away such as Rangihaeta. There needs to be more urban development in and around Takaka. A low density eco-villago at 89 Abel Tasman Drive offers that opportunity. |
| 31261 Mr John Weston | N/A | Sea Level rise in Collingwood and Takaka. |
| 31279 Mr Jeremy Thompson | N/A | Answer 3 |
| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | N/A | See attachment. Summarised below: |
| | | objects to T163 - local rural character, flood-prone area, does not support low-income housing in centre of Takaka, native biodiversity. |
| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | N/A | No more growth. Finite planet alert |
| 31309 Mr & Mrs Rose & Phillip Windle | N/A | See attached. Summarised below: |
| | | Growth sites in Takaka. It seems a waste of money on TDC's account to go ahead with this rezoning |
| | | proposal without consulting land owners first. |
| | | T 143 is proposed as residential. This area is flood prone. The land is also land locked. |
| | | T 145 proposed as business area. Situated in the centre of a productive dairy farm and the area has at least 5 known sink holes. |
| | | T 144 proposed for residential development. We suggest an area joining on from Greenways subdivision would be more suitable. We request consultation regarding boundaries. |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | N/A | Growth in rural areas should be standard residential plus large lot. |
| 31334 Diane Sutherland | N/A | Growth should ONLY be enabled through intensification and in both |
| | | existing town centres and existing rural towns, balancing housing |
| | | with jobs - otherwise people will only end up having to |
| | | commute long distances. |
| | | We do need to recognize the needs of other members of our communities |
| | | eg retired people that are looking to downscale. Some intensification |
| | | targeted at those people is necessary. |
| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | N/A | Less growth in Mapua, more instensive growth in Mouteka, Richmond & Nelson |
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | N/A | I think there is more need for stand-alone rural housing in places like Ngatimoti. We live on approximate |
| | | |

| | | 6 hectares and would love to subdivide to provide housing opportunities for our kids and other people. Land is so expensive here and rare as hen's teeth. We and others would love to see our community grow and prosper. We have planted over 23,000 natives, created wetlands and been a part of this community for 27 years. There is a church and primary school near by and over 20 houses within a 500 metre radius Sure, we may not tick all the boxes but tell me a site that does. Give us a chance to help make the area more vibrant. Steve Anderson and Kath Nauta 1928056306 valuation number |
|------------------------------|-----|--|
| 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | N/A | We need to look at providing space for eco-friendly TINY HOUSE developments so young couples can afford to live here and own a home. |
| | | Growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance housing with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only end up having to commute long distances. We also need to recognise the needs of other members of our communities such as retired people that are looking to downscale. So some intensification targeted at those needs would be acceptable. |
| 31346 Martin Hartman | N/A | Growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance housing with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only end up having to commute long distances. We also need to recognise the needs of other members of our communities such as retired people that are looking to downscale. So some intensification targeted at those needs would be acceptable. |
| 31347 Ms Paula Baldwin | N/A | Don't know enough about the existing to comment. |
| 31349 Laurien Heijs | N/A | Endorse NelsonTasman2050 submission. |
| 31357 Paul & Hazel Taylor | N/A | see attached. Summarised - If TDC proceeds with T-163, we ask that a portion of that property that resides between 7 Fraser Road (our property) and 27 Fraser Road be excluded from any development. We also ask for no vehicle entry from Fraser Road to be allowed. |
| 31363 Mr Steve Cross | N/A | I reject the premise of questions 34-39 |
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | N/A | If you want growth in the smaller towns, then each area will need services etc so the need for transport isn't necessary. Look to Canberra in Australia where they have small towns each able to service the people with shops and Health services. |
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | N/A | Generally, growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns |
| | | |

| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | N/A | |
|-----------------------------|-----|--|
| 31377 Mr Lutz Totzauer | N/A | I disagree because I am against the idea of getting 50 new houses at site T-163 Rangihaeata/ 42 Keoghan Road in Takaka as this location is right next to our lifestyle block. |
| 31385 Mr Gordon Hampson | N/A | Need the ability to build more legal movable dwellings on rural land to give flexibility to cater for future trends. |
| 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann | N/A | I find these arguments quite logical and correct: "Generally, growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance housing with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only end up having to commute long distances. We also need to recognise the needs of other members of our communities such as retired people that are looking to downscale. So some intensification targeted at those needs would be acceptable." |
| 31399 Mr Rick Cosslett | N/A | Keoghan Road newar Takaka Totally unsuitable. Proposed land has ONL status. Development would damage the estuarine environment. To far from residential services infrastructure. Services would have to be built from the ground up. |
| 31400 Miss Heather Wallace | N/A | Keoghan Road totally inappropriate. ONL Status estuarine, sloped and needs plant and roading which will pollute estray. Loss of habitat for at risk species, too far from facilities. |
| 31401 Mrs Lesley Kuykendall | N/A | Towns need to grow but intensification should be the first plan not more urban sprawl. |
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle | N/A | Generally, growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance housing with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only end up having to commute long distances. We also need to recognise the needs of other members of our communities such as retired people that are looking to downscale. So some intensification targeted at those needs would be acceptable. |
| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling | N/A | Generally growth should only be enabled through intensification |
| | | |

| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling | N/A | Growth needs to be by intensification and in both existing rural towns and town centres, but itneeds to balance housing with jobs. Retired people want to downsize and remain in their towns.change the approach take a long term view (30 years!!!) avoi sprawling suburbs because enetgycwill become more expensive, resources sparser and we need to live more efficiently. How much growth do we need? Reduce our carbon footprint, |
|------------------------------------|-----|---|
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin | N/A | Large scale urban sprawl should be discouraged. Well designed intensification should be encouraged. |
| 31416 Tim Leyland | N/A | TDCC feel that the estimates of growth in Tapawera are under-estimated. Low cost housing for the young and appropriate housing and services for the elderly are needed. Tapawera would like to balance growth with retention of its open and green character. We feel this does not preclude intensification with smart planning. Tapawera is concerned that it remains unclear where business growth can occur. This needs to be resolved asap. |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | N/A | I think the questions should be "how much productive land can we as district afford yo carve up?, when do we stop the Sprawl? and when is council going to say no further sprawl?. We need to set population maximums that the district can accommodate in the next 30 to 100 years and work backwards from there. |
| 31423 Mr Roger Frost | N/A | T148 (Murchison) is at the very entrance to Murchison on SH6. At this focal point it will say a lot about the character of the town to the travelling public. These uses are typically not particularly visually appealing. Unless very stringent amenity requirements are to be placed on any development it might be better to swap this designation with one of the other residential areas that have been identified, even at the expense of less direct access to SH6. |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas Hollyman | N/A | Hira needs more consideration There are a lot of businesses eg Happy Valley Adventure Park but no extra housing provided for |
| 31430 Muriel Moran | N/A | No comment. |
| 31435 Mr Alan Eggers | N/A | My submission (attached) is based around providing for additional growth area in Spring Grove. Settlement on the fringe of Brightwater (see attachment). Summarised below: |
| | | 42.51 ha at 3, 5, 7 and 65 Higgins Road. Proposed as supports FDS outcomes, well-serviced by PT, provides lifestyle rural res typologies, opportunities for restoration, proximity to Brightwater and Wakefield. |
| | | |

| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn Ball | N/A | Growth for Motueka is very limited ads a centre with already established services and infrastructure Motueka is well provisioned for growth. |
|---------------------------------------|-----|---|
| 31457 Mr J Santa Barbara | N/A | The T-17 area in Motueka is an excellent site for mixed use med density development. There are adjacent sites already zoned rural residential and in development. |
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | N/A | There needs to be an extension of the T-032 Rural re Future Development Area in Pigeon Valley to provide more housing for the extended Wakefield community. |
| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | N/A | All planning for any site/building project HAS to start from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | N/A | Rural should stay rural! The permanent quest for growth and additional income at any costs has already made enough damage on environment. |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | N/A | Rural should stay rural. Concentrate population and businesses in already existing cities. |
| 31479 Mrs Angela Donaldson | N/A | Again, I believe this should be up to residents in these towns to make relevant comments. |
| 31485 Ms Robin Schiff | N/A | Only appropriate if the planning starts from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | N/A | Generally, growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance housing with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only end up having to commute long distances. We also need to recognise the needs of other members of our communities such as retired people that are looking to downscale. So some intensification targeted at those needs would be acceptable. |

| 31488 Annette Starink | N/A | Growth needs to gently expand round or very close to the centre of the rural town |
|--------------------------------|-----|---|
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | N/A | Growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance housing with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only end up having to commute long distances. We also need to recognise the needs of other members of our communities such as retired people that are looking to downscale. So some intensification targeted at those needs would be acceptable. |
| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | N/A | More intensification in existing rural towns |
| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | N/A | I recognise the need for more variety in housing types in Tākaka, specifically to cater for local needs. The recent co-housing project that was approved is a good example of the types and location of developments I support. I don't support any of the proposed greenfield developments for all the reasons pointed out above. If we need more housing here, then what about intensification in Takaka's existing urban area? For all the reasons pointed out above, we don't need more sprawl If we need more housing here, then what about providing for intensification of the existing urban areas? Generally, growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance housing with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only end up having to commute long distances. We also need to recognise the needs of other members of our communities such as retired people that are looking to downscale. So, intensification targeted at those needs would be acceptable. |
| 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | N/A | Generally, growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance housing with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only end up having to commute long distances. We also need to recognise the needs of other members of our communities such as retired people that are looking to downscale. So some intensification targeted at those needs would be acceptable. |
| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless | N/A | Access to a the port at Picton could be helpful here if any industrial type idea was proposed |
| 31500 Ms Suzan Van Wijngaarden | N/A | I think the sites at Rangihaeata are impropriate for growth. Rangihaeata is a nice, small friendly neighbourhood. People know eachother. People walk and bike on Rangihaeata Road. People and children |

| | | walk there with their horses. There is no cycle lane or footpath, so all people use the road. That is impossible if the amount of houses will be more than double. People came to live here in a small friendly community and not to live in a Richmond style suburb from Takaka. Please don't turn Rangihaeata into a new Richmond like suburb. The green infrastructure is also not right for such an expansion of 250 houses. It is already almost too dangerous to bike to Takaka. With more people and more cars, cycling will be impossible. |
|--------------------------------|-----|---|
| 31501 Mr Hijlko Feitsma | N/A | I strongly oppose the rezoning of 42 Keoghan Road, site T163. I also don't like the T140 and T182 developments along the Takaka-Collingwood Highway. I think it is a very bad idea to build houses here. I live at Rangihaeata and I would not like it if Rangihaeata Road became a busy road. I live at Rangihaeata because it is a nice and rural area. Seeing this change into an urban area full of cars would make me very sad. We always do our shopping by bike, which is a scary and dangerous activity along the Takaka-Collingwood Highway. We also have solar panels to reduce our GHG emissions. Seeing more and more cars around us combined with the horrible growth of airtraffic at the local airfield make any effort to do something abou GHG emissions ridiculous. We have developed two wetlands on the land we own and planted more than thousand (local) native trees. We do a lot of rat and stoat trapping to protect the native birds on our land We might as well stop all that and become rich by just destroying everything and subdividing our land, lik the owners of 42 Keoghan Road want to do. When we came to live at our place at Rangihaeata Road, the real estate agent told us that the land was very valuable because it was easy to subdivide. After we bought it, we heard that subdivisions were not possible at Rangihaeata, because of the environmental stress it would cause. We were very happy with that, because we didn't want to subdivide and we love nature. Now it seems that environmental issues aren't important anymore, growth is what is needed. People that want to get rich from subdividing even write that it would be good for the environment and that new inhabitants at the T163 site could travel to town by bike. We have done that for the past 15 years. Without cycle lanes it is very dangerous. I don't think anyone that knows the road from Rangihaeata to Takaka would permit their children to bike to town. |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne | N/A | I don't know what is proposed. |
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | N/A | growth should be enabled through intensification in existing centers balancing housing with jobs. Otherwise people will have to commute. Takaka has good co-housing project that is meeting the demand of single and elderly locals. We need affordable housing for sole mums close to schools and jobs in the first place to raise resilient kids for our future. |
| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | N/A | All sites away from the centres should not be promoted, eg T-048, T-144, T-145, T-163 and T-182 near Takaka. |

| 31512 Ms Jane Murray | N/A | Further to this is the issue of typology. The FDS indicates that managed greenfield expansion will occur in Takaka, Murchison, Tapawera, St Arnaud and in Golden Bay. NMH understands that while there is demand indicated for this, NMH notes an absence of planning for intensification in those towns in terms of smaller lot sizes and smaller properties, and for required infrastructure and community amenity. It is well-understood that rural towns attract people who wish to have larger lot sizes, however given our ageing population, there will be a certain proportion of the population who may wish to downsize because they may not wish to manage large sections but there may not be any 1-2 bedroom houses available to they may be forced to relocate to another town. Smaller houses are usually more affordable and will appeal to people on limited incomes. |
|-------------------------------|-----|--|
| 31523 Ms karen steadman | N/A | Murchison needs more rural residential sites as this sort of property is the most requested. My own property I would be happy to make available a maximum of 5 lots, 4 to the north of Murchison motorhome park and 1 to the south of the park. Secondly residential sites, and thirdly light industrial sites are all so in demand. I can see more area for retail being required as the town grows, along with walk ways and cycle tracks. The road between Hotham street and Chalgrave street needs tar sealing as it is used as one of our town streets and is a access way to our hospital. |
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | N/A | Generally, growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance housing with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only end up having to commute long distances. We also need to recognise the needs of other members of our communities such as retired people looking to downscale. Therefore some intensification targeted at those needs would be acceptable. |
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | N/A | No opinion. That's for existing residents to consider & determine. |
| 31533 Wendy Trevett | N/A | Hira & Tasman Village are more appropriate. |
| 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | N/A | NO - NOT GROWTH - WELLBEING OR OUR COMMUNITIES. YOU ARE ASKING THE WRONG QUESTIONS. |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | N/A | Sorry - haven't spent time researching these towns |
| 31559 Dr Lou Gallagher | N/A | Just keep green space wherever we can, and protect it by conferring conservation status to it. Locals will replant and trap predators with the least amount of encouragement. |
| 31563 Mrs Loretta Anne Hogg | N/A | Yes - growth in these outer regions - Not overdeveloping in Nelson and Richmond. |
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | N/A | Generally, growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance housing with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only end up having to |
| | | |

| | | commute long distances. We also need to recognise the needs of other members of our communities such as retired people that are looking to downscale. So some intensification targeted at those needs would be acceptable. |
|--------------------------|-----|---|
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | N/A | Generally, growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance housing with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only end up having to commute long distances. We also need to recognise the needs of other members of our communities such as retired people that are looking to downscale. So some intensification targeted at those needs would be acceptable. |
| 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart | N/A | Toddler playgrounds are a huge need in these towns, children up to age 6 miss out on being able to play safely at parks and playgrounds |
| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | N/A | As above, for example the development at Bateman Road in Richmond. Build more houses near to existing towns like Richmonddon't try to 'create' new ones in rural areas. Expand the infrastructure we already have around these towns. Another example: rural expansion such as that near Deck Road between Tasman and Ruby Bay is natural progression in a rural environment, low density subject to strict controls with things like underground water tanks, appropriate waste water systems and proper plantation which have no adverse effect on infrastructure. Intensification high density like what is proposed for the other side of Aporo Road is a ridiculous opposite in a rural setting. Support appropriate growth where appropriate yes, but nobody needs crazy large strategies to overcreate it. Rural towns and rural living will cease to be rural towns and rural living. |
| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | N/A | n/a - this is up to the residents of these towns |
| 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | N/A | Growth should only be enabled through intensification in existing town centres - otherwise people will only end up having to commute long distances. We also need to recognise the needs of other members of our communities such as retired people that are looking to downscale. So some intensification targeted at those needs would be acceptable. |
| 31587 Mrs Yuriko Goetz | N/A | Regarding Question 34, I strongly believe that housing plan in Rangihaeata (off the Keoghan Road) is NOT appropriate. There is No proper infrastructures here. We all rely on rain water and no sewage system means we use |
| | | septic tanks which don't work well because of soil/layer here. The worst thing is we can't get ADSL |
| | | |

| | | broadband, even in 2022 in developed country!! |
|------------------------------------|-----|--|
| | | Rangihaeata beach has been dramatically eroded now and it will hugely impact seabirds habitats (such as Penguin and oyster catcher) along the beach and inlet at the end of Keoghan Road. People here love walking with dogs, go running and biking along the road, even on Keoghan Road. Both Rangihaeata Road and Keoghan Road are too narrow and have already enough traffic. I would be very saif I would not be able to walk with my pet safely due to increasing traffic in the near future. I think other locations in Golden Bay would be more appropriate, but not Rangihaeata area. |
| | | Thank you for your consideration. |
| 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | N/A | Generally, growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance housing with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only end up having to commute long distances. We also need to recognise the needs of other members of our communities such as retired people that are looking to downscale. So some intensification targeted at those needs would be acceptable. |
| 31593 Mr William Samuels | N/A | Generally, growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance housing with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only end up having to commute long distances. |
| | | We also need to recognise the needs of other members of our communities such as retired people that are looking to downscale. So some intensification targeted at those needs would be acceptable. |
| 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner | N/A | Generally, growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance housing with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only end up having to commute long distances. We also need to recognise the needs of other members of our communities such as retired people that are looking to downscale. So some intensification targeted at those needs would be acceptable. However, there are beautiful examples how retired people – rather than going into a retirement village could be more engaged with other housing types where applicable. Student residents halls combined with a retired population close to the centres rather than being once again o the outskirts |

| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | N/A | Generally, growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance housing with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only end up having to commute long distances. We also need to recognise the needs of other members of our communities such as retired people that are looking to downscale. So some intensification targeted at those needs would be acceptable. |
|---------------------------|-----|---|
| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | N/A | Generally, growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance housing with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only end up having to commute long distances. We also need to recognise the needs of other members of our communities such as retired people that are looking to downscale. So some intensification targeted at those needs would be acceptable. |
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | N/A | - Takaka - intensification of existing urban area - Murchison - intensification of existing urban area - Collingwood - intensification of existing urban area - St Arnaud - intensification of existing urban area |
| | | Generally, growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance housing with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only end up having to commute long distances. We also need to recognise the needs of other members of our communities such as retired people that are looking to downscale. So some intensification targeted at those needs would be acceptable. |
| 31608 Robbie Thomson | N/A | St Arnaud; There are no business growth sites. This will become a problem The residential areas for St Arnaud show a site in Massey Str belonging to Ngati Apa, and a rural residential site on the Tophose Korere Rd 5km from the Lake. These satellite developments are not hugely successful, being distanced from the town and in this case lacking even the views of Beechill Rise and Alpine Meadows. The St Arnaud Village was originally surveyed into sections based off the existing streets. On the Peninsula the land is now conservation land and would need to be rezoned. The land is covered in second growth scrub, threatens the village as a fire hazard, and is exactly the kind of |

| | | land to "waste" on housing. Services, stormwater and sewage are all easy to extend or manage. This is central to the village and makes sense on many levels. |
|------------------------------|-----|---|
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | N/A | Growth should be in areas where there are jobs nearby |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | N/A | Generally, growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance housing with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only end up having to commute long distances. We also need to recognise the needs of other members of our communities such as retired people that are looking to downscale. So some intensification targeted at those needs would be acceptable. |
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | N/A | Growth needs to be balanced with employment. Intensification in urban and existing town centres needs to be prioritised more |
| 31617 Ms steph jewell | N/A | Qs 34-38, same principles, Grow Up Not Out |
| 31623 Ms Lucy Charlesworth | N/A | I am wary of answering these questions as I cannot be sure of how they will be interpreted. So I will state I do not agree with developing green spaces. These spaces need to be reserved and protected to allow for sustainable biodiversity and for future generations. Intensification within Nelson CBD needs to be a priority. I do not agrees with building on Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. I do not agree with housing development on green fields. There is a climate emergency. Remove these areas from the FDS. |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | N/A | C/o- NT2050 Generally, growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance housing with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only end up having to commute long distances. We also need to recognise the needs of other members of our communities such as retired people that are looking to downscale. So some intensification targeted at those needs would be acceptable. |
| 31636 Joanna Santa Barbara | N/A | St Arnaud T195 is very close to the Alpine fault line, and T181 is not much further away, and may be subjected to a fire hazard from the surrounding kanuka forest. Neither of these properties should be developed. |
| 31638 Mr steve parker | N/A | As above |
| 31642 Mr Luke Jacobsen | N/A | I am in agreement that we need more housing outside of the flood area of Takaka township. |
| | | |

| | | I feel Rangihaeta is a good area for this, however the impact to my property would be extensive. My property of 262 Takaka-Collingwood Highway would be adversely affected by the scale of this development on the other side of state highway 60. This would deem it much more difficult to farm. I feel a rezoning for my land is also necessary and 250 sections spread across all 3 properties and a mixture of larger lifestyle blocks and sections to be more appropriate. I feel my property which sits between T 140 and site T 163 of the FDS has areas that should be considered for housing. Under this proposal the land would no longer be suitable to be zoned as a rural 1 property it is of small size and not highly productive desirable land, being very poor pakihi soil It is high imput to keep it producing efficiently and economically. It needs seriously considering in conjunction with T 140 and T163. I have attached a plan with some considerations to be put to this proposal - NO ATTACHMENT FOUND. |
|-------------------------|-----|--|
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | N/A | I am not an expert and able to comment everything. Please listen to Joni Tomsett or Tim Neubauer. I think they represent my ideas. |
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | N/A | Generally, growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance housing with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only end up having to commute long distances. We also need to recognise the needs of other members of our communities such as retired people that are looking to downscale. So some intensification targeted at those needs would be acceptable. |
| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | N/A | In general I believe that future growth should only be in areas that are not naturally important or high productive land. |
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | N/A | see site specific comment in the attached submission. Appendix 1 of submission details growth sites along the SHs and how these may affect the network quite specific comments at a safety level, broad level support for intensification sites. |
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies | N/A | Generally, growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance housing with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only end up having to commute long distances. We also need to recognise the needs of other members of our communities such as retired people that are looking to downscale. So some intensification targeted at those needs would be acceptable. |
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | N/A | All growth in these tiny settlements should be very close to the main street and should only extend to 2-3 |
| | | |

| | | story buildings |
|--------------------------------|-----|--|
| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | N/A | Generally, growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance housing with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only end up having to commute long distances. We also need to recognise the needs of other members of our communities such as retired people that are looking to downscale. So some intensification targeted at those needs would be acceptable. |
| 31673 Mike Drake | N/A | Again. Repeating myself we need to grow such that we create an integrated environment. No point in housing people in one place and jobs in another. Minimise commuter traffic and make it tedious to commute. |
| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | N/A | Generally, growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance housing with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only end up having to commute long distances. We also need to recognise the needs of other members of our communities such as retired people that are looking to downscale. So some intensification targeted at those needs would be acceptable. |
| 31679 TR Carmichael | N/A | I have indicated this so far. |
| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | N/A | Hira should be prioritised over the Maitai Valley. |
| 31683 Richard Davies | N/A | Takaka is a "hollow" small town with large paddocks within the triangle of its three main streets. Intensification should take place there. |
| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | N/A | There needs to be business growth to support areas that don't have their own employment opportunities Community centred development close to the centres and intesified with any new housing only developed to support the employment growth and intensified near the businesses. |
| 31690 Mr Norman Matthews | N/A | Area T163 doesn't align with FDS Not an urban area Not close to facilities and services No infrastructure On productive land |
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | N/A | None |
| 31693 Carolyn Rose | N/A | As an owner of these two proposed zoning changes, I am in support of the changes proposed at T-140 and T-182. The rest - it has to go somewhere so long as landowners are in agreement. |

| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach N/A Within the "two mile" block and the land next to that up the slope into the Marakitoki Valley. Towards Walnut Tree Farm, no further. We recommend that the area shaded in purple, in the image to the left, be included in the Rural Residential (RR) Zone, for the reasons as follows: This area is adjacent to the existing community of Mapua, allowing for land intensification close to services. It adjoins existing Rural Residential zoned land. Good access to SH60 thru existing roading on Gardner Valley, Stagecoach, and Tasman View Roads. The soil quality is very poor, this is former forestry ground, and does not support cultivation. The terrain is primarily rolling to steep, which also does not support high-value agricultural activity. RR land is proposed to be converted to higher land intensity in the general area to the Bay side of SH60, so this could serve as a suitable replacement. We recommend that the area shaded in solid blue, in the image to the left, be included in the Residential Zone contemplated for land along Seaton Valley Road (Mapua) are being proposed for intensification, which would thus require water and wastewater reticulation services be established along Seaton Valley Road. It would seem the portion of land to the North and East of Dawson Road, shaded in Blue color, could connect to these reticulation services with minimal cost, due to the higher elevation over Seaton Valley, allowing gravity to transport all wastewater to areas being established for reticulated services. This (shaded blue) area along Dawson Road is currently Rural Residential. However, with the adoption of Plan Change 60, there have been a number of approved ad-hot subdivisions on Dawson Road, with some allotments as small as 0.35 Ha. There is clearly need, pressure, and acceptance by TDC that higher density is already deemed appropriate for this area. Loss of any Rural Residential (RR) can be offset by new RR zone/s just on the other side of SH60 nearby to Mapua. SEC ATTACHMENT. Summarised - new s | 31695 Christine Horner | N/A | More open minded consideration for subdivision. Present proposed residential is very specific. Why?? |
|--|---------------------------|-----|--|
| in the image to the left, be included in the Rural Residential (RR) Zone, for the reasons as follows: This area is adjacent to the existing community of Mapua, allowing for land intensification close to services. It adjoins existing Rural Residential zoned land. Good access to SH60 thru existing roading on Gardner Valley, Stagecoach, and Tasman View Roads. The soil quality is very poor, this is former forestry ground, and does not support cultivation. The terrain is primarily rolling to steep, which also does not support high-value agricultural activity. RR land is proposed to be converted to higher land intensity in the general area to the Bay side of SH60 so this could serve as a suitable replacement. We recommend that the area shaded in solid blue, in the image to the left, be included in the Residential Zone contemplated for land along Seaton Valley and Mapua Drive, for the reasons as follows: Areas along Seaton Valley Road (Mapua) are being proposed for intensification, which would thus require water and wastewater reticulation services be established along Seaton Valley Road. It would seem the portion of land to the North and East of Dawson Road, shaded in Blue color, could connect to these reticulation services with minimal cost, due to the higher elevation over Seaton Valley, allowing gravity to transport all wastewater to areas being established for reticulated services. This (shaded blue) area along Dawson Road is currently Rural Residential. However, with the adoption of Plan Change 60, there have been a number of approved ad-hoc subdivisions on Dawson Road, with some allotments as small as 0.35 Ha. There is clearly need, pressure, and acceptance by TDC that higher density is already deemed appropriate for this area. Loss of any Rural Residential (RR) can be offset by new RR zone/s just on the other side of SH60 hearby to Mapua. | 31697 Robert King-Tenison | N/A | \cdot |
| | | N/A | We recommend that the area shaded in purple, in the image to the left, be included in the Rural Residential (RR) Zone, for the reasons as follows: This area is adjacent to the existing community of Mapua, allowing for land intensification close to services. It adjoins existing Rural Residential zoned land. Good access to SH60 thru existing roading on Gardner Valley, Stagecoach, and Tasman View Roads. The soil quality is very poor, this is former forestry ground, and does not support cultivation. The terrain is primarily rolling to steep, which also does not support high-value agricultural activity. RR land is proposed to be converted to higher land intensity in the general area to the Bay side of SH60 so this could serve as a suitable replacement. We recommend that the area shaded in solid blue, in the image to the left, be included in the Residential Zone contemplated for land along Seaton Valley and Mapua Drive, for the reasons as follows: Areas along Seaton Valley Road (Mapua) are being proposed for intensification, which would thus require water and wastewater reticulation services be established along Seaton Valley Road. It would seem the portion of land to the North and East of Dawson Road, shaded in Blue color, could connect to these reticulation services with minimal cost, due to the higher elevation over Seaton Valley, allowing gravity to transport all wastewater to areas being established for reticulated services. This (shaded blue) area along Dawson Road is currently Rural Residential. However, with the adoption of Plan Change 60, there have been a number of approved ad-hoc subdivisions on Dawson Road, with some allotments as small as 0.35 Ha. There is clearly need, pressure, and acceptance by TDC that higher density is already deemed appropriate for this area. Loss of any Rural Residential (RR) can be offset by new RR zone/s |
| | | | |

| | | are happy towns with relaxed people, a sense of security for parents for their children to walk bike to school to create new work get to work with easy access to parks with community gardens for a cohesive thriving community. |
|----------------------------|-----|---|
| 31711 Sara Flintoff | N/A | Lifestyle blocks, Residential, Light Industrial. |
| 31712 Caroline Blommaert | N/A | Residential growth in Murchison. |
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | N/A | See attached submission. Summarised - Future development of T139 is supported but should not give rise to reverse sensitivity issues. |
| 31717 Mr Frank Ryan | N/A | Although i do not disagree with the need for more housing areas i do not area with the proposed light commercial area shown on the plans for the Murchison area. It is totally separate from the existing commercial area located on the western side of the town. People travelling south from the top of the south after travelling through national park areas do not want to come across a commercial activity area as they enter the town. The definition of commercial could mean any business from spray painting to car wreckers. There are also a number of residential properties with young children in the area that would be affected by some commercial activities. |
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | N/A | Generally, growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance housing with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only end up having to commute long distances. We also need to recognise the needs of other members of our communities such as retired people that are looking to downscale. So some intensification targeted at those needs would be acceptable. |
| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | N/A | Not answering any of these leading questions |
| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | N/A | Generally, growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance housing with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only end up having to commute long distances. We also need to recognise the needs of other members of our communities such as retired people that are looking to downscale. So some intensification targeted at those needs would be acceptable. |
| 31730 Ms Sandy Armstrong | N/A | Obviously I'm opposed to the proposed rezoning in Fairfax Street, Murchison as it directly impacts my lifestyle and, to me greatly reduces the value of my home. My partner and I bought this home for its quiet, rural outlook which, under the proposal would disappear. I am aware that there is some need for |

| | | growth in Murchison, but given that the towns unique beauty will be compromised by any new growth I would like to see strict rules on how and where this growth is to happen. I am particularly concerned that new housing will resemble any new suburbs in our cities, with ugly ticky-tacky houses tightly packed together. I am also concerned that the established trees in Kiwi Park will be removed for housing and the town will lose an amenity that is a true asset to the town and which supports a good variety of native fauna. Many people in the town are unaware of the proposed changes and community engagement has been poor with no community meetings taking place. Community meetings allow all people to bounce ideas around, not just the greedy, self-interested few. What hasn't been addressed is the need for self-care housing for our elders and medical and school services for the proposed increased population. I don believe that Murchison requires an extra 250 new homes and that the area in Hotham Street would be sufficient for the required growth with minimal impact on the towns aesthetics. |
|---|-----|---|
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | N/A | Generally, growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance housing with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only end up having to commute long distances. We also need to recognise the needs of other members of our communities such as retired people that are looking to downscale. So some intensification targeted at those needs would be acceptable. |
| 31734 Eric Thomas | N/A | The growth situation in this area in general v. good not bits and bobs. Utilize infrastructure there as upgrades needed restricted to part of area now. Also create "growth community" within our township and provide for future now. |
| 31748 Jo Brooks | N/A | Any site a family could build a home on is a good site. Other towns are 100km away. My concerns is Murchison and lack of homes. |
| 31754 Ms Joanna Hopkinson | N/A | in Murchison it is crucial rezoning occur + land freed to create lifestyle blocks to attract professionals the town is in a need of, also smaller blocks for smaller homes for families of workers for the new, Innovative businesses in town and commercial sites plumbers + other tradespeople, also sorely needed. |
| 31756 Ronald Alfred & Phylis Kinzett | N/A | All sites in Murchison |
| 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | N/A | Upper Moutere: a great community which addtional families would like to join. 1308 Moutere Highway should be rezoned to residential |
| | | Belgrove: southern side of Pretty Bridge Valley Road should be rezoned to rural residential |

| | | Tapawera: T-157, at base of hill. Not ideal for healthy homes. Eastern side of Tapawera Sports Grounds would be better |
|--|-----|---|
| | | 79 Main Road Tapawera should be rezoned to Residential, along with paddock south of 37 Main Road Tapawera |
| | | Tapawera: T-192, should be located beside Tapawera Township to create a inclusive township and minimise travel between work and home (GHG) |
| | | St Arnaud: with more people working from home, additional residential land should be zoned beside the township |
| | | Tophouse: 3177 Korere - Tophouse Road (southern side of T-181) should be included in the rezoning to Rural Residential. This property has low quality soils and wetlands that can be protected / enhanced, plus has minimal visual impact from the road |
| 31761 Karen Steadman | N/A | Rural residential is the most requested - in Murchison followed by residential. My property I would propose - up to 5A lots (Rural residential) |
| 31763 Susan Rogers | N/A | Survey is flawed from the beginning. You need to redesign this entire line of questioning. It leads only to answers desired by the maker of the survey. |
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | N/A | Generally, growth should only be enabled through intensification and in both existing town centres and existing rural towns, but it needs to balance housing with jobs. If there are no local jobs then there should be no new houses, but business opportunities instead - otherwise people will only end up having to commute long distances. We also need to recognise the needs of other members of our communities such as retired people that are looking to downscale. So some intensification targeted at those needs would be acceptable. |
| 31779 Mrs Julie Sherratt | N/A | Dodson Road, Takaka specifically - land owners should not be restricted by the inappropriate zoning of this land for primary production. The land is very productive, but there are now too many houses here already for the noise and chemical application associated with primary production. The blocks of land especially on the S Highway side of the road are small and very few animals can be grazed there. Horticulture would not be welcomed by the residents as the houses are in close proximity to the land. It would be better to give residents the option of infilling this land with housing as with nearby Park Ave an the proposal for Pages Road. |
| 31786 Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | N/A | Residential growth must be limited to areas close to employment. |
| 31788 Mr Roderick J King | N/A | St Arnaud is more a holiday resort the detour during Kaikoura earthquake SH1 restoration was temporary |

| 31791 Peter Olorenshaw | N/A | Please see attached for further detail - refer to Q 34-38 |
|-------------------------------|-----|--|
| 31800 Helen & Graham Phillips | N/A | I am opposed to any housing development on site T163 at 42 Keoghan Road. |
| 31801 Joan Skurr | N/A | If there is creation of employment then I agree that intensification should be planned in each small town. Think ahead 30 years to cut down on infrastructure costs, and carbon emissions. |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | N/A | Growth, progress and developments are indefinable and misleading terms. Refer to "change" which must result in Net Enduring Restorative Outcomes. |

40 Is there anything else you think is important to include to guide growth in Nelson and Tasman over the next 30 years? Is there anything you think we have missed? Do you have any other feedback?

| 31098 Ms Ella Mowat | N/A | Climate change provisions- where are coastal settlements going to move to? |
|-------------------------|-----|--|
| 31112 Mr Alvin Bartley | N/A | North Nelson has been excluded from any planning?? |
| | | Transport is going to cripple this beautiful part of the region. A hub needs to be formalised with more options for community through public space, cafes, housing etc. |
| 31114 Ms Jill Rogers | N/A | Apartments are a good choice in town areas but in all developments green spaces and places for children to play and community to congregate are a must. I know of no-one in Taman village who has expressed a willingness of develop - (perhaps you are referring to the developer) At present people visit Tasman village and Mapua as part of a cycle tour or picnic on rabbit island - these areas are currently at capacity in summer but space enough for all - if development goes ahead as suggested it will become another sprawl an no longer be a village - It must keep its current rural status - there have been hundreds of houses built just outside Mapua over the last few years - that the capacity |
| 31115 Mr DAVID ROGERS | N/A | BACK TO THAT BASIC QUESTIONWHY IS THE COUNCIL SO ORIENTATED TO GROWTHPRESERVE AND IMPROVE WHAT YOU HAVE DONT RUIN THE REGION BY LARGE SCALE URBAN AND RESIDENTIAL GROWTHIT ISNT NEEDED. |
| 31129 Mrs Gaynor Brooks | N/A | Planning should allow less restrictive allotment sizes for Rural 2 land 50 ha +, (see Nelson and other districts), to take pressure off building on our most fertile land. The Emission Trading Scheme is also going to be a factor in Rural land use going forward. |
| 31130 Trevor James | N/A | THis FDS is a very important thing to get right and we will need to get the right economic instruments to allow the intensification to happen. We need to show to the community that intensive housing can be really nice to live in, if done right. There are too many examples of older 1000-1500m2 sections jammed full of units and no where near any parks. This is not good for establishing a vibrant community. |
| 31134 Mr Martin Hudson | N/A | Please see response to Question 12. |
| 31142 Mr Robin Whalley | N/A | Planners need to get out more . Look at Prague , Annecy, Australian towns in similar geographic position. We have a fantastic opportunity before our eyes. Hidden in full view. |
| 31146 Mr Henry Wilson | N/A | Please see attached (text copied below): |
| | | To All Councillors at NCC. As a resident of Nile Street East I have serious concerns about the overall effect of the (proposal) to |

establish a large

scale residential subdivision in Kaka Valley. I am also very concerned that you appear to be ignoring the clear message

from residents in the area, and wider affield, who are opposed to this proposal.

I am fully cognisant of the wider picture and both sides of the story, but the obvious negatives associated with such a

development are considerable, and represent irreversible damage to the environment and the social fabric of the Maitai

community and greater Nelson. As was demonstrated through the petition, a great many Nelson people wish to

preserve the area in its current state. International studies have shown catergorically that such green spaces adjacent to

cities are of enormous value both recreationally and for the mental health of communities. Once you forfiet this

resource, you can never regain or replace it. I suggest thatt Councillors revisit stated resposibilities to Social Cohesion in

the community when considering decisions relating to this conflict.

NEGATIVES ASSOCIATED WITH THE KAKA SUBDIVISION>

A huge increase in traffic on an already busy Nile Street.

 $Noise\ pollution\ from\ several\ hundred\ weedeaters,\ lawnmowers,\ leaf\ blowers,\ and\ other\ machinery.$

Water quality compromised by runoff from roading, construction, use of domestic chemicals.

Noise pollution from trade associated machinery and vehicles using Nile Street over many years.

The loss of an intrinsic quality of life for local residents and all others who visit for very valid reasons.

Please engage 'real' ethical thinking, and your concience's when contemplating that, in this scenario construction

actually equates to 'destruction.'

Sincerely.

Counsellor Henry Wilson – BappSocSci(Co) - NZAC

31147 Janene Taylor

N/A

Please see attached (text copied below)

To Counsellors of Nelson City Council,

Re: Matai zoning and housing development.

This is my formal feedback to the 2022 Nelson Tasman Future Development strategy.

I oppose any Greenfield housing development within the Maitai Valley, especially but not limited to Kaka valley and

| | | Orchard Flats. |
|------------------------|------|---|
| | | The public opinions of the residents of Nelson, the many thousand petitions from the people of Nelson should be your |
| | | guideline for following your duty to we, your ratepayers. |
| | | Council staff are employed to look ahead to our sustainable future and protect our natural assets. I do no believe you |
| | | have this true guideline in operation and are instead being influenced by big funders, such as land developers and are |
| | | thus allowing 'right action' to take second place to corruption. |
| | | The Maitai land and river cannot speak for itself. It is arguably one of Nelson's best natural rural assets and should be |
| | | protected from urban development. |
| | | Please acknowledge that my letter has been forwarded to all representatives of Council and especially those who sit in |
| | | high seats that have the power to sway decisions. |
| | | Kind regards, |
| | | Janene |
| 31148 Annette Le Cren | NI/A | Places are attached (toyt conicd holow). |
| 31148 Annette Le Cren | N/A | Please see attached (text copied below): |
| | | No, I don't want more green field development in the Kaka tributary or Orchard Flats. Leave that land alone, as some of that land is flood prone, totally unsuitable for housing and much is |
| | | taking away |
| | | = |
| | | valuable land for recreational use and as a natural resource. |
| | | = |
| 31150 Jo Ann Firestone | N/A | valuable land for recreational use and as a natural resource. |
| 31150 Jo Ann Firestone | N/A | valuable land for recreational use and as a natural resource. When the land has gone, it's gone forever. Please see attached. Text copied below: |
| 31150 Jo Ann Firestone | N/A | valuable land for recreational use and as a natural resource. When the land has gone, it's gone forever. Please see attached. Text copied below: I am opposed to any housing development in the Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats area of the Maitai Valley. |
| 31150 Jo Ann Firestone | N/A | valuable land for recreational use and as a natural resource. When the land has gone, it's gone forever. Please see attached. Text copied below: I am opposed to any housing development in the Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats area of the Maitai Valley. Had the 2019 Future Growth literature clearly identified this section of the Maitai Valley as an area of |
| 31150 Jo Ann Firestone | N/A | valuable land for recreational use and as a natural resource. When the land has gone, it's gone forever. Please see attached. Text copied below: I am opposed to any housing development in the Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats area of the Maitai Valley |
| 31150 Jo Ann Firestone | N/A | valuable land for recreational use and as a natural resource. When the land has gone, it's gone forever. Please see attached. Text copied below: I am opposed to any housing development in the Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats area of the Maitai Valley. Had the 2019 Future Growth literature clearly identified this section of the Maitai Valley as an area of |

| | | Best Regards, |
|------------------------|-----|---|
| | | Jo Ann Firestone Couch Stories Co-creator Producer Co-host |
| 31151 Catherine Harper | N/A | Please see attached (text copied below): |
| | | I would like to make it known that I, along with thousands of other Nelsonians, do not wish to see or wan any |
| | | Greenfield expansion housing anywhere in our beautiful Maitai Valley area especially Kaka Valley or Orchard Flats. |
| | | Our last green Valley is precious and necessary for the health of Nelson and its' inhabitants. It is always well used for all |
| | | recreational purposes by all factions of society within the general public. |
| | | More and more the World is coming to the understanding that we need MORE natural, green spaces |
| | | around us not |
| | | LESS!!!!. |
| | | NCC you need to listen to the public. You need to preserve our green spaces not desecrate them. You need to do this |
| | | for our planet, our future generations, all Nelsonians and finally yourselves. |
| | | Do not allow these developments in this beautiful area by encouraging hundreds of houses to be built creating river |
| | | pollution, traffic congestion and the loss of Nelson's jewel in her crown. Too much is at stake and once done can never |
| | | be undone. |
| | | Please do not expand into these precious spaces. |
| | | Kindest regards |
| | | Catherine Harper |
| 31152 Ruth - | N/A | Please see attached. Text copied below: |
| | | I don't want Greenfield expansion housing anywhere in the Maitai Valley, especially Kaka tributary or Orchard Flats. It will be detrimental to the river quality and the peaceful, relaxing area that has been enjoyed by millions of both Nelsonians & probably more importantly, visitors over many years. It is know |

| | | as the lungs of Nelson and should remain so. I am aware that more housing is needed but surely areas like Hira would have a lesser impact. Sincerely, Ruth |
|---------------------|-----|--|
| 31153 Fionna Heiton | N/A | Please see attached. Text copied below: |
| | | I am writing to state that I do not want to see development of houses in the Maitai Valley. It is one of Nelson's most treasured green spaces and highly unsuited to housing. It is outrageous that this development has not been stopped until now and I am appalled at the council for ignoring the 1000's of people opposed to it. The run off into the Maitai will affect water quality, there will be air and noise pollution and the houses will be in a flood zone. |
| | | NO from me |
| | | Best regards |
| | | Fionna |
| 31154 Gwen Daly | N/A | Please see attached, text copied below: |
| | | To whom it may concern: |
| | | I would like to register my opposition to any greenfield development housing in the Maitai Valley especially Kaka flats. I am happy with the sites ear marked for housing such as Bishopdale and Victory. I don't want Nelson to loose the beauty that currently exists in the Maitai. |
| | | Nga Mihi, |
| | | Gwen (Daly) Ratepayer and part of the Nelson Community |
| 31156 Paul Jonkers | N/A | Please see attached (text copied below): |
| | | To Whom it may concern, In writing to you I would like to express my objection to developing housing in the Maitai Valley. I oppose a major subdivision in the valley, an area that is so intrinsically linked to Nelson because of its |

| | | recreational and amenity value. I value the uninterrupted views from the Centre of NZ looking east to the hills, the ability to walk along the river and enjoy the scenery, the peace. The recreational value of this is so very special, priceless even. * Strategically it makes no sense to build on a floodplain. Even if the ground level is to be raised, this just pushes the flood water onto Brandford Park, the access road for this possible development, and down stream to the city. * The Maitai river is a Nelson icon, NCC has spent years and large amount of funds improving the health of the river to make it swimmable and healthy. Slowly it's getting there. A subdivision with all associated earth works of this magnitude will have a major adverse impact on our taonga. * Many cities around the world are trying to recreate green space which have been lost. There are ample examples of the mental and social benefits of having green spaces close to a city centre. With this I would like you to remove ALL reference to the Maitai, Kaka Valley and Orchard flats from the FDS. Yours Sincerely Paul Jonkers |
|---------------------------|-----|--|
| 31157 Dhara Stuart | N/A | Please see attached. Summarised below: |
| | | -Against placement of housing within the lower reaches of the Maitai ValleyValley should be preserved for future generations - References research on mental health: in short, the enormous amount of data in this area all points to the same conclusion: green spaces scaffold all aspects of community mental health. |
| 31160 Mr Chris Louth | N/A | Please see attached. Text copied below: |
| | | Listen to the wishes of thousands of Nelson residents who do not want to see development in the Kaka and Maitai valleys. Leave them as recreation areas for all to enjoy. Thank You Chris Louth |
| 31171 Ms Sallie Griffiths | N/A | Keep the beauty of Nelson's green areas. Once built on then they are lost forever. Please build up not out |
| 31173 Mr Roderick Watson | N/A | Public transport is key. We live in the Glen and we need 2 cars! If you had a regular bus service that would reduce ghg. Intensify right in centre - build high, not just cute \$1m apartments |
| 31185 Myfanway James | N/A | We believe we need more economic instruments to incentivise intensification. This needs to be planned |
| | | |

| | | and executed well. Bad intensive housing puts people off and we will get more opposition. So we need to demonstrate to the community that intensive housing can be fabulous to live in, if done right. There are too many examples of lots of housing crammed into small sections and no parks for quite a distance. |
|----------------------------|-----|---|
| 31186 Mr Gary Scott | N/A | You could investigate the possibility of constructing apartments/ houses along Rabbit island beach, like Surfers paradise in Australia. Maybe look at tahuna beach as well. I know you wouldn't like to even consider these options but I liken these areas to the Maitai Valley, so if you go ahead with the proposed subdivision there, you must also consider Rabbit island and tahuna beach. Another thing to consider is a carpark building on the corner of Hardy and Rutherford (the Army site) An underpass for pedestrians to get to town center should be part of this plan also. |
| 31189 Ms Marlene Alach | N/A | I will email a photo on o T139 in flood |
| 31193 Mr Dan McGuire | N/A | Please see attached for further details. Summarised - oppose N19 intensification, oppose Maitai Valley, general opposition to entire document. |
| | | The assumptions are mistaken, and examining the development of similar towns overseas during the last 50 years shows why. Why does New Zealand have to repeat the same mistakes? |
| 31196 Ms Alli Jackson | N/A | I think it is ridiculous that you have continued forestry in the Nelson catchment area. This is definitely land that could be better used for housing, especially as forestry has such limited returns and such serious environmental impact. Another backward step by Nelson City Council. |
| 31201 Mr John Hunter Smith | N/A | Please see attached - summarised below: -concerned at the drive by NCC to go ahead with intensive housing in the Maitai Valley. |
| | | - Enviromental impact of the development will be irreversible. |
| | | Large amounts of opposition to the development is being ignored by Council. Suggests to purchase land in Maitai Valley and develop it as a regional park. It is far too precious |
| | | historically, environmentally, and recreationally for Nelson to lose just because a business |
| | | opportunity presented itself to developers, council failed to gauge public opinion, did not listen to those opposed to it, and chose ignorance over the implications of this development. |
| 31204 Mr Jack Bauer | N/A | SEE ATTACHED. Summarised - email chain with Jacqui Deans. |
| | | T-181 is drawn correctly however it has been labelled with the incorrect address. Address needs to change to 3103 Korere Tophouse Road. Incorrect address was referenced in the draft technical FDS document on page 73 and 99, aswell as on page 30 of the draft FDS. |

| 31206 Mrs Bev Brandes- Clatworthy | N/A | SEE ATTACHED. Summarised - concern about Bird Lane junction upgrades and proposed new business area in this location that would create extra traffic. |
|--------------------------------------|-----|--|
| | | During the Wakefield Public Consultation webinar, the panel advised that Bird Lane and the junction into it (near T-108) would be upgraded. Does this include upgrades to lighting, footpaths and the width? From the SH turning right, will there be a proper junction to allow safe turn offs? Will Lord Auckland be coming through onto Bird Lane? How much other traffic would this therefore propose? The HGV are currently coming down Bird Lane at high speed, causing potential safety issues for people coming out of their driveways and children in the area. |
| | | Unsure of what is proposed at the new business area/light industrial area (T-108). 25 Bird Lane is understood to currently be light industrial and has changed in the last year to very big industrial, especially since it has been subdivided. Does not object the big lorries for transporting the homes. The area to the back is very busy and loud, more heavy industrial than light. What hours of business are they allowed to work? Currently having some issues with noise levels with the HGV at night. |
| 31207 Mr Solomon Adler | N/A | Please see attached - (text copied below) |
| | | Hello, |
| | | I am deeply concerned about the ongoing threat of housing development in the Maitai Valley. Thousands of people have repeatedly asked you to not allow mass housing in the Maitai Valley. We have been asking for this since the 2006 Nelson Urban Development Strategy (NUGS). We ask again now, with urgency, to please remove all areas of the Kaka and Maitai River valley allocated for potential housing from the 2022 Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy. This valley is just too precious as a natural recreation area used by thousands of people each year, to be given over to over a thousand houses. |
| | | Sincerely, Solomon Adler |
| 31209 Mr Richard Martin | N/A | See attached. (Text copied below). Thanks for the Heads up on the commercial land available(or lack of it) in Wakefield. On reflection, due to availability and suitability, I would now support the proposed T-108 proposal. I guest transit would require that all access would be required to be off Bird lane. Thanks again for coming back to me. |

| | | Kind Regards Richard martin Ps Thought the meeting Mon evening with the Wakefield Community Council went well |
|------------------------------|-----|---|
| 31210 Mr Tim Rhodes | N/A | See attached. Summarised: 1. East Takaka, and Park terrace are great places for more housing 2. Caroline Roses farm opposite airport would be great for residential development, the land is pakahi and low producing. It has great elevation, water and location near Rangihaeta. Perhaps Kainga-ora/first home residential sections on the flat pakihi terraces and light commercial on the old sawmill site. Big need for social housing in Golden Bay. 3. Parapara Valley elevated bush sites for rural residential would be very expensive to develop with poor access roads and a lot of engineering needed. \$ 1.5million plus to buy and build. Shame to loose |
| | | regenerating bush and manuka 4. Collingwood land near healthpost and school an ideal site for residential on flat elevated pakihi land. |
| 31211 Mrs Alison Pickford | N/A | See attached. Summarised below - PT is essential, support for intensification, opposes the Tasman Village proposal, concern that the councils are looking at climate change in the 'best case' Scenario. Caring for biodiversity, the environment, and adding to protected areas, needs to be high priority. |
| 31215 Mr Glen Parsons | N/A | High value home areas should remain so. Dumping a subdivision next to them isn't right. Townies wanna be townies. Lifestylers chose to be lifestylers. Mixing it is oil and water! |
| 31216 Ms Judith Holmes | N/A | Water tanks for retention of roof water should be mandatory for EVERY building. Solar energy production should be mandatory for EVERY building. Free parking, shelters and trails for bikes should be dramatically increased. Cars should be kept out of inner city streets. More trees (especially natives) should be planted urgently. Electric ferries serving all areas of Tasman Bay should be encouraged. Coastal shipping, especially between Golden Bay and Nelson, should be encouraged. |
| 31218 R.J. & L.K. Fitzgerald | N/A | Please see attached - (Text copied below) |
| | | We strongly object to the rezoning of any of the Maitai. The valley is really the last area anywhere near the city and also the suburbs where families can go for leisure and recreation and it should be protected. Roads along Nile Street, Tory Street, Milton Street are already congested without having further traffic. The drainage and sewerage is already overtaxed. The Maitai river is now a trickle compared to what it used to be and certainly cannot be compromised any more. |

| | | Presumably the majority of the housing to be built will be suited to first home buyers which means another "nappy valley" type of settlement and both St Josephs school and Central school being the only two primary schools on this side of town have already reached maximum student capacity. Clearly these councillors wish to be remembered as the least environmentally conscious of all time. |
|---------------------------------------|-----|---|
| | | R.J. and L.K. Fitzgerald. |
| 31222 Mr Andrew Leighton | N/A | Please see attached (text copied below): |
| | | Kia Ora, |
| | | Please add my name to the list of Nelson residents that are strongly opposed to the rezoning of the Maitz valley. The river will be adversely effected by the addition of the proposed 1100 homes to be built on Greenfield land. That river (and its valleys) is a natural treasure that needs to be protected, not used to make developers wealthy. Putting million dollar homes there will not solve the housing shortage in the Nelson/ Tasman region. This boondoggle will permanently ruin this vital and beautiful area that we all enjoy. Please don't let this happen. |
| | | Thank You for Your Time and Attention |
| | | Andrew Leighton |
| 31225 Mrs Beverley Diane Trengrove | N/A | STOP THE DEVFELOPMET PROPOSED BY MAITAHI BAYVIWE DEVELOPMENMT IN THE KAKA VALLEY , STRECTHING INTO THE MAITAI VALLEY |
| | | Based on: |
| | | - presently a a prime recreational area which would be lost forever if development goes ahead so a few |
| | | can further their wealth |
| | | - increased noise and traffic |
| | | - The area is part of Nelson's history |
| | | a loss of recreational area used by many involved in a variety of activities |

| 31227 Ms Lee Eliott | N/A | With regards to the Tahunanui area specifically, I would strongly recommend intensification within the commercially zoned areas only, to include commercial and residential building up to 20 metres or more high to match current building heights i.e Ocean View apartments. Intensification in this area is sensible as a satelite to Nelson City being on the public transport route, cycleways and footpaths, minimising car usage. |
|-----------------------------|-----|---|
| 31230 Ms Jenny Meadows | N/A | Educate, educate, educate not just the community, but yourselves first. |
| 31231 Mrs Jean Edwards | N/A | YES you've missed completely on residents' opinions re infrastructure growth and development; and missed completely our views on Council spending on these instead of focussing on the need for residentia buildings that are no higher than 2 storeys, as well as focussing on rates relief, climate change issues, the homeless and the poor. |
| 31232 Mrs Margaret Meechang | N/A | Talk with the people. Listen to the locals. Dont let political egos get in the way of developments which add to benefits to the people. ALL people. Cater for the workersmany of whom are increasingly finding it difficult to make their way for our future families. |
| 31245 Mrs Robyn Fitzsimons | N/A | Some of the proposals are taking far too much green space, eg Maitai Valley proposals, with a growing citrit is even more important to retain green, open spaces! Every other city in NZ appears to understand this. Auckland has wonderful Regional parks, large inner city parks, bequeathed parks such as Cornwall Park. Wellington has so much green space, it has its wonderful town belt, even with a shortage of land I don't imagine even in my wildest dreams that Wellington Council would consider building on this. As a city grows these green spaces are imperative to the health and well being of its inhabitants. I ask you to consider just what flat green areas would remain that are accessible to everyone in Nelson if the Maitai becomes another Suburb. There are not any! |
| 31248 Mr Will Bosnich | N/A | Tahunanui should be considered a community unto itself and provide a retail and community sector that encourages local shopping and community interaction and can be accessed by walking. As it stands, Council has encouraged SH6 'strip development' which is vehicle rather than pedestrian focused, and further has not established the retail or community environment or infrastructure necessary to allow locals to interact, shop and meet their needs locally. This is a shameful lack of community planning, and resulted in increased vehicle use and congestion. In addition, the lack of a community shopping & retail sector and community square or 'hub' has resulted in a lack of community interaction and cohesion, and an increase in crime and social isolation which accompanies all such vehicle oriented 'suburbs'. Tahunanui has fantastic potential to be a seaside community but desperately needs Council direction and urban planning to achieve this! |
| 31256 Mr Michael Dover | N/A | Please start listening to the 13,000+ people who have told you clearly, over and over again to stop any subdivisions in the Maitai Valley. Thanks. |
| | | |

| 31258 Mr & Mrs Tristan and Stacey Strange | N/A | As land owners of site T-138 in rototal road. We want to express our support for the proposal and would be keen on the development of our land in the future to support housing in Takaka. We think the land would be well suited being flat and close to schooling etc |
|--|-----|--|
| 31260 Ms Vivien Ann Peters | N/A | Please see attached document - summarised below: opposes Tasman Village given HPL, rural character, covenants, existing consents, infrastructure and public transport servicing difficulties. |
| 31261 Mr John Weston | N/A | Concerned about less land to produce to grow food especially with a rising population. See attached (text copied below): Another major concern I have is that of access in Nelson/Tasman. I refer in particular to road access once the sea level begins to rise. If one looks at 'edge of sea' roads in the region from Manganakau/Papongas all the way to the Glen at Wakapuaka you will see there are many instances where roads will have to be raised ,closed realigned etc. This will be a major cost to infrastructure. Examples Paponga, Pakaurau, Collingwood, Parapance, Waitapu, Riwaka to Marahau, Appleby, Lower Queen Street, Nelson Airport, SH6 from Nelson to the Glen |
| 31262 Mr Martin John Shand | N/A | I object to the thought of 6 storey buildings on both sides of Tahunanui Drive. It would turn residential areas behind such buildings into slums with no market for the houses or land. |
| 31267 Mr Donald Horn | N/A | More protection of agricultural land of all kinds. Once under concrete you can't get it back. |
| 31273 Ms Elizabeth Dooley | N/A | I would like people to be able to live in the city and walk or cycle (or take public transport) to areas of recreation. We need to reduce our reliance on fossil fuels and retain areas of recreation near the city. Pocket parks are a poor apoligy for areas of recreation. We need to be able to stretch our legs by walking the Grampians and the Maitai from safe, comfortable homes in the city. |
| 31274 Mr Nigel WHINNEY | N/A | All this construction and housing will be unsustainable as far as fresh waterprovisions and the removal of waste is concerned. More concrete means a greater demand on storm water disposal. More housing means a greater strain on road infrastructure, air pollution, schools, medical cavities (will the newly proposed hospital rebuild be sufficient to cater for this increase demand?). I feel that there has not been enough information made readily accessible for the public to comment properly. It is being rushed through without face to face consultation. It is a though Councils have already made up their minds and are just going through the motions. |
| 31276 Mr Steve Richards | N/A | Tasman does not need a new town. We need to look to a future that is vastly different from today. While electric may be the future of cars, cars are not the future. The FDS is a wonderful opportunity to imagine a different way of living with groups and communities in closer proximity and cooperation. |
| 31277 Mr Simon Jones | N/A | Take the small area of intensification out of the historic area behind the cathedral. (Brougham, Trafalgar, Bronte) |
| | | |

| 31279 Mr Jeremy Thompson | N/A | The country's Climate Change obligations should be front and centre to determining what business growth can be achieved without increasing the population. |
|---------------------------|-----|--|
| 31281 Mrs Jennifer Bielby | N/A | Impact on tourism, potentially a less attractive place to live and visit, increased greenhouse gases, impact on bio diversity. |
| | | Changes in migration could result in less growth, given Immigration New Zealand have recently removed two major 'residence from work' pathways and reduced work pathways to residence to only those earning 200% median wage. Migrants will not choose NZ if there is no pathway to residence. Returned Kiwis may leave again now covid less of an issue. |
| 31282 Paul & Hazel Taylor | N/A | I was surprised that the plan does not include the relaxation of subdivision restrictions through out rural areas of the district. This would seem a more uniform means of providing additional housing. |
| 31284 Mr Jarmo Saloranta | N/A | SEE ATTACHED: Both my wife and I oppose in the strongest possible terms the idea of a new very large Tasman Village town to be located in the Horton Rd - Aporo Rd area. The Horton Rd - Aporo Rd area was proposed in 2015 as a new location for a very dense housing area with a commercial centre. after a large number of public submissions and several days of public hearings, the decision from Tasman council was to scale back the development to a more suitable scope. This included a significant reduction in the allowable lots and the removal of any commercial centre ideas. There were also numerous other specific conditions imposed on the final approved plans. The Tasman Village town is proposed as a solution that significantly exceeds even an assumed 'very high' population growth from the biggest NZ cities. The best known housing need projection for the Tasman Village area is only 'modest' per 2021 Housing Preferences Survey. The Tasman Village town idea completely understates the considerable challenges of bringing sufficient water to the proposed several hundred dwellings. The council ideas include bringing water from Motueka or Mapua. The construction efforts for such undertakings are massive and would cause years of traffic congestions alone to accommodate the earthworks. The Tasman Village location and surrounding areas cannot handle: a) the massively increased traffic volumes and resulting air pollution, b) increased flooding, c) stormwater management, d) stress on already stretched schools, e) |

| | | The Horton Rd - Aporo Road land is without question productive agricultural land. Finally, the mere thought of one of the often admired beautiful rural landscapes being turned into something resembling Richmond's Lower Queen street is appalling and completely unnecessary. |
|-----------------------------|-----|--|
| 31292 Mr Malcolm Macdonald | N/A | TDC to check that there are no plans underway as part of the new Resource Management Plan to rezone your property commercial and if not, will assess their site against a number of criteria – 96 A, B, C Ellis St and 1A and B Schwass for commercial use as part of the FDS. (wants us to assess this property for commercial use, currently zoned part residential and commercial.) |
| 31293 Mr Richard Osmaston | N/A | www.moneyfreeparty.org.nz Thanks for the survey. Good job guys. |
| 31299 Ms Gillian Gallacher | N/A | I have lived here for almost 40 years and have seen many changes during that time. I have seen some amazing projects that both the councils, DOC, community groups and schools have created especially with the protection and restoration of green space, coastal areas, planting projects, trapping of pests and weed control, walkways, cycleways, wetland projects, beach clean ups, recycling and reuse projects. Both Nelson and Tasman are on the map as a place to see for tourists. Tourism has supported the creative and artistic population, there have been changes in the land and farming practices over the last few decades and the productive land with all the diversity we have in this region is now the sight and flavour of our region. I feel we should so very careful in our future planning of the FDS to not let this disappear in front of our eyes and let it be gone for ever. I believe that to concentrate on keeping the increase of homes and businesses to existing areas and continue to restore and protect the environment (all the greenfields) to respect maintain and enhance the land we all love. |
| | | Thank you for reading my comments |
| 31302 Sylvia Shand | N/A | Please see attached for more detail - summarised: Opposes the proposal of intensification up to 6 storey's high in Tahunanui. References 'the Sands'. Believes it will change the character of the neighborhood. Suggests would need more regular bus services to encourage less car use. |
| 31304 Mr Andrew Talijancich | N/A | See attached. Summarised - opposed to Mapua greenfield intensification growth areas, needs more detail on the proposed growth and concerned about constaints impacting the area. |
| | | It is incumbent on TDC to provide a sufficient and reasoned justification for these proposals. |
| | | Council anticipates future changes to the land use on 49 Stafford Drive. That is low-lying land currently |

| | | Parts of the Mapua/Ruby Bay costal settlement are subject to costal erosion and inundation and also pluvial flooding. |
|---|-----|---|
| | | Any growth plan for Mapua is required to give effect to the NZ coastal policy statement. Rather than intensifying development in areas prone to natural hazards, objective 5 of the NZCPS requires locating new development away from such areas. |
| | | Intensive development of the T-033 and T-042 areas will require considerable earthworks. There is no geotechnical or other information to justify these development controls. |
| | | The need for future planning decisions to be sufficiently adaptable to increasing risk means that a full First Schedule process that is able to reassess future risk assumptions is likely necessary for uplifting any deferred zoning allowing further urban intensification at Mapua. |
| 31307 Elaine Marshall | N/A | Please see attached for further detail: Has provided newspaper articles and a more detailed submission for specific areas as attached. |
| | | Summary of attachment: |
| | | support for smaller houses and more intensive development opposition to greenfield expansion particularly new areas such as Maitai, Tasman Village, Lower |
| | | Moutere - promoting compact urban areas mininmises the need for people to travel by car promotoing the use of public transport, walking and cycling. |
| 31309 Mr & Mrs Rose & Phillip Windle | N/A | A business area would be more suited around Central Takaka, south of the central school and hospital. Now is the time TDC need to be planning infrastructure for the future growth rather than later as we are running behind now. |
| 31310 Mr Patrick Steer | N/A | I have a number of general interrelated concerns on the draft, and then use a specific proposal, close to where we live, to illustrate these. I wish to recognise that the region is growing, but that we need to manage this growth in a way that: |
| | | Maintains the quality of life for all of us who already love to live here; |
| | | Conserves or enhances the environment that sustains us and that we all enjoy; |
| | | Provides affordable housing options; |
| | | Uses local knowledge in a participatory planning process. I think the draft FDS is lacking in these. |
| 31310 Mr Patrick Steer | N/A | I use proposal T-163 Keoghan Road to illustrate this. |
| | | - |

| | | T-163 proposes the development of 50 rural residential dwellings on 26ha of land adjacent to the existing closed rural residential community of Rangihaeata. Each dwelling having 5000m². Whilst this land is not high productive land it has some significant environmental features and issues. Approximately 25% is wetland, which TDC is encouraging landowners to protect. On our adjacent property we do this, it is part of the same ecosystem as T-163 that then links into the Onahau wetland. We have sighted the critically endangered Australasian bittern on our land, and we have always assumed that it has come through T-163 to us. We also have a healthy population of freshwater fish in the small stream that flows through us and then onto T-163. The proposal would impact this wetland. This is an example of local knowledge (as an owner of an adjacent property affected by the proposal I have not been contacted before). It also indicates that the 26ha on a map is more like 15ha that could theoretically be used, possibly less if you include the northern end that is adjacent to the estuary, with its risk of flooding. Rangihaeata beach/Onahau estuary is one of the most rapidly eroding stretches of coastline in Tasman. The above, also raises the issue of how to manage a habitat or ecosystem across multiple landowners. This 15ha of potential development land is directly under the Takaka airport flight way – less than 400m from the runway. Planes would be very close to rooftops. It's a small airport but there are scheduled direct flights to Wellington. Increased usage of the airport is likely in the future. This land is pakihi – and having recently had to install a new septic system into this land, I know that it poses environmental risks and challenges if not undertaken correctly. This risk would be exacerbated if there were many systems close to each other, and close to a wetland. The Rangihaeata community is made up of rural lifestyle blocks, most of which are between 4 and 10 acres. The proposal suggests an intensification |
|-------------------------|-----|---|
| 31311 Wendy Hardwick | N/A | See attached. Summarised - Landowner bordering T163, opposes T163 as a growth site, I am appalled that the first I heard of TDC's FDS was from an entry in the Golden Bay weekly. Was this TDC's way of going behind our backs? I am further appalled at the proposal to develop 50 rural residential dwellings on T-163. This would invade our privacy. the proposal would greatly increase traffic, have a major impact on neighbouring properties and increase noise and pollution levels. Think again TDC. Rangihaeata is not a place to build on, and develop. Please reconsider. In conclusion, I strongly object to this draft proposal. |
| 31315 Jess Currin-Steer | N/A | |

| | | houses on T-163 is not viable. Part of the land is wetland which is unsuitable but also crucial to birdlife and ecosystem. The impact would be significant. Is this a health and safety issue building so close to an airport? Golden Bay has a housing crisis. These proposed houses would not be affordable to first home buyers. Affordable housing/rentals should be a priority. This proposal does not meet the needs of the most vulnerable. There would be an increase of traffic which would increase noise and pollution levels. |
|-------------------------|-----|---|
| 31316 John Heslop | N/A | See attached. Supporting submission from Cotton & Light Surveyors - Summarised: |
| | | Proposed future development area T-114 greenfield development. The intention is the land will be developed within a size range ensuring the land is developed to its maximum potential. This site has the capacity to accommodate more housing than is shown on the draft concept plan. Existing native bush will be protected and plenty of walkways will be provided. We believe this is an important attribute to ensure low-cost high density clusters are within close proximity to open space recreational areas. The demand is already there to develop this land now. |
| 31318 Mrs Isobel Mosley | N/A | My concerns relate to Motueka. The report states that its proposals do not meet the need for housing or business development in Motueka and I believe they should. Certainly intensification should be the priority, but more greenfield development is needed. While protection of agricultural land is important, provision of housing close to the town centre is even more so. (We even have a housing shortage for the agricultural workers!) I would suggest that the whole rectangle of land between Whakarewa St, High ST, King Edward St, and Green St + a line continuing south from Green St to King Edward, should be zoned for intensification or greenfield development. Your current proposal includes part but not all of this rectangle Much of the land is currently in orchards, with housing along the streets. |
| | | Motueka is a popular place for retirees, but the town does not have a retirement village along the lines of those proving so popular in Richmond. I personally know of three couples who have moved away from Motueka, leaving their friends and community, in order to move into such a village. Such developments should be encouraged, but at present there is no land available in Motueka. |
| | | Another type of housing I did not see mentioned in the report is tiny homes, which are proving popular and affordable. It would be possible to allow for "tiny home parks", with basic infrastructure, on land which may be threatened by sea level rise in future, because the tiny homes can easily be moved. |
| | | There is land north of the golf course which is not suitable for housing because it is low lying. However, it |

| | | could be used more intensively for horticulture. Or how about moving the airport over there, thereby freeing up more land to the west of town? |
|-------------------------------------|-----|--|
| | | At some stage I believe the Council will have to face up to the fact it cannot abandon Motueka to rising sea level. (Much of the town centre is only 1m above sea level.) However, there are already built causeways, river bank protection works and natural dunes that protect much of the perimeter of the town and building the necessary sea walls to protect the rest is quite feasible. We spend millions on protecting the town from the river. Why would we not protect it from the sea too? |
| 31322 Mrs BARBARA AND TIM ROBSON | N/A | Fundamentally the strategy needs to look beyond 30 years. Future-proofed infrastructure investment (and the associated carbon emissions), has to involve longer term (100 year), planning. The strategy needs to acknowledge our critical energy future. It needs to do more than pay lip service to adaptation and resilience building if we are to set our grandchildren up for a liveable future. |
| 31325 Dr Ann Briggs | N/A | What are the needs of the people? What are the needs of the environment (the flora, fauna and the land itself)? How are we addressing the inter-dependency of people and environment? How does addressing climate change factors underpin all we do? Are we really prepared to change the way we think and act? |
| 31326 Mr Roger Percivall | N/A | Overall, TDC does a great job and this FDS will be difficult to please everyone. If businesses can be encouraged to invest in manufacturing in the TDC area then planning can follow for housing. I think it is important to view successful areas of development, either in NZ or overseas that have similar conditions to the TDC area. |
| 31328 Ms Karen du Fresne | N/A | I think I've already outlined many of my concerns. You have made no mention of adaptive strategies for the region's economy (farming, fishing, horticulture, forestry) - all of which are very vulnerable to climate change impacts. You make no mention of the vulnerability of key transport services like Nelson Airport (sited a few metres from the coast) or of Port Nelson (sited on reclaimed land) Your view of growth focuses on increased size, not on sustainability. You do not appear to have a strategy for reducing reliance on fossil fuels and non-renewable energy. There is no specific strategy for improving public transport. I also think that a sustained public education campaign (taking on board what worked and what didn't work in the govt's Covid campaign) is essential to get buy-in to the sort of lifestyle changes that will be required of all of us. |
| 31334 Diane Sutherland | N/A | There is an urgent MORAL RESPONSIBILITY to put movement away from fossil fuels and reduction of carbon footprints at the HEART of EVERY decision over the next 30 years. |
| | | So draw on bold, innovative and visionary thinking on the whole concept of growth and the way we live - |

| | | no more "business as usual". |
|----------------------------|-----|---|
| 31335 Mr Gregorius Brouwer | N/A | Please see attached for further details: Summarised - endorses NelsonTasman2050, supports outcomes but doesn't agree the proposal will achieve this, does not support Tasman Village, strongly supports intensification (very very high density), develop for need not for demand. |
| | | controlled, to-be-tendered-for developments (so council controls it more than the building companies do) should also include a number of co-housing opportunities, or small/tiny homes opportunities, such as the one currently under resource consent review at 78 Old Wharf Road Motueka, and developments such as Featherson-Brookside, or Earthsong Auckland. You can easily put a clause in that if such allocated intended projects do not eventuate within x-number of years, to release them to more market driven parties. Tiny house developments can occur in lower lying areas, if you make the houses removable and self sufficient in terms of connections to infrastructure. This can be a quick way to provide for low income housing. I see a picture of a tiny home in your document, but read nothing to make it happen. |
| 31341 Dr Adam Friend | N/A | These decisions will have consequences far longer than 30 years, especially with a changing climate and probably sea level rise |
| 31343 Mr Steve Anderson | N/A | If you want to provide housing availability, provide more options and do not knock back the ideas that people have because they do not fit all the criteriawhat sites do? Also, do we want communities that are highly intensified? Sure, infrastructure would be easier but what about some imagination. Do we want to look like the cookie cutter subdivisions of Cromwell and Hawea, not to mention the social problems that come with it. Let us build thriving, creative communities that will thrive into the future and we can all be proud of. |
| 31344 Cornelia Baumgartner | N/A | We need to fundamentally change the way we approach growth. Instead of focusing on short term budgets we need to take a longer view. Why do we still promote sprawling suburbs, when we already know that energy will only become more expensive, resources sparser and when we already know that we will have to live a lot more efficiently? We need to think about how much growth we really need. In particular, we need to look at providing space for eco-friendly tiny house developments so young couples can afford to live here and own a home. Rather than just seeing growth as a numbers game, we should be thinking about the quality of our environments both our urban spaces, but also our rural and natural landscapes. |

| | We need to stop "business as usual" and start taking climate action seriously. We need to reduce our carbon footprint. We need a strategy that also provides direction and actions on how to deliver on the need for climate friendly, well-functioning towns and villages. This strategy, as proposed at the moment, does the opposite. |
|-----|--|
| N/A | The pine forests in the Nelson hinterland, should be replaced with native trees, in order to provide a more beautiful backdrop to our city which claims it is a tourist, outdoor adventure destination, and inappropriately alls itself "city of trees". When the pine trees are felled, the companies leave behind their rubbish, and a desolate environment. On Sugarloaf hill, they felled most of it, but left a drunken mowhawk clinging to one side of the unfortunate hill. Tourists who have spoken to me find the current state primitive, saying that such savage butchering would never happen in an urban area in their country. |
| N/A | We need to fundamentally change the way we approach growth. Instead of focussing on short term budgets we need to take a longer view - isn't that exactly what a 30 year strategy should be doing? Then why do we still promote sprawling suburbs, when we already know that energy will only become more expensive, resources sparser and when we already know that we will have to live a lot more efficiently? |
| | We need to think about how much growth we really need. |
| | In particular, we need to look at providing space for eco-friendly tiny house developments so young couples can afford to live here and own a home. |
| | Rather than just seeing growth as a numbers game, we should be thinking about the quality of our environments both our urban spaces, but also our rural and natural landscapes. We need to stop "business as usual" and start taking climate action seriously. We need to reduce our carbon footprint. We need a strategy that also provides direction and actions on how to deliver on the need for climate friendly well-functioning towns and villages. This strategy, as proposed at the moment, does the opposite. |
| N/A | Merge councils to reduce costs for ratepayers and achieve better efficiency. Where's the public transport system? |
| N/A | Recommend looking at each town centre as a destination and thinking about what existing or new "icons" might draw someone to want to live there or spend time there. For example, we moved to Nelson because of: it's stunning natural environment (e.g. Brook Sanctuary, Grampians, many parks and reserves, boulder bank, tahunanui beach, etc on the doorstep), it's amenity values (walks, bikes tracks, ability to picnic by and swim in the Maitai (we bragged about this extensively when we moved), cafes, cultural opportunities (suter, museum, founders - it's got a lot going on for a small place! (except for now with C-19)), streetscape (we love the car-free part of Trafalgar St), etc. These are Nelson's icons we'd like to see |
| | N/A |

| | | protected and enhanced and anything along that theme we'd support being added. |
|--------------------------|-----|---|
| | | To improve public input, this strategy should have integrated other spatial elements - significant amenity areas, biodiversity areas, buffers for adapting to climate change, areas of historic or heritage value, outstanding natural landscapes, productive soils, etc. It's hard to advise on where development is appropriate when we don't understand this bigger picture and what values might be being traded. |
| | | I understand this strategy is happening at the same time as a plan change in Tasman to see through some of the proposed developments. In my view that's not good process. It makes us feel like our views on this strategy are a waste of time and won't be taken seriously. Talking with your community should not be a tick the box exercise. |
| 31351 Mr Robin Whalley | N/A | Start again .Take a good hard look at the under-utilised Port Land. Especially after the Cawthron development. |
| 31353 Mr Hilary Blundell | N/A | By even considering so much green field expansion in every centre plus new ones, I think you have missed the elephant in the room, and this elephant is getting very angry, and you are poking it. If you ignore it - the IPCC mandate - you must bare the consequences, and these will be very ugly not that far away. It is true that these consequences may happen anyway, due to everyone else also ignoring the IPCC, and this brings forward monstrous weather events that totally undermine your suggestion of resilience. Liability of course will happen with Richmond West, as this will run into trouble before those who signed it off have died. It will hurt, as will the first time the RMD traffic lights are under sea water - Feb 25? Reduce caruse, by encouragement first, and by force later (licensed-only fuel). |
| 31355 Mr Barney Hoskins | N/A | Nelson City should be a key focus as well as Richmond when it comes to intensification, particularly 4-6 story. It should not be a case of finding the quick wins in these locations and then move onto greenfield or smaller communities such as Tahunanui to 'tick the boxes' at the detriment of the community itself. Concerned that the communities will have no say when it comes to proposed buildings when new Zoning is in place so I do not support the high rise levels of intensification in Tahunanui. Nothing taller than a palm tree. |
| 31358 George Harrison | N/A | Make sure there is NOT the destruction of existing amenity in our urban areas |
| 31359 Dr Mike Ashby | N/A | Good work - there's logic, pragmatism and a good future focus on display here. I congratulate the teams involved. |
| 31362 Ms Fiona Macdonald | N/A | I appreciate the work done to date in consulting with the community. Nelson City is constrained by it's geography in terms of growth and development but we need to protect what makes it unique, and think smarter about where and how to build. Focus on creating a dynamic and livable 'city' with a focus on bringing life into the CBD. |

| 31363 Mr Steve Cross | N/A | I reject the premise of this question SEE ATTACHED Inconsistent "finger in the wind" assumptions rather than evidence-based assumptions have resulted in inappropriate areas being identified for unnecessary intensification. Proposals contrary to the elements that tourists value in a beachside town,. Proposals don't meet community aspirations which have been enunciated over many years and will result in loss of the village atmosphere and the "small town" feel. In respect to Tahunanui, any semblance of planning has been discarded in favour of a laissez-faire approach to development. This despite \$10 million and 7 years being spent on the incomplete Nelson Plan. The FDS is an odd situation where green politics and libertarianism intersect — who would have thought? Those of us who thought that Nick Smith's Special Housing Area legislation was nothing more than a ploy to give developers a green light at the expense of considered townscaping can only stand in awe at seeing the FDS which is like SHAs on steroids. Sec 4.19 of report M19265 notes that "Iwi and hapū expressed that the timeframes for the engagement and preparation of the draft NTFDS were challenging. This meant that not all iwi and hapū participated in the process, despite all being contacted and offered the opportunity to participate, with resourcing provided to support their meaningful engagement. This is largely due to limited resources for iwi and hapū and these being stretched given the exceptional amount of regulatory change currently being pursued at both central and local government level." Same applies for Tahunanui residents who are suffering from "consultation fatigue" after dealing with intensification issues through the SHA process; the Nelson Plan process, the 2019 FDS and now this. The same issues have been relitigated multiple times. The purported consultation has been rushed; hasn't provided adequate information on the effect of the FDS on neighbourhoods. Large parts of the Tahunanui area slated for intensification are subject to coast |
|------------------------------|-----|---|
| | | preparing its FDS, exempted all areas subject to flooding or potential flooding. By designating these areas a future intensification sites NCC is predetermining its climate adaption response by precluding "managed retreat" in favour of uncosted & potentially expensive engineering solutions. |
| 31364 Mrs Christine Tuffnell | N/A | I think the whole FDS strategy fails to recognise "kiwi culture" and our love of personal space (our home) and gardens, and our love of the outdoors. This really isn't a submission from me - its answering YOUR questions. There appears to be little control over the proposed intensification - lack of resource consents/lack of ability to object - particularly in relation to access to sun. light, view etc. The historical character of The Wood area in Nelson will be lost (I'm presently living in N109). Looks like I |

| | | will have to move again! If a 3-6 story building goes up on my Northern boundary I will get NO sunshine. FDS fails to recognise the ageing population (many more older people) who need ground floors and easy access to outdoors Is this really how we want to live - in boxes piled on top of each other? |
|------------------------------|-----|---|
| 31367 Mrs Jill Southon | N/A | SEE ATTACHMENT - SUMMARISED - opposes 6 storey height limits proposed in Tahunanui, supports 2004 Tahunanui Plan. You forgot to mention Tahunanui as a distinct area. Nelson is not one area. Tahunanui is sea coastal area with large group of residents. Its rediculous to think to build 6 story buildings in an area where sea rise will happen and Nelson is on a fault line. Tahunanui 2004 plan is to be adopted and used. I object to this blanket 6 story high rise building zone changes. Attachment summarised below: Object to high rise development in Tahunanui, strategy is lazy, 2004 Tahunanui Plan should be used. |
| 31369 Mr Joseph Blessing | N/A | To permit and promote new community development in various sizes up to small town development on lease land: For central or local government to purchase land and develop it in simple forms to get services there and lease the land to be built on lease hold contracts. Objectives: to foster affordable housing and promote housing for smaller income groups as an additional form of housing. To consider here is also to promote permaculture growing on the lease hold sections. Then the land can also be on semi fertile parcels/in such zoning as the residents will - together with council directives and education - grow food fruit and veggies. |
| 31370 Mrs Deborah Knowler | N/A | I think Nelson needs to look really hard at how the city will look in 30 years, taking into account climate change ie flood levels etc, the existing infrastructure and how will this hold up ie Waste water treatment plant, water supply, transport etc etc. |
| 31371 Ms Gabriela Kopacikova | N/A | A fundamental change as to how growth is being approached and managed is needed. Instead of focusing on short term budgets, a longer view would be appropriate. "Business as usual" is no longer working and the time for change is here and now! |
| 31373 Ms Jenny Daniell | N/A | I think this development plan has its eyes closed to the issues raised in the IPCC Climate Change report released this month. We need to decarbonise and to slash fossil fuel usage. Intensification must be planned with this in mind. Greenfields development must stop until we have the knowledge and will to honestly work towards averting climate disaster. |
| 31374 Dr Inge Bolt | N/A | What about wharf development, for resilience and alternative transport options. |
| | | |

| 31376 Mr Wayne Scott | N/A | Please SEE ATTACHED for further detail: Key Points below - |
|----------------------|-----|---|
| | | Aggregate is an essential ingredient in climate change adaption; and the building of infrastructure, roading and housing and will be needed to achieve the growth and development of the region as anticipated in the Strategy. |
| | | The risk of shortages due to sterilisation and the need to protect aggregate resources from future development is overlooked in the Strategy. |
| | | We are concerned that the "core areas for new growth" outlined in the Strategy, happen to be areas of high aggregate potential meaning an important supply of future access to aggregate could be off limits if care is not taken. |
| | | In order to future proof Nelson Tasman, land for existing and future aggregate extraction activities mus be adequately identified and protected from encroachment of non-compatible land uses. The Strategy seems to be focused on protecting "highly productive" agricultural land for primary production but not highly productive quarrying land. We note that quarrying is part of the primary production definition in the Nation Planning Standards. |
| 31379 Mr Alec Waugh | N/A | Please SEE ATTACHED: TEXT COPIED BELOW: |
| | | |
| | | - |
| | | This submission on the Future development strategy fully supports the comment of William Samuels "Time councils are more active shaping cities" Nelson mail 9 April 2022 |
| | | The Council Planning department and Council itself, are a primary reason for the lack of diversity in Nelson housing market, associated delays, and increased costs due to a very conservative approach to housing. |
| | | Protecting current elite nimby's, and poor interpretation of the current RMA, and an inherent bias towards large housing on large sections, has resulted in the current Housing tragedy we all now have to cope with. |
| | | Change the approach, up rather than out, simple planning rules, and flexibility, with an emphasis on speedy turn around and decision making. |
| | | The Nelson and Tasman Council approach to housing has long been a primary reason for the current Housing issues, and a readjustment is long overdue. |
| | | Alec Waugh |

Please see attached. Text coped below: 31382 Mr James P Moran N/A I do not support the greenfield expansion housing anywhere in the Maitai Valley, especially Kaka tributary or Orchard Flats. The Nelson Council and then the NZ Government has declared a climate emergency. Extreme weather events are increasing world wide. Nelson Council needs to be evaluating how to mitigate the effects of increased flooding in the very near future, particularly around rivers and particularly around the Maitai river. This is quite apparent when one considers the ongoing flooding crises in New South Wales and Queensland currently and also across all parts of New Zealand. It is the duty of the Nelson Council to protect the current housing stocks and not to inflame the situation by allowing further development that will add to the current stock of highly at risk property in the Nelson region. **Yours Sincerely** James P Moran Registered Psychologist See attached. Summarised -31388 Mr Colin Garnett N/A Productive soils: Recent developments have seen the loss of countless hectares of highly productive soil on the outskirts of Richmond with more loss planned. How can this be justified? There is no real protection being given to remaining fertile soils around the urban areas. Rural 3 has been an unmitigated failure in retaining any "rural" flavor in the district. It is time Rural 3 Zones are rezoned Rural Residential to reduce the urbanization of the country. Rural Residential: If you want to form new villages/settlements then these need to be an appropriate size and fully serviced with community infrastructure. In my opinion the structure you are proposing needs a total rethink rather than following the same mistakes and thinking.

level effects and sewer and water on hand.

Alternative settlements: Rabbit and Rough Islands present a real opportunity here. No flooding or sea

| | | Rezoning of historic oversights: The rezoning of the Waimea West properties is probably only symptomatic of historic oversight. It is time these and other oversights were visited. |
|-------------------------|-----|---|
| | | Growth plan changes: There seems to be a lack of overall vision and purpose. The plan changes are just tinkering with a set of woefully inadequate and destructive rules and regulations we are laboring under. Go back to the drawing board and present us with something to be proud of. |
| 31389 Mr Dirk Bachmann | N/A | Why not look at housing and developments overeas, mainly Europe. They seem decades ahead of us in a few of their approaches. Why not pcik the best ideas and copy them insetad of sticking to the old ways, which are neither ecologically sustainable nor economical?! The times have already changed. Why not plan and live accordingly?! Thank you. |
| 31390 Miss Anne Caddick | N/A | There is no available housing stock in the Takaka area, and rentals are very rare. The population cannot increase because there is no housing. This has a knock on effect on business. The change of zoning in the Rangihaeata area is totally overdue. This is poor agricultural land with poor soils. A much improved use would be housing. This change should have taken place in 2007, and is long overdue. We fully support the zoning change which we consider URGENT. |
| 31391 Anne Palmer | N/A | I would like to fully support the proposed change of zone to land around Rangihaeata in this marginal land area. More housing is obviously needed with sensible travelling distances to Takaka town. This will support businesses and allow more housing stock in a poorly supplied area. This change is long overdue. |
| 31392 D Gilbert | N/A | My family fully supports the proposed zoning change for Rangihata. This is an ideal area for residential development. There is no housing stock in Takaka. The business is suffering. There are no rentals available, young people are moving away. They cannot find houses. Community is dispersing. The heart of the town cannot expand. People need houses to live in and raise their children. We most strongly support this zone change. |
| 31393 F Young | N/A | The proposed zoning change in Rangihaeta is essential. Housing within sensible distance of Takaka is greatly needed. People and businesses need homes. |
| 31394 Jordan Graham | N/A | The Rangihaeta area is situated so near Takaka that it affords to be used to provide urgently needed houses to a really badly supplied area. As the soils are not appropriate for agriculture, I fully support 100% a zoning change. |
| | | |

| N/A | Please see attached for further detail Summarised - opposing There should be NO residential rezoning/greenfield development (or any other sort) in the Maitai Valley - particularly Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. |
|-----|---|
| N/A | The Rangihaeta zone change should have been undertaken in 2007. It is well overdue. This land is not productive. Housing is needed badly, especially near town. About time the zone change happens, gives others the chance to live near the town. |
| N/A | See attached. Summarised: uncomfortable with structure of submission form (questions about all areas), supports intensification and consolidation, opposes secondary proposal (infrastructure, not needed to meet demand, rural character). The intensification and consolidation of the existing towns seems to be the right approach to allow for and to achieve the projected growth. Rezoning of land should only be allowed in extreme cases. New Tasman Township. The short answer is no. Th site being proposed sits at he head of a highly vulnerable estuary which is already under pressure. A town of this size is going to have a huge carbon footprint. The infrastructure required will require a huge investment, the cost of which eventually will be born by the ratepayer/taxpayer. |
| N/A | See 12 above. |
| N/A | Brave, Bold decisions regarding climate change consequences. led growth more interaction is needed. |
| N/A | The FDS needs to be more progressive to support reduction in carbon emissions. Change in practices will not happen unless local government takes the lead. Setting new rules and guidelines will be necessary to get a change in people's behaviour. Otherwise, change will be too slow to be effective. |
| N/A | Refer to my attachment. |
| | Summarised below: Objection to Tasman Village proposal Various questions on the detailed typologies proposed in Tasman Village and servicing. Reasons for objection: - expensive servicing - no detail of layout or typologies - only supporting landowners for their benefit - process of analysis used in the FDS - traffic impacts - highly productive land (disputes the assumption that T166 has low productive values) - support for existing RC consent at T166 for less intensive resi development (more rural res/lifestyle) |
| N/A | I dont have much to say about where and how our region needs to grow – does it really need to grown? And endlessly? Its a shame that we need have houses everywhere. Its hard for me to picture this growth, and to imagine how much land is required but I do believe we need to first look after those who currently live in poverty in sub-par rentals before we try to make our region an attractive place to move to from elsewhere. We need to make housing more affordable, and use land |
| | N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A |

| | | to look after those who currently don't have a house yet, not those who want a bigger one. I'm all for getting people to move into and around the CBD. Make our town livelier, reduce the number of people having to commute. It's insane to see all those cars streaming into the city in the morning and out again at the end of the work day. Get exciting, visionary urban planners involved and do it now, people are going to run out of patience with the CBD. As also indicated under number 12, I believe our region should aim to become the biking capital of Aotearoa. It could be a serious drawing card for visitors and help bring the much talked about modal shift about. We have world class recreational trails, but we need the infrastructure in town so people can safely bike everywhere rather than having to take the car. The number of parents in Nelson Whakatū who will not let their children walk or bike because they feel its unsafe, is staggering. The number of teenagers that want to drive (and own!) a car as soon as they can cause its fast and safe, is staggering. It can all change if |
|--------------------------|-----|---|
| | | NCC really invests in cycling and ignores the conservative nay-sayers. The mindset/culture will not shift until the infrastructure is there and can be depended on. |
| 31407 Mrs Sarah Whittle | N/A | We need to fundamentally change the way we approach growth. Instead of focussing on short term budgets we need to take a longer view - isn't that exactly what a 30 year strategy should be doing? Then why do we still promote sprawling suburbs, when we already know that energy will only become more expensive, resources sparser and when we already know that we will have to live a lot more efficiently? We need to think about how much growth we really need. Rather than just seeing growth as a numbers game, we should be thinking about the quality of our environments both our urban spaces, but also our rural and natural landscapes. We need to stop "business as usual" and start taking climate action seriously. We need to reduce our carbon footprint. We need a strategy that also provides direction and actions on how to deliver on the need for climate friendly, well-functioning towns and villages. This strategy, as proposed at the moment, does the opposite. |
| 31409 Dr Andrew Tilling | N/A | There should be a staging of development spelt out in the strategy. We should take climate change seriously, and reduce our carbon footprint. Growth should be based on community needs and environmental limits, not the dictates of the market and attempts to accommodate more development. |
| 31410 Mr Scott Smithline | N/A | IF YOU DON'T MAKE 'CLIMATE' YOUR #1 CONSIDERATION FOR EACH ASPECT OF 30 YEAR PLANNING and continue to use old economic models & concepts of 'growth' that aren't innovative & creative we're missing a huge opportunity |
| 31411 Mrs Moira Tilling | N/A | Answer is in box 39. I put it there by mistake. |
| 31412 Ms Rose Griffin | N/A | We are in a climate emergency and we need to be proactive 1. minimise the need for private car use |
| | | |

| | | local government to actively seek and promote excellence in urban design and architecture maximise opportunities to enhance the natural landscape |
|----------------------------|-----|--|
| 31414 Ms Terry Rosser | N/A | See attached. Summarised - opposes T01 and T03 for reasons related to traffic management, flood risk, effects on rural environment, amentiy values (cycle trail), effects on wildlife. |
| | | Increased traffic at the Robertson Rd intersection with State Highway 6 has already been identified by the TDC and Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency as an issue due to its limited visibility. Flood risk T-01 Jeffries Road. |
| | | The zoning changes required for subdivisions at T-01 Shannee Hills and T-03 Jeffries Rd will lead to the fragmentation of rural land and have adverse consequences that are inconsistent with the aim of the TRMP. |
| | | Jeffries Rd and the surrounding area are home to a healthy population of indigenous wildlife including protected species. Maintaining the rural nature of this area will help protect these populations and aligns with the TDC's proposed biodiversity strategy. |
| 31416 Tim Leyland | N/A | Growth should be closely linked to the quality of our environments both our urban spaces, but also our rural and natural landscapes. We need to demonstrate that climate action has been seriously considered, helping communities reduce carbon footprints whilst building functional, practical towns. |
| 31418 Mr Bill Boakes | N/A | there is very little cohesive transport planning we need this. |
| 31419 Mr Hamish James Rush | N/A | Council needs to be visionary not reactionary, set the vision of what we see the district becoming over the next 100 years and BE BOLD!!!!!. We need to create a vision that is going to set the Nelson Tasman Region apart from the rest of the country. This plan needs to address both current short term needs of residents over the next 30 years, while also showing respect and vision for the future. The economic, social, environmental factors must be considered equally in any robust plan. GOOD LUCK!!! |
| 31421 Rosie-Anne Pinney | N/A | The future of growth in Nelson/Tasman needs vision and creativity that will support healthy lifestyles for all sorts of people with differing needs and financial capability. It must be underpinned by the sustainable care of our natural environment. This proposal is more of what we have had for a long time already - sprawl and commuting. We need to take climate change seriously, we need to take the inability of many people to afford a house seriously and come up with a proposal that will offer affordable, environmentall friendly development close to work and amenities. Protect our land for food production and recreation. Create residential areas where people can walk and bike, avoiding the use of their cars. Give people new and different, attractive choices not just a variation on the expensive, traditional quarter acre section |

| | | which is what this proposal is doing. Let growth be community led not developer led. |
|------------------------------------|-----|---|
| 31422 Mrs Marga Martens | N/A | I think it is ridiculous to ask feedback with so many questions!!! |
| 31426 Mr Bruce Douglas Hollyman | N/A | Like to see Hira included in infrastructure plans |
| 31427 Lois Morgan | N/A | Please see attached - text copied below: |
| | | To whom it may concern regarding the Nelson/Tasman Development Strategy |
| | | I wish to submit in relation to the above, the following: |
| | | It is imperative that we no longer use prime agricultural land near our city for sprawled out suburban housing. Not only does this render the land incapable of producing food, all the more important when w can not rely on supplies from other areas or overseas, but such housing causes increased carbon emissions, as the residents need to drive to access shops, supermarkets etc. The building of single dwellings also results in more carbon emissions than that of multi-storey apartment blocks. |
| | | It is crucial that we learn from other places in the world how to best achieve high density living close to cities. The '20 minute' plan, whereby residents can walk, cycle or drive to an urban centre, makes very good sense. Cycle ways and much better public transport and 'park and ride' depots should be part of the planning. |
| | | Ideas such as inner city apartment blocks built over parking areas and accommodating shops as well as different living options within the buildings, need serious consideration, now. |
| | | I urge our city council to stand tall and embrace these forward looking ways of dealing with our country and our planet's burgeoning climate change dilemma, before it is too late. Our children, grandchildren and theirs deserve a better world than we are headed towards at present. |
| | | We MUST do considerably better, and we MUST do it now. |
| | | Sincerely |
| | | Lois Morgan |
| 31428 Marilynn - | N/A | Please see attached - Text copied below: Your proposed plan, is as objectionable as the dam was/is. There is barely enough water to sustain Nelson |

| | | without building any more houses, especially in the Maitahi Valley. Considering the Nelson water supply is already at capacity & is quite toxic, with the dam being constructed beside a mountain leeching iron oxide. The council is either desperate or greedy or both! Bleeding the infrastructure dry is deplorable & lacks any insight into the future of our once beautiful region! Sincerely marilynn Nelson born! |
|----------------------|-----|--|
| 31430 Muriel Moran | N/A | Growth needs to be planned rather than become a runaway force that lets developers take control. |
| 31432 Helen McCallum | N/A | Please see attached - text copied below: |
| | | I would like to submit my disapproval of the proposed intensified high density apartments directly surrounding Tahunanui Dr. There is already issues with the busyness of this road especially as it's the main through way for heavy logging trucks and the like. Lots of high density high apartments will only make it even more dangerous. As any apartment developer doesn't have to provide parking where will all these people put their cars? Right now waka kotahi with support of NCC are trying to get rid of some of the existing parking spaces to enable them to install priority lanes around the business area of Tahuna. While I do see the value of apartment living I just don't see that the Tahunanui Dr area particularly around the access part of the beach and business area can cope with potentially hundreds more cars and the traffic that will generate. Helen McCallum |
| 31435 Mr Alan Eggers | N/A | See attached document. Summarised - new site at 3, 5, 7 and 65 Higgins Road to rural res, serviced to |
| | | grow Spring Grove community. |
| | | The proposed rezoning and residential development of Falcon Ridge Estate meets the objectives and criteria of the FDS with the potential to provide a range of diversified residential lots set within a fully developed natural setting. The rezoning and development could provide an opportunity for a significant public Council reserve that |
| | | includes over 30 hectares of native forest, lakes, ponds and wetlands. The property could be sold in four titles as large lifestyle blocks, but instead the applicant wishes to create a unique fully serviced rural residential development with approximately 45 -50 plus fully serviced rural |

| | | residential allotments as part of the development. |
|---------------------------------------|-----|---|
| 31436 Richard Brudvik-Lindner | N/A | Please see attached for rest of submission max limit of text copied below: |
| | | Summarised - greenfield expansion shoudl be limited, need to be creative about intensification of existing centres, supports Kaka Valley but opposes Orchard Flats, supports Tasman Bay Village Market Town concept. |
| | | I think growth should be happening over the next 30 years in the vast majority of cases (at least 65%) via intensification within existing town centres. Sprawl into farmland (arable land) around Richmond and across Tasman, must stop. |
| | | We need to have Tier 1 City classification allowances in place to help make this happen on a greater scale and faster than urban intensification would occur without it. (But perhaps Tier 1 can be modified a bit to fit smaller scale cities?) Tier 1 status must however ensure rich green spaces/landscaping and sunlight access. |
| | | We must be creative and aggressive about finding ways to put most of our growth in existing town centres. Golden Bay's isolation should allow some flexibility there however. |
| | | I do not accept TDC/NCC rejection of intensification (due to their assertions that growth needs cannot be met this way) in existing centres as the primary growth strategy. Build taller buildings in Nelson and Richmond (up to 6 story) and incentivize urban infill. Allow more mixed use and build Peter Olorenshaw's CBD fringe donut idea. Figure out how to make intensification (more verticality, more infill, greater density) meet the vast majority of our growth needs. |
| | | Expansion into greenfield areas close to the existing urban areas should be allowed in limited situations. For the most part we should build up into the hillsides (in a seismically safe and aestetically-conscious way). Kaka Valley is in close proximity to the Nelson CBD, and if traffic can primarily be channeled onto State Highway 6 then this is the kind of greenfield that should be allowed (but it most impose limits on th size of engine, fuel type of engine and decibel level of any vehicle that travels from Kaka Valley into Maita Valley Rd transponder technology allows this to be monitored using artificial intelligence). I do not see how Orchard Flats can be allowed to develop unless it's traffic can be diverted to a major arterial highway and so I do not support it unless there were stringent aesthetic/environmental restrictions on sections developed at that site, along with title restrictions that required all vehicle traffic in/out/inside/through the site to be |
| 31437 Mr & Mrs Derek & Gaylyn Ball | N/A | We question the accuracy of the growth predictions for the area. Councils are rushing ahead to provide for future growth which may not happen! |

| 31438 Aleisha Hosie | N/A | I think consideration needs to be made when developing land for residential areas that pockets of green space/parks are provided. with section sizes getting smaller we need to provide a place for families to play/meet and socialize. I feel that Tasman especially is lacking in this department - its all well and good to leave a reserve - but more playgrounds are needed. one just needs to Look at the Marine Parade in Napier - the Margret Mayhe - playground in Christchurch - Anderson Park In Napier - Kowhai Park in Whanganui. All these are amazing examples of amazing play spaces. Tasman really does not compare. |
|-------------------------|-----|--|
| 31439 Mr Bruce Gilkison | N/A | Q38 St Arnaud T195 is very close to the Alpine fault line, and T181 is not much further away, and may be subjected to a fire hazard from the surrounding Kanuka forest. Neither of these properties should be developed. |
| | | It is vital that a Future Development Strategy pays heed to factors that are certain to occur over the next few decades and that will affect generations to come. While the speed of climate change might not be known with absolute certainty, the direction and the nature of its impacts are crystal-clear. It will be costly, wasteful and short-sighted not to plan for these impacts, and to lock ourselves into decisions, directions and development that future generations will regret and, one way or another, will have to pay for. |

| 31441 Mr Chris Head | N/A | I just hope that this planning is being carried out with due diligence and research into methods that successful cities around the world have used to sustainably grow and support their communities. I hope you have bold people amongst your group who are willing to take the steps required to push through responsible changes. My experience of regional city planning in NZ is a resistance to taking steps very far beyond the way it's always been done. It will be a real shame if the eventual outcome of this project is a facsimile of sustainable, efficient, environmentally responsible urban development, but in reality just the same Nelson region with a 30-year veneer of "upgrades" tacked on. |
|---------------------|-----|---|
| | | Transport is a significant issue in Nelson and surrounding areas. Traffic density is high and appears to be increasing. From what I have seen, serious roading and transport development appears to have taken a back seat to land development, resulting in hilariously inadequate transport options around the city and surrounding region. The bus system is archaic and unreliable, and there are few other options apart from using a private vehicle. I live in Brightwater and work at the airport. There is no other way for me to get to work except private transport. In fact there is no public transport option serving the airport. Extensive, reliable, efficient public transport forms the backbone of every successful city (and not just a fleet of ageing diesel buses). This proposal needs to more adequately address how transport incorporates into the 30-yr plan. |
| 31444 Kate Graham | N/A | See attached. The specific parts of the FDS the Ministry's submission relates to is: Capacity of existing and future educational facilities and provision for active modes of transport and public transport. |
| | | Schools fall under "additional infrastructure" and the Ministry is concerned that the FDS does not identify the educational facilities required to support or service the development proposed. There is no clarity on the timing of the potential development to allow for forward planning of education facilities by the Ministry. |
| | | The Ministry values the relationship that exists between both Councils, including a willingness to share data. The FDS is high-level and will require further in-depth discussion between the Councils and the Ministry; and further data exchange to allow the Ministry to assess the implications of the FDS on the current school network. |
| | | The Ministry suggests that the role of the Council should be further defined within the FDS, acknowledging the finer details will be further considered within the implementation plan. The proposed area of growth around Tasman Village is of particular interest to the Ministry as it has the potential to create a satellite village. |
| | | The Ministry is supportive of intensification in principle. Clarity regarding timeframes is sought to better |

| | | understand the implications of the proposed growth on the Nelson/Tasman school network. |
|------------------------|-----|---|
| | | The Ministry seeks to work with both NCC and TDC to ensure development is provided for n a timely and coordinated manner that allows for infrastructure, including schools, to be upgraded or established as an where needed. |
| 31447 Dr David Jackson | N/A | How about creating a city and villages with heart and character? Any fool can jam in more housing and get density, but to create liveable neighbourhoods and cities takes care and intelligence. I don't seen much of the latter two. |
| 31448 Dominic Williams | N/A | We have a request in relation to the FDS that is not able to be addressed in the online questionnaire. It relates to Zone T-01, and specifically to our 4Ha rural lifestyle property at number 106 Jeffries Road, Brightwater. |
| | | Under the current proposal our property would be almost exactly bisected, and our visible rural skyline and outlook dominated by housing. This is not an appealing prospect given that we actively chose and paid a premium to have a secluded rural living environment. |
| | | We are also concerned that the current plan will have a significant impact on the value of the remaining (i.e. un-rezoned) half of our property. There is a high chance it would be viewed as an uneconomic but high maintenance property with all of the drawbacks and none of the benefits of either suburban or rural living - and potentially very high annual rates if it was to remain undeveloped. |
| | | We feel the current proposal has potential to put us at a very significant disadvantage. |
| | | So, our request is: If the T-01 rezoning is inevitable, please include all of our property in the plan. This would enable us to make a clean break with little additional impact on the surrounding landscape or on neighbouring properties - and with the added advantage to council of a further 10 or 15 residential dwellings. |
| | | Please let us know when the next public forum on the FDS is being held as we would like to discuss this matter with the decision makers before the proposal is finalised. |
| 31449 Mr John Chisholm | N/A | Improve roading More cost-effective planning process to build Less bureaucracy Encouragement for business development i.e high tech, manufacturing |

| | | encouragement of overseas investment fewer retirement villages expansion of the airport, possible international flight to Australia cargo facilities and distribution hub at the airport |
|------------------------|-----|---|
| 31451 Janet Huddleston | N/A | I object to the T-163 proposal for land development in Rangihaeata. I am concerned for the impact on the Onahau estuary and the adjacent Esplanade reserve. This is a rich and diverse habitat of estuarine plants and birdlife, including some rare and endangered species. I have sighted the New Zealand banded rail in the Onahau estuary, one of it's few known habitats in the South Island. Over several seasons a NZ bittern has been seen and heard in the estuary during breeding and nesting |
| | | season. The Onahau estuary is fernbird habitat with a healthy population thriving there. Harrier hawks also bree there. |
| | | I am concerned about the impact an increased number of people living near the edge of the estuary would have, especially pets such as cats and dogs. This could be devastating to such a fragile habitat. |
| | | Also of concern is the increase in sewage outflow and grey water into the Onahau estuarine habitat. |
| 31452 Mr David Bartle | N/A | Councils should focus on sustainability, not growth. This includes setting more robust boundaries that protect agricultural land The Strategy should be urgently reviewed for its financial implications. Intensification will require a special purpose investment vehicle and finance. Councils should look further at all options for sustainable housing investment including green finance, and local investment. Councils should both commit to investing in social housing and set explicit social housing portfolio target as a core part of this strategy. Could the councils establish more explicit criteria for use of greenfield sites? All new developments should include children's playgrounds, parks, provision for local shops, and cycle routes. |
| 31453 Paul Kilgour | N/A | I object to this proposal, labeled T-163. Concern for the impact on the Onahau estuary and the adjacent Esplanade reserve. This is a rich and diverse habitat of estuarine plants and Birdlife, including some rare, and endangered species. I have sighted the New Zealand Banded Rail in the Onahau estuary. One of it's few known habitats in the South Island. Over several seasons a NZ Bittern has been seen and heard during breeding and nesting season, in the estuary. The Onahau estuary is Fernbird habitat with a healthy population thriving there. |

| | | Harrier Hawks also breed there. |
|--------------------------|-----|--|
| | | I am concerned about the impact an increased number of people living near the edge of the estuary would have. Especially pets such as cats and dogs. This could be devastating to such a fragile habitat. |
| | | Also of concern is the increase in sewage outflow, and grey water, into the Onahau estuarine habitat. |
| 31454 Mrs Tracey Koole | N/A | Nelson/Tasman area needs to learn from bigger cities that are in a position of urban sprawl and gridlocker roads. (For example Auckland and Bay of Plenty) Too much concrete and too much sprawl is detrimental to the environment. There are already issues with too much concrete over land in coastal areas such as Piha in Auckland and low lying sprawling Bay of Plenty towns. I am worried about low lying areas such as Tasman village if it is covered in concrete. |
| | | Growth in existing urban areas, upward and intensified I think will allow enough people to utilise a slick public transport system. Look at Europe to see the benefits of a rail system that works and living in appartments with adequate local green areas and big trees. Auckland should have had a rail to the airpoin the 1960s when it was on the cards but was voted out and now the whole city is a slave to roads. People can have affordable housing in appartment living and without stress of land care. To have parks and large trees amongst the intensification of existing areas works in Europe with the transport underground. I am disappointed in the set up in berry fields and hope the future plan is not continuing this way. |
| 31455 Cynthia McConville | N/A | See attached. Summarised - I oppose the proposal to rezone land at Site T163 to rural residential (infrastructure servicing, rural character, natural environment) Rangihaeata is made up of lifestyle blocks and any multi housing development would be out of context with the nature of the area. Any considerable population increase needs to take place on the main highway. T140 aligns with outcomes 1,3 and 5 of the FDS. Public transport, residential and business land and a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions could be achieved at T140. The Onahau wetland encroaches onto the property and there is exceptional birdlife that surrounds. Infrastructure for any development there would need to be provided by individual homes in a challenging |
| | | environment. To protect the Onahau Estuary from any disturbance requires Council to remove the undeveloped extension of Keoghan Road down to the estuary and close the road off. |

| 31457 Mr J Santa Barbara | N/A | Please explore the implications of carrying capacity and energy descent and integrate these concepts into all planning activities. |
|--------------------------|-----|---|
| 31458 Mr Brent John Page | N/A | Please find attached map of proposed area we would like to be included. Summarised - image only. |
| 31459 Ms Ruth Newton | N/A | Greater consideration of climate and economic factors. |
| | | Please note that although question 30 says 'tick all that apply' the system does not allow this |
| 31460 Kris Woods | N/A | I am not opposed to Growth or intensification themselves as these both can be positive and enhance the area. However if the recent past development and growth are an indicator of what will occur in the future than I am strongly opposed. I believe that the current way the Nelson/Tasman area has been allowed to "grow" is ruining the area. Instead of maximizing opportunities, having a cohesive, functioning plan that takes into account infrastructure and land use, it is a hodge podge of quickly thrown up, poor quality buildings that is an environmental atrocity as it is "throw away" and not meant to last, combined with a traffic problem that is completely unnecessary for a small rural area. |
| 31461 Mr Matt Olaman | N/A | See attached. Summarised below: This is a request that 433 Pigeon Valley Road and 405 Pigeon Valley Road be included in the T-032 Rural Residential Future Development area for Pigeon Valley. The reasons for this submission are as follows: ② Over the last 20 years there has been widespread rural residential subdivision in the Pigeon Valley and this has extended to the end of the seal on Pigeon Valley Road. ③ In terms of character and amenity, these two properties with areas of 6ha and 9ha are part of that rura residential character that defines the valley area. ② The end of the seal generally defines the extent of rural residential development in the valley and these two properties are within that area. ② Both properties are accessed by the sealed Pigeon Valley Road. ② Any further subdivisions of these properties can easily be provided with on-site wastewater and stormwater. ② Both properties can be provided with good dwelling setbacks from any nearby commercial forestry land to ensure there no reverse sensitivity issues with rural residential development in the valley. ② The Pigeon Valley is ideally suited to Rural residential development with good sealed road to access the nearby Wakefield Township. ② Both properties are not at risk from flooding from the Pigeon Valley Stream |
| 31469 Dr Jozef van Rens | N/A | The whole plan has to start from the principles of -reducing climate vulnerability and build resilient infra structure -accelerate urban intensification |

| | | -facilitate enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
|--------------------------|-----|---|
| | | We don't need more perpetuating low-density green fields developments that are a major contributor to an array of existing, well-documented problems (e.g. car-centric development; high emissions construction; diffuse pollution of waterways; loss of rural land; traffic congestion; loss of soil carbon; social dislocation; inefficient urban infrastructure) |
| 31470 Jocelyn Hogarth | N/A | Please see attached - text copied below: Hi< This email is to request NCC remove all reference to the Maitai Kaka Valley and Orchard flats from the future Development Strategy. Kind Regards Jocelyn Hogarth |
| 31472 Dr David Briggs | N/A | The whole process of planning simply has to be changed and brought up to date. Your approach is to estimate demand (in what sems to be a very naive and uninformed way) and provide for it - doing your meagre best, then, to limit the environmental and social costs. As local authorities, your responsibility should be to plan the whole of the region in ways that best satisfy all the interests of concern, including environmental good, social good and cultural good. Development shouldn't take precedence over these interests. It should be moderated to help achieve them. |
| 31475 Dr Gerard Berote | N/A | Follow the demand in a sustainable way and avoid speculation and the inevitable lobbying. |
| 31476 Mrs Karine Scheers | N/A | In general: keep the green areas green. Expand in existing centers, preferably by building higher. Keep all land that is suitable for agriculture for this purpose. If building has to be done on greenfield then rather dit on land that's not suitable for agriculture. |
| 31478 Mr Chris Koole | N/A | I hope to see parks included, especially with all the intensification planned. Smaller personal spaces mean public outdoor areas become increasingly important. |
| 31483 Debbie Hampson | N/A | I feel completely defeated by NCC & it's total disregard for the residents of Tahunanui, first with the cycle way, then with the upcoming four lane highway cutting through our neighbourhood, & now to complete the trifecta, the destruction of our community with High rise apartment buildings obliterating neighbouring residents daylight. |
| | | Tahunanui has been identified as being subject to liquefaction in the case of an earthquake, & also to rising sea levels with climate change, so why would the council now deem it safe to build up to 6 storey high apartments!?. |

| | | For me personally, being on the south side of a potential building site would mean the total loss of winter sunlight which would be absolutely & extremely detrimental to my mental health (& all other residents who find themselves in a similar predicament!). |
|---------------------------|-----|---|
| 31485 Ms Robin Schiff | N/A | question 29: Do you think we have got the balance right in our core proposal between intensification and greenfield development? (Approximately half intensification, half greenfield for the combined Nelson Tasman region.)? A: Definitely not. This is an appalling imbalance, likely perpetuating low-density greenfields development that are a major contributor to an array of existing, well-documented problems (e.g. car-centric development; high- emissions construction; diffuse pollution of waterways; loss of rural land; traffic congestion; loss of soil carbon; social dislocation; inefficient urban infrastructure). This trend is likely accelerated by the lack of a visionary policy to accelerate the promising urban intensification whose impact is rendered largely impotent by the feeble projected uptake. There should be a moratorium on an new unconsented greenfields developments both to curb their negative impacts and to accelerate urban intensification. The extent of intensification in Richmond needs expanding as well as accelerating so as to help drive the wholesale reduction of greenfields development. Good planning starts from the principles of reducing climate vulnerability and building resilient infra structure -accelerating urban intensification -facilitating enormous decarbonisation of lifestyle and transport -facilitating affordable low emissions transport -facilitating affordable zero carbon housing -reducing inequality and inequity |
| 31486 Mrs Josephine Downs | N/A | We need to fundamentally change the way we approach growth. Why do we still promote sprawling suburbs, when we already know that energy will only become more expensive, resources sparser and when we already know that we will have to live a lot more efficiently? We need to think about how much growth we really need. Rather than just seeing growth as a numbers game, we should be thinking about the quality of our environments both urban, rural and natural landscapes. We need to stop "business as usual" and start taking climate action seriously. We need to reduce our carbon footprint. We need a strategy that also provides direction and actions on how to deliver on the need for climate friendly, well-functioning towns and villages. |

| 31488 Annette Starink | N/A | Car yards, garages, mega stores and warehouses all out and away from the town centres. Make the towns people and child friendly. Cars need to be considerate to bikes, pedestrians all forms of slow traffic. Not the other way around. Now it's a car culture which needs to change. All Towns should be a people culture. |
|---------------------------|-----|--|
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | N/A | Refer to attachment "Question 49 - FDS submission" |
| | | Summarised below: objects to secondary proposal, importance of rural amenity values, need to change way we approach growth. |
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | N/A | Concern about T-166; references the Harakeke Application and applications reference to productive land. Also concerned about saturation and ponding on the lower portion. Also mentions possible Tsunami inundation risk. |
| 31490 Mr Nigel Watson | N/A | Comments that T-168 were granted permission to purchase property from the overseas investment authority on the basis that the land would be planted in Olive trees. |
| 31491 Ms Annette Milligan | N/A | I am deeply concerned at the lack of reference to the existential crisis facing our world: climate change. If we are going to have a region which is healthy, or indeed liveable, for its inhabitants, we must have this a our primary focus. This FDS is only one part of that - but in this Plan, there is not nearly enough enough evidence of reference to the grave threats. According the the IPCC Report released in the last week, the opportunity for keeping the increase in global temperatures within liveable limits, is rapidly closing and has now reduced to 2025. This FDS gives me no comfort that there is any recognition of the catastrophic effects we are facing. |
| 31493 Ms Helen Lindsay | N/A | There is nothing new and inspiring in this strategy, we need a complete change of approach to how we live and work, we need to stop the emphasis on constant growth, and our reliance on motorised transpor for food and employment. The strategy as written does not propose any major change and if implemented will continue to allow urban sprawl to gobble up productive land and it does not address the real housing and employment needs of the community. |
| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | N/A | We need to fundamentally change the way we approach growth. Instead of focussing on short term budgets we need to take a longer view - isn't that exactly what a 30-year strategy should be doing? Then why do we still promote sprawling suburbs, when we already know that energy will only become more expensive, resources sparser and when we already know that we will have to live a lot more efficiently? We need to think about how much growth we really need and how we can make sure the needs of local communities are met. Rather than just seeing growth as a numbers game, we should be thinking about the quality of our |

| | | environments both our urban spaces, but also our rural and natural landscapes. We need to stop "business as usual" and start taking climate action seriously. We need to reduce our carbon footprint. We need a strategy that also provides direction and actions on how to deliver on the need for climate friendly, well-functioning towns and villages. It is very clear than the 'enabling' and 'market depending' strategy has not been able to provide the wider community what it needs. The FDS should identify more pro-active methods to ensure it will deliver on its promises as expressed in the 'outcomes' (should be called objectives) as needed my its community and as legally required. The FDS is failing on all of these ambitions. More pro-active methods include the use of redevelopment agencies, fast track processes and lower consent charges and development contribution for community / social housing initiatives. It is disturbing to see that the FDS has not included any of this and continues to leave it to the market. The more extensive and technical submission from the Nelson Tasman 2050 collective provides a more systematic assessment of the FDS and suggestions for improvement. This feedback form has been very difficult to use effectively to try and convey my concerns on the FDS but I tried!. I can totally understand why many people have been scared away by the FDS and this submission template. The submission from the Nelson Tasman 2050 collective is to be considered part of my feedback and |
|-----------------------|-----|--|
| 31494 Mr Jan Heijs | N/A | should be processed and considered as such. SEE ATTACHMENT 1 (summarised Full NelsonTasman2050 submission): highly recommend rethink to entire strategy due to reliance on greenfield expansion in the FDS/proposed growth scenario and the impacts of this on GHG emisisons. Concern about the intensification rates proposed (backyard development) |
| 31495 Ms Mary Duncan | N/A | We need to fundamentally change the way we approach growth. Instead of focussing on short term budgets we need to take a longer view - isn't that exactly what a 30 year strategy should be doing? Then why do we still promote sprawling suburbs, when we already know that energy will only become more expensive, resources sparser and when we already know that we will have to live a lot more efficiently? Rather than just seeing growth as a numbers game, we should be thinking about the quality of our environments both our urban spaces, but also our rural and natural landscapes. We need to stop "business as usual" and start taking climate action seriously. We need to reduce our carbon footprint. We need a strategy that also provides direction and actions on how to deliver on the need for climate friendly, well functioning towns and villages. This strategy, as proposed at the moment, does the opposite. |
| 31498 Ms Anne Kolless | N/A | It is important to consider the Health & well-being of our future generations & not cram masses of people into one area. |

| | | Green space with forest parks & playgrounds for kids are equally important as is somewhere to go to ones work place in an easy comfortable non stressed traffic jammed way. |
|--------------------------------|-------|--|
| 31500 Ms Suzan Van Wijngaarder | n N/A | Why does Golden Bay need to grow and become a second Richmond? Is this something the council wants? Or is it something the people from the Golden Bay want? I agree that there is a need of more affordable houses, but not so many! I am wondering if the council needs all the new houses in Golden Bay to have more people to pay for that stupid dam. |
| | | Why not use the houses that are already here. There are far too many houses that are only used as holiday homes and that are empty for most of the year. Why not change a rule that only a small percentage of houses can be used for holiday homes. That would provide enough houses to live in and then all those new suburbs are not necessary. |
| 31504 Mr Michael Goetz | N/A | T- 163 Rural residential around Rangihaeata is not suitable for that kind of Development. |
| 31505 Cheryl Heten | N/A | Perhaps local authority "cost of development" should be public knowledge thereby creating an opportunity for existing urban dwellers to change existing housing into multi story homes rather than restricted to "property developers". |
| 31507 Renatus Kempthorne | N/A | Growth needs to be guided, especially in the Smart Little City. |
| 31509 Mrs Michaela Markert | N/A | Regarding Tasman Village, the developer-driven approach doesn't meet the FDS Standards. The fact that it is presented here for the future while the developers are willing to invest now makes me wonder. I also find it very hard to work with 2 screens to answer the questionnaire. The way the questionnaire is set up makes it very hard for us residents to answer it in the first place. Even though I am familiar with planning, the participation costs me a whole morning doing it in the shortest way possible. Maybe you could reduce it to one screen in the future as not everybody has a printer. The maps and the suggestions you are relating to should be shown on the same page. |
| 31510 Dr Martin James Grinsted | N/A | There is a critical need for a strategy that is more robust in its integrative approaches (e.g. this one ignores the role of energy, or the climate vulnerability of almost all of the region's economy). We also need ongoing well-founded public education to equip our community to prepare in a cohesive way for the challenges that lie ahead due to the impacts of climate change and, while this may fall outside the scope of the strategy, it will be a great advantages to making the strategy effective. |
| 31513 Bob Kennedy | N/A | See attached. Summarised - opposed to T163 rural res given loss of ecological values and birdlife. |
| | | The Golden Bay branch of Forest and Bird object to the proposal in the Future Development Strategy to rezone land at 42 Keoghan Road Site T163 to Rural Residential. We ask that the property be removed |
| | | |

| | | from the Future Development Strategy. |
|-----------------------|-----|---|
| | | The lower part of the property at 42 Keoghan Road is part of the Onahau wetland, a fresh water wetland of national significance. |
| | | Ecological values in the above report state that it is very important to birdlife. The wetland supports a healthy population of fernbirds, is home to banded rail and the nationally critical bittern. It is also a nesting site for the harrier hawk. |
| | | Evidence of early Maori occupation is found throughout the area. The Future Development Strategy gives no information of what research and consultation Council has had with iwi prior to identification of T163 in the draft document. We would like to be assured this has taken place. |
| | | Council has legal responsibilities under the NZ Coastal Policy Statement. See below: |
| | | Policy 11 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (2010) states: Indigenous biological diversity (biodiversity) |
| | | To protect indigenous biological diversity in the coastal environment: (a) avoid adverse effects of activities on: |
| | | (i) indigenous taxa that are listed as threatened or at risk in the New Zealand Threat Classification System lists; |
| | | (ii) taxa that are listed by the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources as threatened; |
| | | It is apparent that a considerable number of 'threatened' and 'at risk' taxa occur both in the Onahau wetland and the Onahau estuary. In summary, due to its location, the site T163 at 42 Keoghan Road is unsuitable for housing development. |
| 31515 Geoffrey Vause | N/A | It would have been a lot easier to do the submission on a .DocX or .Doc file as opposed to a website HTML or a PDF. We spent a lot of time filling in the questionnaire and then overnight all the saved replies disappeared. |
| 31518 Mr Ian Faulkner | N/A | I oppose the plan for 4 to 6 stories in our Tahunanui community. In the past there has been a lot of poorly planned and developer driven infill housing that has not served our community well. I don't want to see development for development sake without a clear plan of what we want as a community to make sure we develop a strong, connected happy community. I can see already what a five story, gated monstrosity with no connection to the community looks like with Ocean View, that has been plonked into the middle of our community blocking views, sun and looks out of place. |
| | | With a very busy, noisy state highway roaring through our community it seems ironic that Council seeks to bring massive intensification of housing into this area without any plan to mitigate noise, traffic volume, speed or even provision for parking. |
| | | Much more discussion and planning needs to be undertaken for a good outcome for us residents in |

| | | Tahunanui to be achieved, and that will enhance our community and not destroy it. NOTHING HIGHER THAN A PALM TREE PLEASE. |
|----------------------------|-----|--|
| 31520 Andrew Stirling | N/A | See attached (map of site). I would like to offer a recommendation that allows the use of some more marginal land for housing in the Teapot Valley Area by extending the designated area T-054 northward. My partner and I are the owners of 4 Teapot Valley Road which is the block immediately to the north of the proposed area designated T-054 in your draft strategy. (Refer to attached picture T-054 land zone.jpg). Our land sits on the lower slopes of the same hillside as the top half of area T-054. In the past we have grown a commercial crop (saffron), but this proved not to be viable long term. Since we do not have any water allocation and the land is relatively small compared to our neighbours on the western plains we have been unable to find a suitable agricultural use for our land. We feel that we can make a small but positive contribution to the future growth of this area if we are able to join our section in with area T-054 and use the land for more rural residential sections. Please alter the draft plan and extend area T-054 northwards to include 4 Teapot Valley Road? Note that due to an anomaly in the land zoning, this land is zoned Rural 1 along with the large flat properties on the eastern side of Waimea West Road that have irrigation available. The land on the same hillside as ours to the west and south has a lesser zoning, our land is the same as this. I'm sure this will not be a problem for the TDC to rectify before proceeding with the implementation of the future development strategy. I know that the future development strategy does not carry the power to re-zone land, but I hope the TDC will give strong consideration to it when deciding on zone boundaries in future. |
| 31521 Mrs Marie Waterhouse | N/A | You have missed carparking requirement. Make the inner city and city fringe intensified first. Please do not create slum areas. |
| 31522 Marilyn Davis | N/A | Please see attached: I do not support the proposal. Do not go over 2 story's in Nelson City as you will destroy its beauty and shut out people's sun. Cars do need to get off the roads, so garages or carports a necessity. Don't destroy our beautiful city with these ugly high rise buildings. |
| 31523 Ms karen steadman | N/A | There is not much mentioned about creating a more sustainable place to live, ie the encouragement of solar, own water supplies. In the smaller towns where there is plenty of rain new development areas should be encouraged to be more self reliant, rather than than rely on council infrastructure. There is a new area on the outskirts of Christchurch where having solar, water tanks and planting 15% of the section in trees are the rules. This is I think something the council should be moving towards. |
| 31524 Carsten Buschkuhle | N/A | Tasman Bay Village |
| | | The aim for this project is to create a "real village" with a core village center containing a town hall with |
| | | |

co-working spaces, stores, services. This core center also becomes the local center for the existing (approx. 2.000) inhabitants of the "Tasman Area" which we classify as starting at the top of the Ruby Bay Cliffs all the way to the Kina Highway entrance, including Kina Peninsula.

We are currently working on a masterplan with the target of developing, in stages, 150 (min. if on site serviced only) to 600 dwellings based on current availability of freshwater granted by TDC being 400 to 450m³ (600m³ shared with Tahimana who might only need 150m³). There might be areas set aside for even more intensification to max. 800 dwellings if and when TDC provides service connections in the long-term future. We feel at this scale a new village center for this region has tremendous benefits such as social life improvements, less traffic movements (climate change benefit) etc.

We are worried about the very "wide open" statement in the draft FDS documents about IWI issues (explicitly mentioned by Te Ataiwa without any detailed knowledge of the new issues for us) and seek TDC together with us and all mana whenua to rectify these "issues". We want to bring to everyone's attention that we currently hold an active consent to develop all our properties into 64 lots and have a full cultural assessment approved at hands. Therefore, we have no understanding why cultural issues would have appeared from nowhere and also we would not have to address these if we use our current existing consent.

We will be very much more able to address concerns and integrate cultural values in a village style development, we have even engaged very positively with Whakatu corporation as a possible partner which is currently being further investigated. Such a partnership would focus on exactly the benefits of a happy and heathy community as we understand is of huge value not only for mana whenua but also for us as responsible developers.

| 31525 Murray Davis | N/A | Please see attached for further detail: Summarised below: Does not support proposal but will support 2 story buildings but need to be careful where they are built - referenced their property as an example of having a 2 story building next to it and lack of afternoon sun. |
|--------------------|-----|--|
| 31526 Elise Jenkin | N/A | We need to fundamentally change the way we approach growth. We need to take a longer view rather than a focus on short term budgets. We should not still be promoting sprawling suburbs, when we already know that energy will only become more expensive, resources sparser and when we already know that we will have to live a lot more efficiently. We need to think about how much growth we really need. Rather than just have a focus of continual growth we should be thinking about the quality of our environments of urban spaces, and rural and |

| | | natural landscapes. We need to stop "business as usual" and start taking climate action seriously and reduce our carbon footprint. We need a strategy that also provides direction and actions on how to deliver on the need for climate friendly, well-functioning towns and villages. This strategy, as proposed at the moment, does not do this. |
|--------------------------|-----|---|
| 31530 Mr Richard Clement | N/A | My attached Submission covers this together my future input at a Hearing. Summarised below: Objects to Tasman Village for reasons related to lack of infrastructure, commercial/social amenities, not needed to meet projected growth, HPL, high amenity values, flooding, funding, light pollution, climate change impact (distance from centres), landbanking, consultation process and lack of early engagement with Tasman Community Association. |
| 31532 Dr Aaron Stallard | N/A | This consultation shows that NCC and TDC fail to grasp the reality of the climate and ecological crisis. The councils talk about growth as though it is healthy and normal and infinite, when in fact to address the climate and ecological crisis we require rapid degrowth in terms of resource consumption, land use, extraction of materials, GHG emissions, population, etc. This consultation should be focussed on degrowth, not growth. |
| 31533 Wendy Trevett | N/A | Make sure there are parks & reserves in the 2 proposed new towns. Public transport needs to be addressed in the contributing towns where there is adequate transportation for the workforce. |
| 31534 Mr Grant Wilkins | N/A | Please see attached - text copied below (has also included a video attachment - https://nelsoncity-my.sharepoint.com/:v:/g/personal/thuja_johnson_ncc_govt_nz/ESUgNZrYt29Iro5_vgyCoEMB9VairfE-IfYQdZZhEAqfqQ?e=CehVdt) Hi |
| | | I live at 86 Murphy Street, Toi Toi, Nelson and have done for 14 years. In this time I have been flooded so many times I've lost count. |
| | | The stormwater system goes under ground at start of my property and its constantly overflowing. This bring mud and junk that I have to clean up not to mention some times water over a meter deep. Piping the ditch up to the park 2 property's away and controlling the water there looks to be a good plan The system is out dated to many houses for it and now a new subdivisions above me will be hooking to system. |
| | | Please can this be looked at. I fear every rain storm Thanks Grant Wilkins |

| 31539 Ms Rebecca Hamid | N/A | SEE FULL SUBMISSION. Summarised below (similar to NT2050 submission): singluar focus on growth, challenges underlying growth projections, insufficient consultation, misleading submission form (outcome questions), community feedback ignored, biased process, non-compliance with government directives. Recommends re-think of the draft. |
|---------------------------|-----|---|
| 31540 Timo Neubauer | N/A | Please see two attachments including peer reviewed document. Summarised below: ATTACHMENT 1 - NelsonTasman2050 Full Submission. Challenges growth projections, economic development rationale and methodology for site selection which perpetuate greenfield expansion and counteract desired outcomes for the environment. Recommends broadening of approach taken to intensification away from infill and to a more qualitative approach that balances densities with appropriate levels of amentiy and considerations for wider urban form. Highly recommends rethink of the entire strategy to employ sound, evidence-based economic principles that facilitate quality urban consolidation. ATTACHMENT 2: Peer Review of Submission on the FDS - supports the concerns within the NT2050 submission and agrees that strategy's underlying evidential basis is weak and that the assertion of greater greenfield land supply potentially encouraging intensification of the existing urban area is fatally flawed. Greater greenfield land supply will discourage intensification. Generally, process appears rushed, more time should be taekn to develop a comprehensive strategy that better reflects the community's aspirations for more sustainable and compact urban form. |
| 31541 David & Vicki James | N/A | Please see attached - text copied below: To whom it may concern We would like to put our submission against the proposed zone changes in the Tahunanui area. Some of our concerns are parking,traffic,infrastructure,height of buildings We wish to be heard at the hearing The online submission form was unusable |

Cheers **David James** D & V James Please see attached - text copied below: 31543 Marianne Palmer N/A **Dear Councillors** I wish to submit AGAINST this proposal. I've been out of town and have only just found out about this today so don't have time (I'm flat our working in a busy Medical Centre & vaccinating) to put together a comprehensive email to you but I wish my objection to be noted and registered. I am against this for a number of reasons including, but not limited to: 1. Both 3 and 6 story building will look totally out of place and ruin the character of The Wood. Already we have the Cawthron Institute sticking out like a sore thumb. 2. The shade that these tall buildings will cast over existing buildings will reduce/ruin the level of sunlight and sunshine coming into existing homes. This will lead to higher power bills for existing residents and living in a dimmer house which is likely to increase the level of SAD (a recognised medical condition) in the community. 3. The enjoyment of ones home will be reduce with less light and less sunshine. People often choose a property based on where the sun falls and how long it lasts. 4. Privacy will be significantly reduced with 3 and 6 storey buildings, especially when these buildings can be built up to just 1m from existing boundaries. Once again, this will reduce the enjoyment of ones property and it simply isn't morally right of fair to current property owners. 5. If developers aren't required to provide garages or off street parking where are cars supposed to go? Tasman Street, Grove Street and Halifax Street East are already full of cars on both sides of the road from 8am to 6pm Mon to Fri as workers in the city leave there cars there all day which leaves no on street car parking for existing property owners and makes the street narrow and busy. This is particularly the case around Learning Land and Bobby Franks Café (both excellent amenities in the community). Are the developers even going to provide proper sheds and parking for bicycle and mobility scooters? 6. There are no empty sections in the areas of proposed 3 and 6 storey developments so does this mean

This is not an exhaustive list but it's all I have time for before 14.4.22. I want my email to be registered as

existing house are going to be knocked down of removed on purpose thereby reducing the character of

the areas in question? I certainly hope not. The ONLY suitable height it 2 storeys or less.

| | | on objection and I want someone to reply to this email. |
|--------------------------------|-----|--|
| 31544 Debra & Jonathan Leonard | N/A | T-163 42 Keoghan Road (as referenced in Draft Future |
| | | Development Strategy) |
| | | Lot 2 Deposited Plan 20066 |
| | | RT NL13B/671 |
| | | 26.0600 hectares |
| | | The Leonard's own the above land holdings in Keoghan |
| | | Road, referenced as T-163 in the Draft Future |
| | | Development Strategy (FDS). |
| | | See attachment - summarised below: |
| | | ATTACHMENT 1 - The Leonards support the inclusion of T-163 within the FDS with a yield of |
| | | approximately 50 residential units. However, they seek an amendment to a G6 Typology |
| | | with an average lot size of 2,500m2. |
| | | ATTACHMENT 2: See attached feasibility report for on-site wastewater disposal and potential for |
| | | subdivision (supporting inclusion of T163 at G6 density). |
| 31545 Mr Bruce Bosselmann | N/A | Please see attached - text copied below: |
| | | This proposal is absolutely alarming, even a 2 storey apartments next to your house has major sunlight and visual effects, your "Future development Strategy" needs to very carefully look at what you allow a where |
| | | The Wood area is a wonderful, lovely place to live now, would any of you want a 6 story apartment next |
| | | to you? I don't think so, and I do not want one next door either |
| 31546 Anna & Liviu Friedman | N/A | See attachment. T-168 303 Aporo Road (as referenced in Draft Future |
| | | Development Strategy) |
| | | Lot 1 DP 328328, Lot 1 DP 19518 and Lot 3 DP 304381 |
| | | RT 606765 |
| | | 16.3311 hectares |
| | | Lot 2 Deposited Plan 461365 |
| | | RT 606764 |
| | | 18.3607 hectares |
| | | The Fridman's own the above land holdings in Aporo Road, referenced as T-168 in the Draft Future |
| | | - ' |
| | | Development Strategy (FDS). |

| 31547 Raine Oakland Estates N/A Please see attached for further detail. Summarised below: Owns property at 467 Suffolk Road, Nelson (contain sites N11 and N112) and strongly support inclusion in the FDS with changes in extent to the boundaries and typologies. Detailed plans for and business park growth. See attached. Summarised - requests for extensions to sites around Richmond to cover Boost landholdings as shown in Appendix A of attachment. Booster generally supports the approach of the FDS to provide appropriately zoned land for business, industry and other commercial activities for the growth of the Nelson and Tasman regions, particularly in the main centre of | mit that T- |
|---|-------------|
| landholdings as shown in Appendix A of attachment. Booster generally supports the approach of the FDS to provide appropriately zoned land for business, industry and other commercial activities for the growth | |
| zoned land for business, industry and other commercial activities for the growth | er |
| | |
| | |
| Richmond. Booster supports the core proposal of the FDS to provide for | |
| consolidated growth focused along State Highway 6 and meeting demands of the Tasman rural towns. | |
| Booster is a financial services company, with a number of investment arms. Its | |
| investments include agriculture, horticulture and viticulture land and companies. | |
| PTBI is a Public Trust established under the Public Trust Act 2001 and in its | |
| capacity as custodian of funds manged by Booster owns five blocks of properties in Tasman. | |
| Part of the Packhouse Vineyard Block has been identified as an area for future | |
| Business development under the FDS. Booster supports this approach, but | |
| considers it is also appropriate to expand the future development areas to include the balance of the Packhouse Vineyard Block. | |
| Booster also seeks the expansion of the future development area in Richmond | |

| | | to include the Annabrook Block, Packhouse Vineyard Block, Hunter Vineyard and Edens Road Block. Booster considers that it is appropriate for the Packhouse Vineyard Block and the Annabrook Block to be identified as future |
|------------------------|-----|---|
| | | Business development areas and that the Hunter Vineyard and Edens Road 4 1482 |
| | | Block be identified as future Greenfields residential development areas (type G1 – Medium density) under the FDS. |
| | | Identifying the Richmond Blocks as areas for future development is consistent with the purpose and approach of the FDS. |
| | | The Annabrook Block, Packhouse Vineyard Block, Hunter Vineyard Block and Edens Road Block are all located on State Highway 6 on the outskirts of Richmond, and within the general area identified as the "Core area for new growth" under the FDS, as shown in Figure 2 below. 3 Therefore, the FDS already recognises the general location as appropriate for development and growth. |
| | | Summarised below: Supports business growth in Richmond however proposes additional growth areas around Hope and extension to site T-035. |
| 1549 Mr Ian McComb | N/A | Establishing a system of land use consents for temporary/relocatable housing in areas that would not be suitable in the longer term such as areas subject to climate change. eg. increasing temporary worker accommodation in Motueka until such time as they are needed to be moved because of sea level rise. Land use consents for temporary/relocatable houses reduces the housing crisis now, whilst waiting for identified areas to be developed. |
| 31550 Toby Neil Harvey | N/A | See attached. Summarised below: owner of T003, does not support its inclusion in the FDS and imperative to keep it as a farm. |
| | | I would like to discuss 62a River Terrace Road & 139 Jeffries Road that is on your T003 proposed site. This farm as long as I can remember has been called "Waimea Plains View" and I was surprised to see o the "arcgis" site that someone has named my farm "Shannee Hills", which it is not. It feels like my rights and that of my whakapapa have once again been taken away right in front of our noses. |

| | | Please take my property out of this scheme, I fully do not support it and know that it's imperative to keep it as my farm, the home of my whanau. I also would like the rates to remain as the current status quo or even lower as it is being used as farm land, not commercial/residential. The rates are already high & would like to look at the rates remission for my farm as anything more will effect our quality of life. We live by our means from that which our land provides, and presently that's enough. |
|-------------------------|-----|---|
| 31552 Mrs Rowena Smith | N/A | On behalf of Ngāti Apa ki te Rā Tō I support the inclusion of the Massey Street site in St Arnaud/Lake Rotoiti as a growth area through the FDS process. As such, if there are any other submissions made regarding this land block in the FDS process, Ngāti Apa ki te Rā Tō want the opportunity to be heard at the upcoming hearings. |
| 31554 Wendy Barker | N/A | Fossil fuel driven vehicles are going to be phased out and gone. Unless you are serious about public transport and appropriate and safe cycleways (as are prevalent in many European countries) this idea of sprawl is totally inappropriate. It seems to me this plan has been designed without thought for the reality of the future. |
| 31556 Ms Esmé Palliser | N/A | As we grow the need for more green space is essential. Currently TDC is well below its requirements for recreational/reserve spaces & I'm not sure in NCC. FDS is more than just housing, infrastructure and roads. It can not be about social engineering - it is about people, families & communities and their social, mental & physical well being. |
| 31557 Mr Richard Palmer | N/A | Please see attached - text copied below: Dear Nelson City Council I have just returned from a time spent in Dunedin. Time does not permit me to have the appropriate form of submission, however I would appreciate that my submission is acknowledged. This is a rushed submission to express my strong objection to this proposed change in Building By-Laws. I am 80 years old. My forefathers came to Nelson in 1834 and the rest of the family sailed here on "Phoebe" in 1843. My roots go very deep by Nelson standards. I am not a wealthy man, and I am trying to maintain my living standards. The Nelson City Council has previous cost me a lot of equity to the tune of \$180,000's when we came to sell, after some ten years of living at 21 Scotland St. address. The redrawing of the Hazards Plan about eight years ago, put a red line right through of living room. This was of course very detrimental to us.(There is evidence that the fault line does probably not exist.) I cannot absorb another loss due to Council impositions. If the "Intensive Development" as planned goes ahead I can see the same property value loss occurring again. This is not a fair deal to me or my family. I am considerably older than my wife who will undoubtably suffer if this plan change proceeds. We do not wish to be living in shade, losing our privacy. |

| | We do not wish to compete with non-residents for carparking spaces on the street. Tasman Street is narrow enough as it is. With two Child-care facilities on the street traffic is congested, busy and sometimes very dangerous. The cars travel too fast anyway. There are high number of elderly people living in the area and they will be disadvantaged thru loss of sur and mobility will be hampered by congestion. The cost of living in a shaded house increases costs for the residents. Electricity costs will rise and maybe health levels will suffer. The results as planned will cause a :ghetto type" environment. This is the 2022 not the 1922's I do not want these changes as this Plan will impose hardship (lack of sun and privacy) on the existing residents who decided to live here in this area "as it is" I am against this plan. My health precludes me from attending in person at a Hearing. Therefore, please accept this email as my discontent to the proposal. I present this submission in my true honest opinion that such a move will be wrong in the respects that I |
|-----|---|
| | have stated, and sadly time does not permit further points against. |
| N/A | Make it a policy to protect wildlife corridors. Keep the wildlife at the top of our agenda, because all they need to thrive is our protection. This is an area with a bounty of retired people with the time and skills to trap predators and protect our taonga. People come to this area because of the beautiful natural environment - Let's make sure we don't gobble up every bit of it. |
| N/A | Putting a line in the sand is not easy and many objections in 2022 may have further opportunities in the future. In short what is a Negative now could turn into a Positive further down the timeline. T-048 will not be available. |
| N/A | I agree with so many of the sentiments behind the questions BUT the detail of what is planned does not match. The needs of people, and the lifestyle they seek are ultimately being ignored in favour of nuts and bolts. This survey errs on social engineering rather than community development. It is very hard to highlight anywhere within these proposals where the standard of LIVING, JOY, HABITAT, RELATIONSHIP WITH THE ENVIRONMENT, CONNECTIVITY AND SENSE OF BELONGING, PRESERVATION OF WILDLIFE AND DEVELOPMENT OF WILDLIFE CORRIDORS, AND THE PRESERVATION OF THE UNIQUENESS OF THIS REGIO AND WHAT MAKES IT SPECIAL, ITS HISTORY AND SIGNIFICANCE TO LOCAL IWI is highlighted and addressed. |
| | Thankyou for the opportunity to submit. |
| | N/A |

| 31563 Mrs Loretta Anne Hogg | N/A | No leave them to grow organically now and focus on underdeveloped regions - as above. |
|-------------------------------|-----|---|
| 31564 Ms Magdalena Garbarczyk | N/A | We need to fundamentally change the way we approach growth. Instead of focussing on short term budgets, we need to take a longer view. We need to think about how much growth we really need. We should be thinking about the quality of our environments both our urban spaces, but also our rural and natural landscapes. We need to stop "business as usual" and start taking climate action seriously. We need to reduce our carbon footprint. We need a strategy that also provides direction and actions or how to deliver on the need for climate-friendly, well-functioning towns and villages. |
| 31566 Mr Timo Neubauer | N/A | We need to fundamentally change the way we approach growth. Instead of focussing on short term budgets we need to take a longer view - isn't that exactly what a 30 year strategy should be doing? Then why do we still promote sprawling suburbs, when we already know that energy will only become more expensive, resources sparser and when we already know that we will have to live a lot more efficiently? |
| | | We need to think about how much growth we really need. Rather than just seeing growth as a numbers game, we should be thinking about the quality of our environments both our urban spaces, but also our rural and natural landscapes. |
| | | We need to stop "business as usual" and start taking climate action seriously. We need to reduce our carbon footprint. We need a strategy that also provides direction and actions on how to deliver on the need for climate friendly, well-functioning towns and villages. This strategy, as proposed at the moment, does the opposite. |
| 31570 Ms Annabel Norman | N/A | With the urgency we now have for a complete re boot to respond to climate change, preservation of our green spaces, protection of our rivers, up grading of infrastructure, transport options to reduce use of cars, protection of highly fertile soils for food production this FDS is not acceptable. We are living in a world now where we are all well informed that our lifestyle model is causing damage to ecosystems, the degradation of natural areas and contributing to rapidly escalating climate change. SEE ATTACHED |
| 31571 Ms Susan Drew | N/A | So, my plea is to protect the Maitai and stop it from being rezoned. I apologise that I don't know all the and out of the proposal but I do know that I do not want to not see the beauty disturbed. I also would be |
| | | |

| | | very concerned with the increased traffic movements down Nile St and flowing on to Tory St. There would be storm water and pollution outcomes from intensification as well. SEE ATTACHED - summarised below: Letter and various news articles regarding the Maitai Valley and value of the area. |
|--------------------------|-----|---|
| 31572 Mr David Todd | N/A | The Future Development Strategy as presented would allow changes to take place without any notification or right to object. Intensification will take place, but it must be accompanied by a procedure which protects existing property owners rights. |
| 31573 Mrs Susan Lea | N/A | It seems decisions have been made that lock Nelson Tasman into a plan that residents have little say in, and indeed our councillers may not either The Nelson / Tasman area is unique - intensive growth is neither required or wanted we must limit the town/city boundaries / preserve our natural features - beautiful vistas - green areas , coastal beaches - rivers and valleys - mountains / lakes . Walking and hiking and bike tracks . Enhance our air quality. control polution, limit placing of indusrial areas sensitivly (ie the MDF factory should never have been buildt where it is , Eves valley better option.) Another concern is Tahunanui - I do not want to see it crow into an area of high rise tourist accommodation. again devalueing existing residential housing. Small and Smart should be our mantra Thank you for reading |
| 31574 Mr David Bolton | N/A | This submission is in support of the T-94 Greenfield Future Development Area on my property at 144 Whitby Road, Wakefield. PLEASE SEE ATTACHED - summarised below: Asseses above site against outcomes and supports inclusion within the FDS. |
| 31576 Mr Joris Tinnemans | N/A | A 2020 study published by The Lancet from researchers funded by the Global Burden of Disease Study projected that world population will peak in 2064 at 9.7 billion and then decline to 8.8 billion in 2100. A decline in population in 40 years or so may not apply to NZ, but it will eventually. If one is actually thinking about the future, we should not include greenfield expansion in our plan. Our children will thank us for leaving green fields green. |
| 31577 Mrs Jarna Smart | N/A | Toddler playgrounds are a huge need in these towns, children up to age 6 miss out on being able to play safely at parks and playgrounds. Also a scooter park near the skate park in motueka would be beneficial for many as our skate park is often used by professional riders and isn't safe for our younger tamariki |
| 31578 Karen Munting | N/A | I do NOT support the NCC proposal known as the Future Development Strategy that will see housing intensification by the establishment of high rise apartments in zones that cover all the Wood area, Manuka street to Nile, Weka street and up past the hospital. |
| 31580 Jenny Long | N/A | Doing what we can to reduce emissions, to design towns that make environmentally-friendly behaviours easy, and to protect green spaces from urban sprawl is critical. |
| | | We cannot have a healthy society and a healthy economy with an unhealthy environment - the |
| | | |

| | | environment is what allows us to have societies and economies, not vice versa. |
|----------------------------|-----|--|
| 31581 Mr Tony Bielby | N/A | Support growth where appropriate yes, but don't need ridiculous large strategies to over-create it. If this is allowed then rural towns and rural living will cease to be rural towns and rural living. Why is it necessary to encourage unnatural business growth and accommodation? This should be a natural progression to meet local demands and natural growth. The tail shouldn't wag the dog! Creating an unnecessary demand is short term, profit driven greed. This plan is actively encouraging landowners (and seemingly inspired by them) to move away from using highly productive land for growing into housing and infrastructure so they, and the council profit. This is obviously greed driven. The attitude that a plan of rural development such as what is proposed can be driven by acquisitive individuals potentially seeing huge profits by selling their land for development is fundamentally wrong. It's about all our futures, not theirs or individuals in the council. Rural is rural; a perspective which is being totally ignored by many of these proposals. The existing qualit of life by existing residents of this part of the world is being ignored. |
| 31582 Mr Anthony Pearson | N/A | PLEASE re-assess your population growth assumptions |
| 31583 Mrs Barbara Watson | N/A | Refer to attachment. Summarised below: Oppose to Tasman Village, would create 3rd largest town in the district, rural lifestyle/amenity, climate change and prioritising intensification, lack of public transport in the area, not needed to meet demand even in high growth scenario. |
| 31586 Ms Charlotte Watkins | N/A | As well as the many items outlined above, including in Q 12 and 29, there is a critical need for a strategy that is more robust in its integrative approaches (e.g. this one ignores the role of energy, or the climate vulnerability of almost all of the region's economy). We also need ongoing well-founded public education to equip our community to prepare in a cohesive way for the challenges that lie ahead due to the impacts of climate change and, while this may fall outside the scope of the strategy, it will be a great advantages to making the strategy effective. |
| 31592 Mr Lee Woodman | N/A | We need to fundamentally change the way we approach growth. Instead of focussing on short term budgets, we need to take a longer view. We should be thinking about the quality of our environments both urban spaces but also rural and natural landscapes. We need to stop "business as usual" and start taking climate action seriously. We need to reduce our carbon footprint. We need a strategy that also provides direction and actions on how to deliver on the need for climate-friendly, well-functioning towns and villages. This strategy, as currently proposed, does the opposite. |
| 31593 Mr William Samuels | N/A | We need to fundamentally change the way we approach growth. Instead of focussing on short term |
| | | |

| | | budgets we need to take a longer view - isn't that exactly what a 30 year strategy should be doing? Then why do we still promote sprawling suburbs, when we already know that energy will only become more |
|------------------------------------|-----|---|
| | | expensive, resources sparser and when we already know that we will have to live a lot more efficiently? |
| | | We need to think about how much growth we really need. |
| | | Rather than just seeing growth as a numbers game, we should be thinking about the quality of our environments both our urban spaces, but also our rural and natural landscapes. |
| | | We need to stop "business as usual" and start taking climate action seriously. We need to reduce our carbon footprint. We need a strategy that also provides direction and actions on how to deliver on the need for climate friendly, well-functioning towns and villages. This strategy, as proposed at the moment, does the opposite. |
| 31594 Ms Annemarie Braunsteiner | N/A | We need to fundamentally change the way we approach growth. Instead of focusing on short term budgets we need to take a longer view - isn't that exactly what a 30 year strategy should be doing? Then why do we still promote sprawling suburbs, when we already know that energy will only become more expensive, resources sparser and when we already know that we will have to live a lot more efficiently? We need to think about how much growth we really need. |
| | | I think how growth is addressed in the FDS is from what we think we know – not considering what we might have already learnt from the past? Our world is in constant change and any strategy should reflect that – and whilst it does state to be under review in 3 years, etc I am not certain as already mentioned i will be adaptable as we need it to be. |
| | | There is no "business as usual", we need taking climate action seriously. We need to reduce our carbon footprint. We need a strategy that also provides direction and actions on how to deliver on the need for climate friendly, well- functioning towns and villages. We need this strategy to educate people – what the need, not what they desire – to remodel towards an innovative ne thought process in the people the FDS aims to serve – and this I believe is the responsibility of our local councils! |
| | | This strategy, as proposed at the moment, feels not progressive or not progressive enough to work towards a future where we all are served in what we need & at the same time serve the challenges that will drop on us year after year. |
| 31595 Gary Clark | N/A | As above |
| 31596 Mr Raymond Brasem | N/A | We need to fundamentally change the way we approach growth. Instead of focussing on short term budgets we need to take a longer view - isn't that exactly what a 30 year strategy should be doing? Then |

| | | why do we still promote sprawling suburbs, when we already know that energy will only become more expensive, resources sparser and when we already know that we will have to live a lot more efficiently? We need to think about how much growth we really need. Rather than just seeing growth as a numbers game, we should be thinking about the quality of our environments both our urban spaces, but also our rural and natural landscapes. We need to stop "business as usual" and start taking climate action seriously. We need to reduce our carbon footprint. We need a strategy that also provides direction and actions on how to deliver on the need for climate friendly, well-functioning towns and villages. This strategy, as proposed at the moment does the opposite. |
|---------------------------|-----|---|
| 31599 Ms Charlotte Stuart | N/A | I have some feedback about the intensification proposal for the wood. This is not been mentioned specifically but I hear it is on the cards that six stories will be allowed in the wood? I am not opposed to some intensification in this area, but I am opposed to unrestricted intensification, and high-rise units. I think three levels should remain the extent of the height restriction. |
| 31600 Ms Jane FAIRS | N/A | We need to fundamentally change the way we approach growth. Instead of focussing on short term budgets we need to take a longer view - isn't that exactly what a 30 year strategy should be doing? Then why do we still promote sprawling suburbs, when we already know that energy will only become more expensive, resources sparser and when we already know that we will have to live a lot more efficiently? We need to think about how much growth we really need. Rather than just seeing growth as a numbers game, we should be thinking about the quality of our environments both our urban spaces, but also our rural and natural landscapes. We need to stop "business as usual" and start taking climate action seriously. We need to reduce our carbon footprint. We need a strategy that also provides direction and actions on how to deliver on the need for climate friendly, well-functioning towns and villages. This strategy, as proposed at the moment, does the opposite. |
| 31605 Mrs Olivia Neubauer | N/A | We need to fundamentally change the way we approach growth. Instead of focussing on short term budgets we need to take a longer view - isn't that exactly what a 30 year strategy should be doing? Ther why do we still promote sprawling suburbs, when we already know that energy will only become more expensive, resources sparser and when we already know that we will have to live a lot more efficiently? We need to think about how much growth we really need. |

| | | Rather than just seeing growth as a numbers game, we should be thinking about the quality of our environments both our urban spaces, but also our rural and natural landscapes. |
|--------------------------------|-----|--|
| | | We need to stop "business as usual" and start taking climate action seriously. We need to reduce our carbon footprint. We need a strategy that also provides direction and actions on how to deliver on the need for climate friendly, well-functioning towns and villages. This strategy, as proposed at the moment, does the opposite. |
| 31608 Robbie Thomson | N/A | Clearly the FDS is advisory. What is needed is some legislation with teeth to enable development to go in the desired direction. Typically development happens when farmers or croppers get forced to sell by rate hikes or offers they can't refuse, and private development companies push for a rezone that councils are often happy to grant due to demand for housing. So most development is driven by private enterprise for a profit motive, not always for the best outcome. This model has to be changed if we are to work towards our best future, and some of this change needs to come from central and local government. |
| 31609 Mrs Sonja Antonia Lamers | N/A | Supportive of Council plans to 1 Provide opportunities for housing development in the district 2 Increase housing variety in Wakefield 3 Plan for future bus routes between Wakefield and Richmond/ Nelson PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENTS. We would like to ask for an extended time as a group to be heard for our submission. |
| 31610 Ms Mary Lancaster | N/A | A fixed percentage of housing needs to be affordable Thoughtful intensification of existing towns, near to jobs, should be priotitised over more remote greenfield development requiring the one-car-per-commuter formula |
| 31611 Ms Jude Osborne | N/A | Take a long term view - these things take time to build, so these plans need to be future proofed. Lead the housing build - don't sit back and let developers dictate what form it should take. Identify needs project 30 years ahead - and build towards that need. Centralise your housing strategy to intensification - not greenfield sites - if you want it to succeed. Don't build on greenfield sites if you want to take an active stance in lowering traffic traffic levels - inner city intensification is the best solution to overcome this, alongside having attractive infrastructure to mak this lifestyle desirable. Avoid creating cheap commuter suburbs. |
| 31612 Mr Paul Davey | N/A | I am very concerned about the plan to allow developers to build 6 storey buildings in the Tahunanui area, |
| | | |

| | | which some how fails to get a mention in this future plan. Probably Nelsons most iconic beach suburb would be ruined and the great family friendly ambiance of the area would be gone. The idea of intensifying an area so close to the sea which already has major issues with erosion is fool hardy and would only come from someone who doesn't think Global Warming and Sea Level Rising is |
|------------------------------|-----|---|
| | | happening. Who would benefit from high rise buildings been built in Tahunanui. You can't hide 6 storey towers behind a tree, a whole community would suffer for the greed of a few |
| 31613 Henry Davey Wraight | N/A | Why is there no subject to submit on Tahunanui? Theirs options for stoke but yet tahunanui again gets forgotten again. |
| 31615 Mrs Annie Pokel | N/A | We need to fundamentally change the way we approach growth. Instead of focussing on short term budgets, we need to take a longer view. We should be thinking about the quality of our environments both urban spaces but also rural and natural landscapes. We need to stop "business as usual" and start taking climate action seriously. We need to reduce our carbon footprint. We need a strategy that also provides direction and actions on how to deliver on the need for climate-friendly, well-functioning towns and villages. This strategy, as currently proposed, does the opposite. |
| 31616 Mrs Marion van Oeveren | N/A | We need to take climate change seriously and change the way we approach growth. We need well functioning urban and town centres that support low carbon living, working and transport. |
| 31617 Ms steph jewell | N/A | Luckily I have an injured leg so am sitting on the couch, leg elevated, with time to apply myself to this. I had got to this very stage this afternoon but accidentally hit some random key and lost the lot. So this is my second attempt. Thank you for the opportunity to say my bit. I'm currently very privileged in where and how I live, but I haven't always been, I know what it is like to buy coupon groceries only. If we don't concentrate on the environment and carbon, everything will be much worse, and this is our opportunity to stop the bad practices. When I'm too decrepit to live as I currently do, I'd like to be on the 2nd or 3rd or 4th floor with a view of the last century's roof tops, the mountains and the street below, and just for me 30 or 40 sq metres will be fine if it's warm and light and my kitchen doesn't look into someone's bathroom. I'll grow basil and a nikau in pots on my balcony. I won't smell petrol fumes. Perhaps I'll hear the quiet hiss of the light rail I've used in Dublin: Motueka will have this because it will be the new conurbation with Tasman and Braeburn, all asphalted; plusses and minuses. But to be more serious again, not only the 80kph speed limit, but how about no more than one residence per person/family? I think they have this in Costa Rica, it would help our housing crisis. I indulge in driving |

| | | to Kaiteriteri 3 or 4 times over summer and there are always many unoccupied houses with their curtains closed. Is this the District that we want? I don't want Communism but we are way out of balance in so many ways and a council should be able to target the difficulties from many angles. |
|------------------------------------|-----|---|
| 31619 Ms Marama Handcock- Scott | N/A | There are specific questions about the levels of intensification in all areas but not Tahunanui. Why? Have you already made up your mind and don't want feedback? Or is Tahunanui just forgotten? |
| | | I think the proposal for consideration diagram is misleading. It completely misses identifying Tahunanui on this diagram. It also uses icons for low-rise housing in the Tahunanui area on this diagram which is clearly not what the strategy is proposing. A tiny area of Richmond centre is proposed for high intensification but you are happy to identify it correctly, but where a larger area of Tahunanui is concerned, you don't. Are you being deliberately misleading so that people have to really dig and find out what you have proposed for Tahunanui? Or is Tahunanui just forgotten again? https://tdc.cwp.govt.nz/assets/PageContentImages/The-Proposal-for-Website.png |

| 31621 Dr Kath Walker | N/A | While the draft strategy lists the attributes which previous surveys have shown people living here value most (eg good access to natural areas, supportive community, regard for environmental protection) the |
|----------------------------|-----|---|
| | | strategy proposed does little to try and protect those attributes. • It presents as a fait accompli a high population growth model, when that would destroy the essence of the area. |
| | | • In suggesting such broad scale intensification, the strategy makes no attempt to retain the existing character of the places most people already live ie the Nelson city flat land, the seaside village of Tahunanui, and around Isel Park in Stoke. |
| | | In this respect it would impose an entirely different living condition on whole communities who have settled there precisely because of their current character. |
| | | In contrast it suggests potential green-fields development in the Maitai and behind Stoke should be "developer-led". Yet these are the only sites where the nature of the land development can still be known before people choose to live there, so if developed should be required by NCC to be high intensity from the start. |
| | | Rather than encouraging further increases in population by using up more and more greenfields land, and by allowing the nature of the current settlement to drastically change thru indiscriminate high-rise building, the strategy should focus on constraining growth in population. |
| | | • This could be done by setting small footprint sizes of any new build, including and especially those on lifestyle blocks on the edges of town. |
| | | In conclusion, the proposed strategy is lazy in its approach- essentially allowing both the current settlements to expand outwards while also irretrievably changing the nature of the only parts of the town old enough to have some charm. More thoughtful and inventive approaches are needed. |
| 31622 Peter Butler | N/A | Just that you have marked Tahuna slump for infill housing which I see as dangerous given its vulnerability, whihc will only increase with climate change |
| 31623 Ms Lucy Charlesworth | N/A | This questionnaire is poorly worded and ambiguous. Unfortunately, this makes it inaccessible to many members of our community. Badly done guys. I am wary of answering these questions as I cannot be sure of how they will be interpreted. So I will state - I do not agree with developing green spaces. These spaces need to be reserved and protected to allow for sustainable biodiversity and for future generations. Intensification within Nelson CBD needs to be a priority. I do not agrees with building on Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats. I do not agree with housing development on green fields. There is a climate emergency. Remove these areas from the FDS. |
| 31624 Mr Yachal Upson | N/A | Just in case it wasn't clear: Climate change. Sea Level Rise. Energy scarcity. The need for close, strong, self sufficient communities (probably on bikes). The party is almost over |
| 31625 Dr Bruno Lemke | N/A | Mapua has a paucity of public green space (about 2% of the total area). And because of the planning |
| | | |

| | | regulations that require 5% of the developed land to be set aside for reserves and for these to be within walking distance of residents (less than ½ km), this results in lots of tiny unconnected green space. Completely unsuited for native plants, animals and birds. Also if 2 storey buildings are promoted then there needs to double the land area set aside for public reserves. A simple solution would be that council PLANS these reserves to be in suitable areas and of suitable size and that developers contribute to the purchase of council planned reserves. |
|--------------------------|-----|---|
| 31627 Mr Timothy Tyler | N/A | Mode shift - get places of work closer to where people live. |
| 31628 Mr Daniel Levy | N/A | The inclusion and increase in scale of the proposed greenfield development areas in Kaka Valley and Orchard Flats in the FDS2022 disregards the flawed nature of the inclusion of the Maitai Valley development areas in the 2019 FDS (only 4 submitters) despite overwhelming public rejection of these areas in the UGS 2006 and the current 13000 strong petition for the Maitai Valley not to be urbanized. This seems to be yet another attempt to sidestep public opinion and the democratic will of Nelson residents. There may be legal obligations to provide for future growth but these obligations do not call for growth at any cost. Proposed development of this area has already caused too much distress and division in Nelson and the well being of the existing society should be more carefully considered when planning for the future. A total disregard for the huge potential impact on the currently enjoyed rural amenity of the Maitai Valley is unacceptable. The potential negative impact on the physical and mental well being of Nelson residents should not be ignored when producing high level planning documents such as this FDS. Previous generations of Nelsonians and Councils have always valued the rural amenity and succeeded in protecting that stretch of the Maitai Valley from the ravishes of urbanization. The proposed and much needed city intensification will only render the rural character of the Maitai Valley even more valuable in future. This together with the unacceptable potential impacts on the health of the Maitai river plus the increased risk of flooding downstream in Nelson City that would result from developing this area, lead me to strongly advocate for the removal of the Kaka Valley and Orchard Flat Areas from the proposed FDS2022. |
| 31630 Ms Stefanie Huber | N/A | I request that the Nelson City Council, does not accept or approve any private or public action that will lead to or result in the rezoning of rural land in The Kaka Valley, (adjacent to the Maitai Valley) as residential land. |
| 31631 Mrs Joy Shackleton | N/A | Quality, character, greenery. |
| 31631 Mrs Joy Shackleton | N/A | Time and time again the Tahunanui community has expressed its opposition to high-rise developments in the Tahunanui area. Over the years many Councillors have supported this position. In 2016, when some SHA high-rise proposals were placed before Council with short notice, there was huge community opposition. Council voted unanimously against the proposals at this time. |

| | | The current NRMP recognizes the feel and character of Tahunanui and height limits reflect the mixed-use status. Residents fear the loss of our character and village atmosphere. We are futher frustrated that there is no vision for Tahunanui and that planning seems to happen reactively and in a centralised manne with no regard for the community. We ask for a shared vision. SEE ATTACHED - summarised below: opposes high rise development in Tahunanui, supports use of Tahunanui 2004, no building should be higher than 2 or 3 storeys. |
|-----------------------------|-----|--|
| 31633 Ms Jacquetta Bell QSM | N/A | The FDS needs to have more emphasis on intensification. Car-centric greenfields 'cookie cutter' suburbs mean loss of rural land, pollution of waterways, increased traffic congestion, inefficient urban infrastructure and high-emissions construction. Nelson styles itself as a Smart Little City. Councillors have declared a Climate Emergency. if these words are to be anything other than 'greenwashing', FDS 22 needs a radical overhaul and a complete rethink of what a sustainable future really means. |
| 31635 Mr Joe Hay | N/A | SEE ATTACHMENT (summarised): opposes Maitai, disappointed with level of Greenfield in the FDS |
| 31636 Joanna Santa Barbara | N/A | We need to fundamentally change the way we approach growth. Instead of focussing on short term budgets we need to take a longer view - isn't that exactly what a 30-year strategy should be doing? Then why do we still promote sprawling suburbs, when we already know that energy will only become more expensive, resources sparser and when we already know that we will have to live a lot more efficiently? We need to think about how much growth we really need and how we can make sure the needs of local communities are met. Rather than just seeing growth as a numbers game, we should be thinking about the quality of our environments both our urban spaces, but also our rural and natural landscapes. |
| | | We need to stop "business as usual" and start taking climate action seriously. We need to reduce our carbon footprint. We need a strategy that also provides direction and actions on how to deliver on the need for climate friendly, well-functioning towns and villages. It is very clear than the 'enabling' and 'market depending' strategy has not been able to provide the wider community what it needs. The FDS should identify more pro-active methods to ensure it will deliver on its promises as expressed in the 'outcomes' (should be called objectives) as needed my its community and as legally required. The FDS is failing on all of |
| | | these ambitions. More pro-active methods include the use of redevelopment agencies, fast track processes and lower |

| | | consent charges and development contribution for community / social housing initiatives. It is disturbing to see that the FDS has not included any of this and continues to leave it to the market. |
|-------------------------|-----|--|
| 31638 Mr steve parker | N/A | Consideration to minimum lot sizes. |
| 31645 Mrs Karin Klebert | N/A | I am not an expert and able to comment everything. Please listen to Joni Tomsett or Tim Neubauer. I think they represent my ideas. |
| 31646 Mr Paul Thorton | N/A | Please see attached for further detail - summarized below: As a general comment, the plans have been developed with little or no recognition or understanding of what is in the zones identified for new build or intensification. The Kaka Valley project should be scaled back to have no impact on the Maitai Valley and there should be no vehicle access into the valley. The Orchard Flats development should be scrapped completely as it compromises the experience of being in the Maitai Valley. There should be no uncontrolled development in the streets around the city centre (The Wood, Nile/Tory St) and certainly not 6 storeys - it should be no more than 2 story to be in keeping with the look and feel of the area. There is a real sense that we are at a crossroads with the city development. The essence of planning is to be clear on what you have of value - to protect and enhance it and what you need - making sure that this complements what you already have. If the two above developments go ahead as suggested then we will most likely destroy in 5 years what has developed naturally since the city was founded. It feels like we are 50 years behind the rest of the world in not understanding the value of what we have and thinking it is all about development and growth at all costs, with no sophistication or sensitivity. I do not think the existing residents of Nelson City, those who are most affected by the proposals, want any of it and are prepared to fight to defend what they value. This is not `nimbyism', a term from 1980's, nowadays we realize that many of the reasons why locals back then opposed developments wasn't to protect their view it was to keep the integrity of why they loved or moved to a place in the first place. In 2022 we should be smarter than this - we may want to have a look around other cities in the world to see what they have done with places like the Maitai Valley and the Wood - they certainly haven't wrecked them. |
| 31649 Mr Nils Pokel | N/A | We need to fundamentally change the way we approach growth. Instead of focussing on short term budgets, we need to take a longer view. We should be thinking about the quality of our environments both urban spaces but also rural and natural landscapes. We need to stop "business as usual" and start taking climate action seriously. We need to reduce our carbon footprint. We need a strategy that also provides direction and actions on how to deliver on the need for climate-friendly, well-functioning towns and villages. This strategy, as currently proposed, does the opposite. |

| 31650 Ms Eve Ward | N/A | I believe all future growth planning for Nelson and Tasman needs to highly prioritise the environmental component. More than ever this should be a given if we want a beautiful healthy region that is playing its part in mitigating Climate Change. |
|-------------------------|-----|---|
| 31651 Dr Patrick Conway | N/A | I am outraged that this plan designates the Tahunanui Slump zone for "Residential Infill." This designation flies in the face of known geotechnical hazards inherent in developing this area. Earthquakes, floods, and inadequate infrastructure have resulted in damage to dwellings and roads. Such an incautious designation leaves this area vulnerable to potentially catastrophic disturbance by developers who may have little interest in the long-term safety or integrity of the community. |
| 31652 Mrs Anita Kagaya | N/A | All places should have basic necessities like hospital/clinic, housing, libraries, parks, etc within close reach. Having some good longterm work options so the towns can develop and retain young people would be important too. |
| 31655 Ms Lea OSullivan | N/A | see site specific comment in the attached submission. Summarised below: strongly favours intensification of existing urban areas, supports the core proposal given existing plans for PT and active transport, key focus is providing for modal shift away from vehicle travel, acknowledges that intensification alone cannot meet demand for housing so timing/staging is important to give priority to intensification, subsequent processes (plan changes etc) should provide info on GHG emission reductions and WK request that team works together in the carbon modelling space - Emission Reduction Plan is being finalised in the next few months. Appendix 1 provides site specific feedback as they relate to SH network. |
| 31657 Mrs Andrea Hay | N/A | SEE ATTACHED (summarised): opposes Maitai Valley, disappointed about the level of focus on greenfield development |
| 31662 Joe Roberts | N/A | SEE ATTACHMENT - summarised below: supports FDS high growth, proposes extension to T102 to encompass 70A Waimea West Road, Brightwater, has support from Brightwater Community Association (attachment 2). |
| | | This submission supports planning for the high growth scenario, as not keeping up with the demand will continue to have a serious negative impact on affordability of housing in New Zealand. This submission seeks to highlight that the land at 70A Waimea West Road, Brightwater, is immediately adjoining the greenfield land (Greenfield Area T-102) and would further contribute to meeting the FDS targets. the land at 70A Waimea West Road: 1. Contains biodiversity values and access opportunities that could contribute positively to the Snowden's Bush immediately adjoining. Including the site within the FDS for Brightwater would therefore help achieve Outcome 7 in terms of the natural environment. These outcomes are |

| supported by Council's Reserves Staff and the Department of Conservation; 2. Is only 4ha in area and therefore the productive value of this property is very limited, whi | |
|---|---|
| relevant to Outcome 10; 3. The flooding risks can be appropriately mitigated, and less than some of the other areas included/recommended in the FDS 2022; 4. The owners have been in close contact with Wahanga 2017 LP, the owners of the land at Bryant Road, and can demonstrate that the addition of 70A Waimea West Road can integrate the planned subdivision adjacent, including infrastructure services The submitters are also in the process of discussing this option with the Brightwater Resider Association. The Association has confirmed its support for 70A Waimea West Road being incompact for 50A Waimea West | 100 te with ntial cluded in the |
| 31665 Mr Grant Smithies N/A We need to fundamentally change the way we approach growth. Instead of focussing on sh budgets, we need to take a longer view. We should be thinking about the quality of our env both urban spaces but also rural and natural landscapes. We need to stop "business as usua taking climate action seriously. We need to reduce our carbon footprint. We need a strategy provides direction and actions on how to deliver on the need for climate-friendly, well-functionand villages. This strategy, as currently proposed, does the opposite. | ort term ironments Il" and start y that also |
| 31666 Stacy Currin-Steer N/A I wish to object to the housing proposal T-163 Keoghan Road, Rangihaeata. | |
| As a local resident I think it is totally inappropriate to build housing here because: | |
| - it is under the flight path of Takaka airport; | |
| - will impact on the Onahau wetland as an important habitat for birdlife and freshwater fish | ı; |
| - will not provide affordable accommodation in Golden Bay; | |
| - and will have a significant negative impact on an existing community. | |
| | |
| 31667 barbara nicholas N/A growth should also take into consideration future waste water treatment options - the Best unlikley to be sustainable given likely impacts of sea level rise and more intense storms and | |

| | | There are many reasons not to allow development here: 1. This area is identified as a future ONL. TDC is tardy with these designations, so any future development should protect all these designated places from inappropriate development. 2. The area slopes toward the Onahau estuary. If this designation is allowed then potentially 50 houses could be built here. This would involve building platforms, roading and infrastructure that will have a huge runoff potential into the estuary. 3. This area is an important site for shy and at risk bird spp especially, however there will be other species needing consideration, eg whitebait spp. Some of the birds registered at this site that need high protection are- in the estuary - bar tailed godwit, South Island pied oystercatcher, pied stilt, white heron, royal spoonbill, white faced heron, variable oystercatcher, caspian tern, large pied shag, spotted shag, little pied shag. It is also a moulting site for large numbers of paradise ducks. Bird species in the wetland are Australasian bittern, fernbird, nesting site for harrier hawks. And others. Housing brings domestic animals particularly cats, dogs, rats etc. The estuary currently enjoys a relatively undeveloped status, this is very necessary for the other at risk species' survival. |
|--------------------------------|-----|--|
| 31670 Mr Peter Taylor | N/A | 15% intensification over 30 years is way too low. Much more could be achieved if it was facilitated by the town planning and building regulations |
| 31671 Ms Josephine Cachemaille | N/A | We need to fundamentally change the way we approach growth. Instead of focussing on short term budgets, we need to take a longer view. We should be thinking about the quality of our environments both urban spaces but also rural and natural landscapes. We need to stop "business as usual" and start taking climate action seriously. We need to reduce our carbon footprint. We need a strategy that also provides direction and actions on how to deliver on the need for climate-friendly, well-functioning towns and villages. This strategy, as currently proposed, does the opposite. |
| 31672 Ms Kate Morrison | N/A | Apologies, I couldn't find the specific section to provide feedback on the intensification of Tahunanui proposal. I would like to put forward a submission that strongly opposes the proposed intensification of Tahunanui for the following reasons: |
| | | 1) In the Future Development Strategy you outline that 'western parts of Tāhunanui are subject to coastal inundation and flooding risk and are part of the Dynamic Adaptive Planning Pathways process that the Council is progressing. Any future zoning of these areas will be guided by the outcome of this' however this is contradicted with the proposed intensification zoning in Tahunanui. |
| | | 2) The local community does not want to become the Surfers Paradise of NZ with this level of |

| | | intensification which would ruin the amazing ambience of our community |
|------------------------|-----|---|
| | | 3) With the projected sea level rise it does not make sense to intensify an area that is at risk |
| | | 4) Part of the proposed zones are subject to liquefaction. I acknowledge that buildings can be designed to mitigate some of this, but with the risk to the Nelson region of earthquakes it just does not make sense to build high rise buildings (just ask Christchurch City Council) |
| | | 5) Having up to six story buildings in the community will destroy surrounding amenities including shade, sea views etc. |
| | | Thank you for your consideration. Kate |
| 31673 Mike Drake | N/A | Living out at near Tapawera I would like to have a park-and-ride type facility on the boundary of high intensification. This would allow us to park-and-ride, walk or bike to do business in the Nelson Bay Towns. What do we want this area to be like in 100 years time, not just the next 30 years? |
| 31676 Marion Satherley | N/A | See attached. Summarised below: growth predictions flawed, development of new towns is outdated, intensification should be favoured, need to understand infrastructural requirements for the growth detailed in the FDS, details historical plan changes in the Mapua area and need for structure plans of each area. |
| | | The growth predictions used for Māpua will lead to huge and disproportionate expansion of the current urban footprint. Why it is Māpua that is being targeted for providing a disproportionate contribution to the region's housing needs? Isn't it more reasonable to plan for growth in this community that is more proportionate to the current size of Māpua and in line with preserving its character. |
| | | The single largest greenfields med-high density residential development being proposed (Seaton Valley slopes / flats) is located on land that, prior to drainage for agricultural purposes, was a natural wetland area. |
| | | What is the basis for the assumption that many of our future residents will be looking for traditional sub-division style housing rather than options within current residential neighbourhoods? If more greenfields development are needed in the greater region, |

| | | would it not make more sense to provide this type of accommodation option within the existing larger townships? (Nelson, Richmond, Motueka) closer to work, retail and public services? |
|--------------------------------|-----|--|
| | | It is unclear how high density residential development proposed for Seaton Valley (greenfields intensification) and Māpua Village (urban intensification) will be realised to ensure they will not compromise but instead add to the need to create a thriving community. |
| 31677 Mr Mathew Hay | N/A | We need to fundamentally change the way we approach growth. Instead of focussing on short term budgets, we need to take a longer view. We should be thinking about the quality of our environments both urban spaces but also rural and natural landscapes. We need to stop "business as usual" and start taking climate action seriously. We need to reduce our carbon footprint. We need a strategy that also provides direction and actions on how to deliver on the need for climate-friendly, well-functioning towns and villages. This strategy, as currently proposed, does the opposite. |
| 31680 Mr Jaimie Barber | N/A | We need to be bolder and should really be planning for 100 years out. It takes time for intensification development to become the highest and best use of land. Property owners of land in prime intensification localities continue to add value to their properties which further extends the horizon to development. We need to be bolder - higher intensification & less greenfield - this will speed up the transition of the highest and best use of land from single family homes to development sites. We are not seeing intensification now because we did far to little 20-30 years ago. |
| 31681 Seev Oren | N/A | Tasman Village may create more jobs make affordable land by creating small parcels of land. |
| 31683 Richard Davies | N/A | The strategy is focused on Nelson-Tasman, not Golden Bay. The Takaka Valley is a mountain valley (albeit at sea level). One hazard here is posed by side valleys like the Rameka Gorge in particular. The T144 designated intensification is inviting a future catastrophe. |
| 31689 Mrs Karen Driver | N/A | There is a lot that has been missed. We need to stop greenfield development and sprawl. The plan needs to be much better before it is accepted. |
| 31691 Mr Stephen John Standley | N/A | No |
| 31693 Carolyn Rose | N/A | Close to town. Options for water supply. Good geological profile for buildings. |
| 31694 Mr Greg Bate | N/A | It beggars belief that even in a Draft Strategy you would include the Tahunanui slump as a possible area for infill housing given its past history, current restrictions on property owners and the probable future |
| | | |

| | | effects of climate change. One has to presume that this was a bureaucratically lazy oversight that was |
|--------------------------------------|-----|---|
| | | never seriously discussed or meant to be included. You will see by my address I have a personal interest (as well as a large group of residents on the Tahunanui slump who have been meeting about unconsented work on four properties being 'developed' in Moncrieff Ave, Grenville Tce and The Cliffs). The proposed infill on the Tahunanui slump will make it even less resilient. Please reference the BECA Report Nov 2020 outlining geotechnical requirements in areas of slope instability and run out zones. |
| 31696 Community Action Nelson CAN | N/A | Please see attached for further detail: Summarised below. |
| | | We fully support collaborative planning between Councils. Many opportunities are identified in this plan for future development. This is a consolidated growth model which we believe is lacking integration with other changes that are occurring around us now, such as climate change for one. It is a growth model which is relying heavily on greenfield development, which has significantly higher carbon input, and is also completely at odds with the earlier and mentioned intensification models. It also fails to deliver on the possibilities for much wider housing choices for the longer term future, or urban areas which are high on amenity values. |
| | | Housing unaffordability, the ongoing demand and supply issues, continue to significantly impact our region. CAN believes that our city has been operating on what we call a developer-led urban planning model. Both Councils have spent considerable effort and time developing Intensification plans - we recommend priority be given to maximise the potential of these before any greenfield development is approved. Believe need a more community-led planning model. We highly recommend a reshaping of the strategy to more fully engage reliable, evidence-based successful urban plans that integrate our long term needs more effectively, which also facilitate quality |
| 31697 Robert King-Tenison | N/A | urban intensification, and not just more suburbs or outward sprawl. Doing what you can to help small regenerational development in isolated disused/underused blocks. |
| 31698 Mrs Kelly Atkinson | N/A | It beggars belief that even in DRAFT the Tahunanui Slump is included as a possible area for infill housing, given its history, current restrictions on property owners and the effects of climate change. One has to assume that this was a bureaucratically lazy oversight that was never discussed or intended for inclusion. |
| 31699 Mr Kevin Tyree | N/A | Avoid Council Funded Development on Coastal Inundation Areas and Maori Land as this is to Problematic and Costly eg Proposed new site for Nelson Library |
| 31700 Mrs Kerensa Johnston | N/A | SEE ATTACHMENT - summarised: opposes Tasman Village for cultural reasons. New Community Near Tasman - We have concerns with the proposal for a new community near Tasman. It is unclear how this area will be serviced and there is no apparent allowance in the LTP for the |
| | | |

| | | installation of infrastructure in this location. It is understood that this catchment has limited access to water. |
|----------------------------|-----|--|
| 31700 Mrs Kerensa Johnston | N/A | SEE ATTACHED - summarised: Intensification - The Submitters support intensification in principle, however, the market conditions, building requirements and topography all make multi-story 6 residential projects challenging to deliver in the region at an affordable level (the main issue is the cost of land development and building not necessarily the cost of land). Similarly, the fundamental supply and demand equation results in a relatively inelastic market even at quite high densities. Intensification will only impact on affordability once the fundamental undersupply issue is addressed and this will require significant streamlining and alignment of infrastructure servicing, consenting, the freeing up of supply of materials and labour and the availability of capital. The submitters would only support intensification of existing areas where the Councils had allocated sufficient budget to create more and better shared outdoor areas. |
| 31700 Mrs Kerensa Johnston | N/A | SEE ATTACHED - summarised: Managed Greenfield Expansion – key points: The submitters recommend that any greenfield development needs to be within defined development zones and that greenbelt zones are introduced around all settlements in suitable locations to provide focus to development 8 and servicing plans, avoid sprawl and promote intensification and provide distinct settlement character. The submitters do not support further low density rural residential developments. These are an inefficient use of land, inefficient to service and diminish the rural character of areas. As a general point the submitters support mixed use development in CBD/Fringe areas and increased sustainable industrial growth in appropriate areas. |
| 31700 Mrs Kerensa Johnston | N/A | SEE ATTACHED - summarised: Submissions in support: N-11 Saxton – 900 – Med Density N- 100 – Griffin – Developer – led T – 15 – Te Āwhina Marae Papakainga – Low density T- 102 – 100 Bryant Road, Brightwater – Standard density – 189 Motueka Intensification (north) T – 190 Motueka Intensification (South) |
| 31701 Mr John-Paul Pochin | N/A | It feels like this is Nelson on the same trajectory as it has been since colonial times, encouraging growth to support an expansion and a development of land for the benefit of a few. In the face of the climate crisis, biodiversity loss and dwindling resources we should be focusing on making better use of what we have, |

| | | not continuing to eat up more of the planet. |
|----------------------------|-----|---|
| 31702 Mr Thomas Drach | N/A | General Comments on the Plan: |
| | | Waimea Plains fertile agricultural ground should remain off-limits to non-agricultural activities and off-limits to residential and commercial development. |
| | | We must protect and support all fertile agricultural ground to grow our food supply as local as possible, for too many reasons to efficiently elaborate upon, unless requested! |
| 31704 Mr Paul Bucknall | N/A | It's good to see hazard mitigation and responding to climate change and GHG emissions coming into the FDS. Why is the housing crisis not so explicitly factored in? What we do about demographic challenges like the labour force, migration and our ageing population are also key issues we face as a country and a region that need to be factored into this discussion. |
| 31705 Mr Lindsay Wood | N/A | Please refer also to the ATTACHED DOCUMENT as well as the many items outlined above (including in Q 12 and 29). There is a critical need for a strategy that is more robust in its integrative approaches (e.g. this one ignores the role of energy, or the climate vulnerability of almost all of the region's economy). We also need ongoing well-founded public education to equip our community to prepare in a cohesive way for the challenges that lie ahead due to the impacts of climate change and, while this may fall outside the scope of the strategy, it will be a great advantages to making the strategy effective. |
| | | Summarised: FDS is inadequate for a climate-responsible future. No decarbonisation trajectory, gives climate minimal consideration and ignores changing energy, outdated models and doesn't take into account emissions associated with buildings, drivers of FDS are growth and low density subdivisions, urban intesification rates are too low, public transport needs to be anchor. |
| 31706 Paul Donald Galloway | N/A | Climate Change Emergency must be prioritize by preparation for coming extreme weather events, flooding, droughts, sea level rise, and implementation of well devised sustainable housing projects. A vision of well prepared small strong communities encouraging regenerative farming by protecting the productive precious soil surrounding our communities, healthy rivers (no housing permitted anywhere near them), creating new businesses for recycling and being more self sufficient. When the numbers of car-people create frustration congestion driving in circles for over 10 minutes in search of a parking, not one left on every street of a town like Nelson, this is the product of mindless growth with entire housing |

| | | developments with all black roofs and often all black painted houses contributing to the heating of the planet, no solar panel or water tanks included with the houses then we know we don't have wise knowledgeable leadership and no wiser developers like Bayview Mahitai scrapping (as of April 2022) entire Kaka Valley steep hill sides of regenerative manuka and mahoi growing since the last fires of the late 1980s. Industrial farming at its worse, not leaving corridors of bush in the gullies to stop erosion and filter the rain water flowing into the wetland valley floor and finally into the Maitai River or for the sheep for protection. Slow down plan better with the latest scientific reports and solutions to guide infrastructure and housing developers. Thank you |
|--------------------------|-----|---|
| 31707 Ms Mary Caldwell | N/A | I am endorsing the Nelson Tasman Climate Forum's view . |
| | | Greenfield areas must be kept for food production . |
| 31708 David Ayre | N/A | Main feedback: I am deeply unimpressed by this whole process, which is shallow and makes no effort to deal with the major issues of our time; it tries to follow a Business As Usual pathway when the near future in the next 10, 30 and 100 years is going to be nothing like usual; as a result, it completely misses its own intended target, namely "How do we prepare for the future?" Simple feedback on most questions: the major targets for changes in the next 30 years should be to limit the rate of growth, prioritise intensification, and only expand onto greenfield sites if there is no viable alternative; major development should be by starting a new population centre from scratch that is designed and built for life in this century (e.g. to scale, better building design, low energy demand, active transport), and provides employment and services within its own community, rather than acting as a satellite to other towns with all the associated travel; all new development, wherever it is, should be created at current higher intensification levels from the beginning, rather than created as low density urban sprawl and then in a few decades trying to rework it at higher densities. SEE ATTACHED |
| 31709 Ofer Ronen | N/A | Tasman Village will allow smaller allotments for smaller families. |
| 31710 Ms Angela Fitchett | N/A | See answer 12. We cannot continue down the same path as we have in this region, accommodating destructive growth, enabling blind market forces and facilitating yet more carbon emissions. This is old style 'growth'. New style growth will be about seeking quality, building all communities and enhancing peoples' lives in this region. It will mean some will have to give up old ways. As someone in the baby boomer generation, I welcome the opportunity to make the future better for all. And, it's very obvious that if we don't change, change will be forced upon us. Let's get ahead of the curve with some visionary thinking. |
| 31711 Sara Flintoff | N/A | Murchison is so far away from Richmond and needs to be a stand alone town. |
| 31714 Joan Butts | N/A | See attachment. Summarised: |
| | | |

| | | New site, requests that FDS plans for mixed use development area to support the adjacent Tarakoe Port on PTL land, assesses this against the FDS outcomes. |
|----------------------------|-----|---|
| 31715 Mrs Suzanne O'Rourke | N/A | Fonterra's main area of interest, and thus the key reason for this submission, is the implications in terms of the compatibility of potential land use change in the vicinity of Fonterra's operations at Brightwater and Tākaka. The potential implications of specific strategic growth options, identified in the Draft FDS, that are located near these two manufacturing sites are addressed separately below. This section of the submission provides Fonterra's general comments on the Draft FDS. Fonterra supports the need to identify and outline the strategic growth options for future housing and business land, and associated infrastructural needs, in the Nelson and Tasman regions for the next 30 years. This is the purpose of the FDS, once approved. Fonterra also acknowledges that the development of the Draft FDS is a requirement of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020. Fonterra, in the context of the purpose of the Draft FDS, considers that the outcomes identified are generally appropriate. However, Fonterra considers that the outcomes, given that they underpin the identification of the strategic growth areas, also need to recognise that the future potential land use change needs to occur in areas which are not alongside existing incompatible land uses (i.e., residential areas alongside industrial land uses). In this context, and also recognising that the FDS is to be reviewed every three years with reference to the outcomes being sought, Fonterra requests the following amendments to the Draft FDS outcomes: 3. New housing is focused in areas where people have good access to jobs, services and amenities by public and active transport, and in locations that avoid existing incompatible activities and where people want to live. 5. Sufficient residential and business land capacity is provided to meet demand with the capacity provided in areas that avoids existing incompatible activities. As an overview, the proposals relevant to Fonterra's operations in the Tasman district, as put forward in the Draft |
| 31716 Mr Alan hart | N/A | Too many multistory building, especially in areas with treasured urban or natural amenity would change the character of Nelson for the worst. |
| 31719 Mr Chris Pyemont | N/A | Rather than just seeing growth as a numbers game, we should be thinking about the quality of our environments both our urban spaces, but also our rural |

| | | and natural landscapes. We need to reduce our carbon footprint. We need a strategy that also provides |
|------------------------|-----|--|
| | | direction and actions on how to deliver on the need for climate friendly, well-functioning towns and villages. This strategy, as proposed at the moment, does |
| | | the opposite. |
| 31720 Ms Rainna Pretty | N/A | Strongly disagree to intensification - 4-6 storey buildings in The Wood. Developers don't have to provide off-street parking which will affect car parking availability on the street. 3x3 Townhouses can be built 1m from my boundary without consultation therefore no privacy, no view, no sunlight. |
| 31722 Trevor Chang | N/A | Tahunanui is the jewel in Nelson's crown, providing both accommodation and outdoor activities. Transit in their wisdom are already in the throes of killing the commercial centre of Tahunanui with their 4 lane road with clearways to prevent customer kerbside parking. An August 2004 Tahunanui Structure Plan was commissioned by NCC and never enacted. Since then Tahunanui has become a political football - kicked around and totally ignored. |
| 31723 Mr Tim Bayley | N/A | We must not allow our existing residential to be destroyed by bad Urban Planning that destroyed the existing amenity that residents have worked so hard to create ALL people have rights and we MUST have the right to submit on ALL proposals not just lip service as this document does |
| 31724 Nick Clarke | N/A | Please see attached for further detail: Summarised below: Tasman & Nelson are NZ's second and 3rd least affordable regions outside of Auckland. Housing affordability therefore should be priority for the FDS to address. Many of the greenfield development areas identified in the strategy are located a long way from town, with poor provision of public transport or local jobs, services and amenities. Covenants to impose minimum house size requirements is inappropriate and needs to be addressed. Inclusionary zoning is an essential tool for NCC and TDC to be provide affordable housing and should be implemented as part of the FDS. |
| 31725 Ian Williamson | N/A | See attached. The Braeburn Rezoning project is an excellent proposal for the TDC to be involved with and wholeheartedly support it. Its advantages are: 1. Above sea level rise. |
| | | 2. not that far from our town centre and commercial area. |
| | | 3. Close to a connection with the main highway to Richmond. |
| | | 4. Close to a potential site for a replacement "sewerage treatment station' which will eliminate the need |

| | | for 'septic tanks'. |
|--------------------------|-----|---|
| 31727 Mr Philip Jones | N/A | We need to fundamentally change the way we approach growth. Instead of focussing on short term budgets we need to take a longer view - isn't that exactly what a 30 year strategy should be doing? Then why do we still promote sprawling suburbs, when we already know that energy will only become more expensive, resources sparser and when we already know that we will have to live a lot more efficiently? We need to think about how much growth we really need. Rather than just seeing growth as a numbers game, we should be thinking about the quality of our environments both our urban spaces, but also our rural and natural landscapes. We need to stop "business as usual" and start taking climate action seriously. We need to reduce our carbon footprint. We need a strategy that also provides direction and actions on how to deliver on the need for climate friendly, well functioning towns and villages. This strategy, as proposed at the moment, does the opposite. |
| 31729 Andrew McLean | N/A | Braeburn 42709 FDS. I am in full support of the plan to rezone this property. We have lived in High Street Motueka for 62 years and have searched the town for housing/sections as |
| | | our family has grown up and for the wider Whanau too. This has been a frustrating exercise, due to the lack of development in town and now with current sea level rise concerns, almost an impossibility! |
| | | There is a very great need for more suitable land for all types of building. |
| 31730 Ms Sandy Armstrong | N/A | I think you have totally missed the true sense of community. In an effort to shove as many people as possible wherever you can you have completely forgotten to ask the whole community what they actually want. There is no vision of beauty in this plan and you have forgotten that what brings the tourists here is its beauty. What you are creating is something that can be found anywhere in the world. This is your opportunity to make a plan that allows for growth and a healthy environment and something that encompasses all the good that New Zealand can offer. Please create something that we can all be proud of in 30 years time, something the whole world can look at and aim for. |
| 31731 Ms Jessica Bell | N/A | We need to fundamentally change the way we approach growth. Instead of focussing on short term budgets we need to take a longer view - isn't that exactly what a 30 year strategy should be doing? Then why do we still promote sprawling suburbs, when we already know that energy will only become more expensive, resources sparser and when we already know that we will have to |

| | | We need to think about how much growth we really need. Rather than just seeing growth as a numbers game, we should be thinking about the quality of our environments both our urban spaces, but also our rural and natural landscapes. We need to stop "business as usual" and start taking climate action seriously. We need to reduce our carbon footprint. We need a strategy that also provides direction and actions on how to deliver on the need for climate friendly, wellfunctioning towns and villages. This strategy, as proposed at the moment, does the opposite. |
|---------------------------|-----|---|
| 31733 Mr Ray Hellyer | N/A | I do not agree with the proposals for Braeburn because the existing infrastructure is not satisfactory for are increase of population in this area, the Council has proved its not competent to maintain the present infrastructure to an adequate standard, and in the past has ignored requests for even the slightest infrastructural improvements! |
| 31734 Eric Thomas | N/A | We need in our growth for Murchison to plan opportunities for future tech. Eg. not all houses need to have electricity off main grid. Use solar or whatever future brings. Water collect rainwater tanks, top up if dry. Give people options/choices and all this will minimize upgrades to provide for growth. |
| 31736 Ms Carol Curtis | N/A | assuming the idea of "new community" is different for "greenfield developments". can NelsonTASMAN clearly define these terms in relation to the main OUTCOMES. |
| 31737 Ms Amanda Young | N/A | We need a great variety of houses within the already established urban areas. This will provide for growth and reduce house prices. I strongly object to the changes I have seen over the last 20 years or so with sprawling subdivisions, horrendous traffic, infrastructure that can't cope and the eroding of rural areas of quiet and/or productive rural areas. It is not somebody's right to move here and demand a stand a alone house (lots of people don't want or need these), or to make money from the land in such a way that causes harm to the natural and physical environment. |
| 31741 Mr Robert Stevenson | N/A | There should only be limited intensification in Tahuna, with building heights of no more than 3 levels |
| 31746 Chris & Gill Knight | N/A | Please see attached - text copied below: Dear NCC counsellor |
| | | This is a hasty submission to register our rejection of the proposed Tahunanui high rise developments. In our view this plan will continue the destruction of the much celebrated and beautiful Tahunanui Beach and its charming recreation areas. High-rise compacted intensive apartment dwelling will add to an already increasingly noisey area. There is nothing low-key or any sympathy for the environment about this plan. |

| | | This proposal will surely bring more noise and destruction to the environment and area where already the short-sighted proposal of a planned 4-laned highway will ensure NCC will win the award for the 'most destructive council'. It will go down in history as being best ever to remove charm and charisma to a once beautiful peaceful area. |
|------------------------------|-----|---|
| | | We would like the opportunity to speak to this submission. Please confirm. |
| | | Yours sincerely |
| | | Chris and Gill Knight |
| 31748 Jo Brooks | N/A | Like to see our town developed in to a town of the future not a town in the past. We are the getaway to Tasman region and top of the south and our image should reflect that. Murchison is literally the hottest little gem in TASMAN and we could be a showcase to the region . |
| 31750 Mark Lile | N/A | This submission supports planning for the high growth scenario, as not keeping up with the demand will continue to have a serious negative impact on affordability of housing in New Zealand. WDL has been working with TDC (and its consultants) over its planned expansion to its residential subdivision in Wakefield for at least 18 months. This has involved considerable time and resources invested to ensure the masterplanned expansion of residential development achieved the sustainable management of natural and physical resources in this location. The applicant has also been working along building companies about providing a rage of typologies, with potential also for community housing development. This process of collaboration and consultation has been very positive for all involved, with a clear signal that the subject land would contribute significantly toward meeting the TDC obligations under the NPS UD, while also contributing to a well-functioning urban environment. Given the above, WDL supports the inclusion of T-107 (177 Edward Street) in the draft FDS 2022. |
| 31751 Hazel Pearson | N/A | Whole region limits. So each outcome has to take into account the limit. If one thing is bigger another thing must be smaller. |
| 31752 Jill Pearson | N/A | We know the planet is finite. Currently human population is not. We have to match them and we have to start very very soon. |
| 31756 Ronald Alfred & Phylis | N/A | Cycle and walkways everywhere in Murchison. To seal the Hothom/Chalgave Street. This street is used by |
| | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |

| Kinzett | | a large amount of vehicles and is considered one our town streets. |
|--------------------------|-----|--|
| 31757 Mr Duncan Thomson | N/A | |
| 31761 Karen Steadman | N/A | There will be a need for more retail space in Murchison, create an overall plan for future growth - after the current plan - The town I believe could double in size in the next ten years The town needs a revamp - beautification by a consultant. we need to develop as a stand alone town - we are not a village on the outskirts of Richmond. |
| 31762 Mr Mark Hewetson | N/A | The request to speak is not ticked, however we are willing to be contacted to further support the proposal as needed |
| 31763 Susan Rogers | N/A | 40. It beggars belief that even in a Draft Strategy you would include the Tahunanui slump as a possible area for infill housing given its past history, current restrictions on property owners and the probable future effects of climate change. One has to presume that this was a bureaucratically lazy oversight that was never seriously discussed or meant to be included. You will see by my address that I have a personal interest (as well as a large group of residents on the Tahunanui slump who have been meeting about unconsented work on four properties being 'developed' in Moncrieff Ave, Grenville Tce and The Cliffs). The proposed infill on the Tahunanui slump will make it even less resilient. Please reference the BECA Report Nov 2020 outlining geotechnical requirements in areas of slope instability and run out zones. |
| 31764 Mr Dylan Mackie | N/A | Thank you. Good luck! |
| 31766 Ms Pooja Khatri | N/A | This survey is flawed and needs to be redesigned. Greater community consultation is required. |
| 31767 Eleanor Greenhough | N/A | See attached. Summarised - opposes secondary part of the proposal, particularly T136, local landowner, loss of biodiversity and productive land, generally opposes greenfield growth and supports intensification. My submission is to comment and oppose the secondary part of the proposal. The potential new community particularly T136 at Braeburn Road. Quite a while back the council also stated that all future development was going to be on the coastal side of the district, not on the Moutere side of the district. There is a lot of land behind Tasman that has been allowed to be developed into what appears to be rural residential blocks. A lot of this housing is on ex pine tree country and had not been developed into productive farm land. This is the area that houses should be intensified in. I would not like to make too much comment about the spiritual values of this area but my understanding is that when Te Rupraha was annihilating the local iwi they spread far and wide through the Moutere not just in Tasman. If this development is allowed to go ahead it will have created urban sprawl from Lower Moutere through to Mapua and beyond. This is a unique area and should not be split up into blocks for |

| | | houses. It has the options for horticulture on the easier land as per existing crops. (hops, apples, grapes). I understand that one person around the area is trialling a small plot of saffron and it is appearing successful. We cannot afford to keep chopping up land to grow houses on. |
|---------------------|-----|--|
| | | The development of Berryfields in Richmond is a prime example of a total and utter waste of good productive land. Why did the council allow this? |
| | | I am totally opposed to the greenfield idea. Housing needs to be intensified in areas of existing housing or pushed back on to areas of hills where there are existing houses but the size of the section needs to be decreased. |
| | | Housing creeping out into rural areas leads to complaints about what farmers do. The noise they make, the smells that happen, sheep worrying etc and all farmers are trying to do is get on with the job of looking after their land and animals or crops and contributing to feeding the population. Farmers and councils do not need the hassle of people ringing the council every five minutes to complain about what they are doing because urban people have no comprehension as to what goes on on a farm. |
| 31768 Ms Julie Cave | N/A | We need to fundamentally change the way we approach growth. Instead of focusing on short term budgets we need to take a longer view - isn't that exactly what a 30 year strategy should be doing? Then why do we still promote sprawling suburbs, when we already know that energy will only become more expensive, resources sparser and when we already know that we will have to live a lot more efficiently? We need a strategy that also provides direction and actions on how to deliver on the need for climate friendly, well-functioning towns and villages. This strategy, as proposed at the moment, does the opposite. |
| 31769 Ms Jo Gould | N/A | Yes, we should be clear on what decision making criteria are used to determine what level and extent of intensification or greenfield development is appropriate. I think you have missed from the outcomes the importance of amenity and recreation values to Nelson residents. Intensification should be done in ways which enhance a range of values - natural values, amenity values, recreation values. |
| 31770 Mr Simon Barr | N/A | Please see attached for further detail - briefly summarised below: |
| | | NAL acknowledge that 'Airport Noise' is identified as a Strategic Constraint in the FDS. |
| | | NAL support the overall approach undertaken within the FDS, as the provision of housing supply and choice will be a critical component of providing for the growth needs of the Region. However, NAL seek t |

| | | ensure that residential development, as sensitive to noise from Airport Operations is not intensified in close proximity to Nelson Airport, as represented by the 55dBA airnoise contour. NAL opposition to the extent of intensification for N-102 (Roto Street and surrounds) or N-034 (Tāhunanu Drive West) is predicated on the current operative Natural Resources Plan contours. NAL seeks that the operative Airport Effects Advisory Overlay is appropriately recognised as a qualifying matter preventing additional residential intensification in those areas identified as N-102 (Roto Street and surrounds) or N-034 (Tāhunanui Drive West) (Figure 1), and to a lesser degree for Allport Place (Figure 2). |
|-----------------------|-----|---|
| 31771 Colleen Shaw | N/A | This strategy ignores the perilous state we as a planet, a country and a region are currently in and heading to more vulnerability to energy issues and climate breakdown. I think there should have been focus on this in the FDS. In 30 years we as a planet are supposed to have cut our emissions to be able to keep our increased temperature below 2.5° more than it has been. This document does not provide strategies for contributing to this end. As much of the population is sleep-walking because it is a distressing thing to face, I think there should be more emphasis on education about climate breakdown mitigation and adaptation that we will have to face. The fact that we are having to face it is not optional and this seems very much in the background of this document. |
| 31772 Colin Ratcliffe | N/A | A few years ago TDC made headlines in Nelson Mail "build up not out" but what have you done you have destroyed probably hundreds of hectares of good agriculture land and easy hill country. (almost 100 ha in the last few years with the berryfields and industrial estate Queen St) Now you are proposing to cut up more good hill country for residential development. The worst part of this of course is much will be "lifestile blocks" which will not really make much difference to the housing shortage, as it is the people with money who will buy these, and the unhoused will still remain unhoused Also you could fit a lot more "sections" into the proposed areas by making the lot size smaller. And you are also proposing cutting up more agricultural land to the south and east of main road for residential!!! |
| 31773 Ms Jo Leyland | N/A | Please see uploaded file. Summarised: concern about the proposed growth scenario creating ribbon development that does not support resilient communities, supports intensification to reduce emissions, opposes greenfield expansion, supports stronger directive on meeting district's housing needs equitably and with urgency that CC requires. |

| 31776 Mark Lile | N/A | See attached lengthy document. Summarised: submission from CCKV Maitai Dev Co LP and Bayview Nelson Ltd, landowner of N106, supports its inclusion and requests extension, requests that scoring be adjusted from high to very high, supports inclusion of greenfield land to support housing capacity and concern about the financial feasibility of the intensification proposed in the FDS and the affordability of homes. |
|----------------------|-----|---|
| | | This submission supports planning for the high growth scenario. Despite having a reported capacity for 14,000 units already zoned, our region has shown that it is already not keeping up with the demand, and has in fact fallen significantly further behind in the last three years. Greenfield development is therefore fundamentally important to the FDS 2022, evidenced by the much larger number of new houses being constructed in Richmond than in Nelson. It there is too much reliance placed on intensification, the community is highly likely to fall further and further behind on available supply, having a negative impact on the housing affordability and community wellbeing. This prioritization would lead to Nelson City not achieving its statutory obligations under the NPS-UD. |
| 31777 Mr David Lucas | N/A | Growth is difficult to ascertain, as most existing residents would want Nelson to remain as a small pretty city. The growth is coming from outside the region so therefore council planners are effectively planning growth for future residents who haven't yet arrived, to the detriment of existing ratepayers. The danger of adding intensification outside of the central city is that it will spoil the city vibe of low level villas and treed vistas that most people enjoy. |
| 31778 Mr Jim Thorton | N/A | Please see attached: Text copied below - To whom it may concern, I wish to put forward my concerns regarding proposed housing development in the Maitai Valley. I don't want greenfield expansion anywhere in the Maitai Valley, Kaka tributary or Orchard flats for the following reasons – Traffic – increased traffic will mean easy access entering and leaving of the valley will be next to |
| | | impossible, especially during peak hours. As there is only one road into the Maitai valley (and no possibility of a second road or room to widen the existing road due to being right next to the Maitai river) this is a problem that cannot be ignored and reasonable ways to rectify this issue are non existent Loss of Green space – Once this green space where proposed houses are to go is lost it can never be retrieved. In these times where our health and well being are paramount we seem to be removing/loosing some of the very things that can be done to help keep us in good mental health. |
| | | Please consider my concerns and move to stop this development that is not in the best interest of current or future Nelsonians. |

| | | Regards |
|-----------------------|-----|---|
| | | Jim Thornton |
| 31781 Jac Stevenson | N/A | Please see attached for further details: summarised below - In conclusion , all we ask, is that you retain the character of Tahunanui as a Beachside Village, nobody wants to see the development of six storey apartments on the flats of Tahunanui, totally disrespecting those who have made Tahunanui their home. We don't support the FDS in its current format in relation to Tahunanui's Beachside Village, six storey apartments and the number proposed would destroy Tahunanui as we know it, and that is totally unacceptable. |
| 31782 Greig Caigou | N/A | SEE ATTACHMENT - summarised: supports careful planning of a future town, after other opportunities for intensification are taken up elsewhere. Concern about traffic flows around Aporo Rd and Williams Rd corner (church on corner). |
| 31784 Ms Teresa James | N/A | I attended the Golden Bay focused FDS information webinar but have not been able to give necessary time to engage further with the document unfortunately. I wished to take this opportunity however to voice my strong support for choices that take into consideration and act on the urgency and scale of the climate crisis (reference the latest IPCC reports on climate change) and also address issues of housing affordability. I guess it may be outside the precise scope of this strategy and consultation but in case it is appropriate to raise the issue here - I would like to ask whether council (other?) rules could be changed to allow more self contained units/sleepouts/tiny homes (or even renovations to main houses to allow for additional separate kitchen facilities) on existing properties. I see this as one solution to the housing crisis in Golden Bay. There is little single or small home (permitted) accommodation in Golden Bay. Many people would be happy to have tenants or family etc renting on their property but currently I understand there are rules that prevent this (or make it prohibitively expensive). In the future where we will need more intensification to work in with climate change mitigation efforts and whereby we desperately need more places to accommodate people, I think this could be a really useful area to look at. |
| 31785 Parrish Hurley | N/A | Would like land adjoining T-017 (on the South end) to be rezoned (see attchment 2 for a map). The land is flat to rolling country, would be suitable for Rural Residential and some medium density opportunities. Located 3.5kms to Lower Moutere Sub Power Station. The other side of the ridge is owned by Long Bush Farms, they also agree their side lends itself to the same development. Total of 120.9ha. The land is non productive and has been used to grow wilding pines and gorse since 1955. Can be accessed on Lower Moutere side, via Chamberlain Street and McBrides Road (or possibly via Motueka Highway). Located only |

| | | | eight minutes to town without affecting horticultural land. Land has not been affected by past adverse weather events. |
|-------|--|-----|--|
| | Friedrich Mahrla and Dorothea Ortner Ortner | N/A | We need: a long term view, away from business as usual; changes to transport infrastructure/public transport; growth that does not destroy but enhance and protect the quality of our natural environment. |
| 31787 | Lilac Meir | N/A | Make small allotments, town houses, affordable land for young couples. Allow 500sqm titles to build small homes near the school and the community centres. |
| 31788 | Mr Roderick J King | N/A | Please see attached: Are we trying to repeat the mistakes made overseas post war. The infrastructure is in need of rebuilding judging by the continual water leaks and sewage spills. Before any intensification or new development occurs the infrastructure needs to be sorted & roads, wastewater, stormwater & portable water & power. |
| 31790 | Ali Howard | N/A | Please see attached for full submission - summarised below. |
| | | | Support's planning and funding for urban residential developments. Asks that council removes all references to possible mass housing in the Maitai Valley, Kaka Valley, Orchard Flats, Mahitahi, Maitahi, Bayview (on the Maitai Valley side of the Malvern Hills ridgeline) from the 2022 FDS. |
| | | | Notes many reasons why to not have large subdivisions in the Maitai. |
| | | | Questions how is NCC enabling "democratic local decision-making and action by, and behalf of, communities", when it ignores the thousands of people who don't wish to have large housing estates in the Maitai Valley. |
| 31791 | Peter Olorenshaw | N/A | Please see attached for further detail - have determined answers to multi-choice based on answers in submission. |
| | | | A: Please see the rest of our submission. We think there is a lot you have missed and we will try to bullet point them here: |
| | | | • Transport Emissions dominate our household emissions massively. We need to reduce our emission at 10% year on year, allowing for sprawl goes right against that. |
| | | | • Climate Change Mitigation is poorly covered by any MCA analysis - We are in a climate emergency - if any development doesn't result in lowered greenhouse emissions, less car use it should be stuck off the list. Massive reduction in our climate emissions is not optional, its essential. |
| | | | • 15% intensification in 30 years is just 0.5% per year. This is a pathetic amount, far below what could be achieved and far below what your advisors suggest would happen through medium density planning changes would give. |

| Asking people if they would prefer to live in standalone houses without given them that might mean (1/2 house commutes stuck in endless traffic, complete car dependence emissions, never being able to walk or bike to places you want to go to) Partitioning Potential (the built of our existing housing stock is 3 or more bedrooms for more 1 and 2 bedroomed places - we can partition these under-utilised buildings low cost both in dollar and carbon terms without the need of new infrastructure (see Tiny Houses on flood and liquifaction prone land that might otherwise be ruled inelintensification Floating houses that are naturally see level rise resilient Car dealerships should made an industrial activity, freeing up a lot off prime land in along transport routes that could then be put into apartments or mixed use apartments | e, increased climate s, but the demand is s very fast at very e appendix for how) eligible for |
|---|---|
| the ground floor. | ents/offices/shops on |
| Please see attached for further detail - summary below: | |
| Opposes 6 & 3 storey buildings in Tahunanui. Opposes intensification in the Tahunan | nui area. |
| I have lived in Rangihaeata for 40 years. It is an area of quiet lifestyle blocks with narroad. it is not suited to multi housing development. That would be out of character h I value the peace and privacy we enjoy here. | |
| It seems that not enough consideration has been given to the changes which we anti 30 years because of climate change. There are likely to be reductions in availability o to the need to be less dependent on road transport for all needs. However, intensific to ensure that there are a range of options and that needs are met. I am particularly people living on their own. | of fossil fuels leading cation needs planning |
| See attachment. We have concerns with the proposal for a new community near Tast that this catchment has limited access to water. We support intensification in principle, however, the market conditions, building requipography all make multi-story residential projects challenging to deliver in the regil level. The submitters recommend that any greenfield development needs to be within defiziones and that greenbelt zones are introduced around all settlements in suitable local focus to development and servicing plans, avoid sprawl and promote intensification a settlement character. | quirements and ion at an affordable fined development ations to provide |
| | |
| | level. The submitters recommend that any greenfield development needs to be within def zones and that greenbelt zones are introduced around all settlements in suitable loc focus to development and servicing plans, avoid sprawl and promote intensification |

| | | N- 100 – Griffin – Developer – led |
|--------------------|-----|---|
| | | We support the development of this land T $-$ 15 $-$ Te $\bar{\text{A}}\text{whina}$ Marae Papakainga $-$ Low density. |
| | | T- 102 – 100 Bryant Road, Brightwater – Standard density. Wakatū is currently developing the adjacent Wairoa Subdivision and the |
| | | associated upgrade of services will allow 100 Bryant Rd to be developed in the |
| | | short term to medium term to increase housing supply in Brightwater. |
| | | T – 189 Motueka Intensification (north) |
| | | T – 190 Motueka Intensification (South) |
| | | We support the intensification of housing in Motueka and sees this as a key |
| | | part to the provision of alternative housing models to increase housing |
| | | provision across a range of housing typologies. |
| 31803 Jackie McNae | N/A | See attachment. The submitters own a 18.2971ha property within the identified Rural Residential Growt Option T17 described as the Mytton Heights Hills area. The submitters support this growth option for the reasons set out below. The submitters land holding of 18.291ha of land was until recently in forestry which has now been logged. The submitters are aware that under the current 2019 FDS their landholding sits within an identified growth area for Rural Residential development. Since the harvesting of the forest over their land, the submitters have been going through a process of assessing the suitability of their land for a rural residential subdivision. They have assembled a project team to assist with the assessment of their landholding and the design of a rural residential subdivision. The submitters support the identification of their land as a Rural Residential area. The submitters wish the land to be able to be subdivided down to a minimum of 5000m², though the eventual development of their land will most likely produce a range of allotment sizes reflecting land contour and suitable building sites over the landholding. |
| | | The submitters seek the confirmation of their land as part of the Rural Residential Growth options for T17 Mytton Heights Hills. The submitters seek that the FDS flags the potential density for this growth option being a minimum subdivision area of 5000m ² . The submitters seek that the Council rezones this land area at the earliest opportunity to Rural Residential with a minimum 5000m ² subdivision standard. There is no need for this land to be introduced as a Deferred Rural Residential option as there is no |

| | | proposal to extend reticulated services into this part of Motueka Valley. The demand exists now and this growth area should be brought on for development as soon as possible. |
|--------------------|-----|---|
| 31804 Jackie McNae | N/A | The Submitters own land in Golden Hills Road which they seek to be added to the Future Development Strategy as a Rural Residential Growth Area. The reasons for their Submission are attached. |
| | | The Submitters landholdings were part of an enclave of land in Golden Hills Rd where back at the time of the notification of the Tasman Resource Management Plan (TRMP) the owner of the Submitters' land and others adjoining sought through the TRMP that the land be rezoned Rural Residential. At the same as the previous owner sought the zoning, they pursued a subdivision of the landholding. The subdivision involved the creation of a Right of Way to the west of what are now the Submitters' landholdings and created seven allotments of varying areas, including one large allotment with the homestead, that the then landowner, had planted in grapes. The Submitters seek their landholdings be identified as a Rural Residential Growth option. The Submitters wish to be heard in respect of their Submission |
| 31805 Ian Shapcott | N/A | Yes, the fundamental principles have been missed. Business as usual underpins the FDS. Science and Mātauranga Māori explicitly confirm that this is irresponsibly unacceptable. See other "Generic" part of this submission |
| 31806 Jackie McNae | N/A | The Submitters have a broad interest in residential and business growth areas across the region. They have been involved in a large number of residential and business park developments. Their overall submission to the Future Development Strategy (FDS) is their experience over the last 30 years in the region is that Councils have consistently under planned for the growth demands within the district. The FDS should be an opportunity to ensure for the next 30 years and potentially 50 years, that planning for growth keeps in front of demand. The attached submission sets out the specific issues of concern and details the areas for inclusion in the Future Development Strategy. |

The FDS should be looking at growth needs over the long term and should adopt a high growth projection as the basis for planning. History has shown that our region has often exceeded the high growth projection models, often significantly exceeded such models. As such the FDS must adopt a high growth model.

The Submitters consider the yields identified are overly optimistic, particularly for intensification. The Submitters fully support Councils endeavours and provision within the Planning framework for intensification for a range of housing densities including High Density apartment and townhouse typologies. However the yields Council has identified arising out of intensification are overly optimistic particularly in the short to medium term. In many locations the areas identified for intensification are lower lying existing brownfield sites that often are heavily fragmented in the first place. As the FDS itself acknowledges, it will be quite a long timeframe to realise some of the intensification aspirations. In the meantime, ensuring that there is a full choice of supply in the market, for a range of housing typologies it is essential that there are the growth options available in all settlements, to ensure that housing options do not become any less affordable than they are currently. If Council limits the supply, and limits opportunities, housing affordability will continue to be a remote possibility for many in our Community.

The Submitters support the opportunity to develop a growth settlement around the Tasman Coastal area providing for urban density of development and seeks to have the Rural 3 area reviewed and identified as Rural Residential.

31807 Jennifer Rose

N/A

See multiple attachments.

In relation to the NTFDS there are specific components which Kāinga Ora supports and areas which Kāinga Ora makes recommendations.

Kāinga Ora supports the Councils in forming the NTFDS and recognises the importance of the Proposal in synthesising existing high-level planning documents, analysis, and information to form an initial recommendation for future growth and development in the Region.

The core proposal could provide for approximately 26,000 new homes across the Nelson Tasman urban environment while a new community near Tasman Village could provide a further 3,200 homes. The supporting technical document to the NTFDS indicates that wastewater capacity at Bell Island WWTP requires further upgrades within the next three years to that already underway. It does not however provide a degree of comfort that upgrades can be identified, implemented, and funded so as not to delay the implementation of the proposal.

Kāinga Ora is not supportive of a new Tasman Village community being established because this option has raised significant cultural concerns from local iwi (Te Ātiawa). Kāinga Ora respects the concerns Te Ātiawa has with this secondary aspect of the Proposal and supports ongoing kōrero, engagement and hui with Te Tauihu iwi to better understand their aspirations for urban development in the Top of the South.

Kāinga Ora supports consolidated growth focused largely along the Regions' existing transport corridor (State Highway 6), further investment in public transport and prioritising intensification of housing development in existing main centres to minimise the need for people to travel by private car and promote the use of public transport, walking and cycling as a means of achieving a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions in the Region.

Kāinga Ora supports the Council's Proposal for intensification of housing and commercial development in Nelson, Stoke, Richmond, Brightwater, Wakefield, Māpua and Motueka as it will build transport resilience by reducing traffic volumes in the centres as well as the connecting road network, and by providing travel choice for the communities in the Top of the South. Reliance on private motor vehicle is expected to reduce if communities are able to live close to centres, public transport corridors and walking and cycling linkages.

Overall, except for the secondary part of the Proposal (which relates to the establishment of a new

31808 Ben Williams

N/A

See attachment.

Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) welcomes the opportunity to provide feedback on the Draft Nelson and Tasman Future Development Strategy (the Draft Strategy).

RNZ's facilities in the Nelson Region are located within the Saxton Field Reserve, Main Road, Stoke (the Facilities). The Facilities include a 53 metre guyed aerial mast and other equipment.

It is important that the Draft Strategy have regard to the Facilities in a way that ensures RNZ can continue to undertake daily operations, maintenance and upgrades of its Facilities as required, so that RNZ can continue to carry out its functions as a lifeline utility.

RNZ is cognisant that its Facilities at Stoke are already to some extent, in close proximity to a range of residential development and it is in no way seeking to unreasonably restrict urban development in Stoke. However the identification of greenfield development sites in Stoke (including N-011) increases the likelihood of

| | | extensive new development near the Facilities, and correspondingly increasing risks. |
|--------------------|-----|---|
| 31811 Jackie McNae | N/A | See attached. The Submitters own two separate groups of properties along Gladstone Road that currently sit within the Residential Zone which the submitter supports being included in a Business Zone. The Draft FDS identifies these two groupings as T117 and T178 and proposes both of these locations as Business Growth options. The submitters support the Draft FDS in respect of identifying T117 and T178 as Business Growth Areas for the reasons set out in the attached Submission. The Submitters support the identification of their landholdings as Business Growth Areas in the FDS and seek that these growth options be maintained in the finalised FDS. The Submitters request that the rezoning of these land areas happens at the earliest opportunity given that the transition from residential activity to business activity has already started. Council is considering a Growth Plan Change for Richmond, and included in that Growth Plan Change is identification of Business Growth Areas. This process is likely to precede the review of the TRMP and the submitters seek that their landholdings in Gladstone Rd be included for rezoning to a Business activity zone as part of the Richmond Growth Plan Changes. |
| 31813 Jackie McNae | N/A | The Submitters have a particular interest for residential growth in Pohara in relation to their property located at Richmond Rd. The Submitters seek to have this property included in the Future Development Strategy. The attached submission sets out the specific issues of concern and details the areas for inclusion in the Future Development Strategy. The Submitters request that their land at Pohara be identified as a growth option, but with the lower area of land being identified as a future growth option only when flood mitigation works have been completed and monitored as to their success. Further in respect of any future growth on the lower level land any future consideration woul need to exclude areas within the Cultural Heritage Precinct. |
| 31815 Peter Wilks | N/A | I believe the Medium-High population forecasts are wildly optimistic and the region will not grow anywhere like what is forecast. Families are getting smaller and the demographic in Nelson/Tasma is a |

| | | aging population that will want to be living in Richmond/Stoke/Nelson City. |
|-----------------|-----|--|
| | | There should be a limit to planned growth in this region or it will ruin the existing lifestyle and attractiveness of this region as a place to live. |
| 31823 Rob Wilks | N/A | See attached. This response is particular to our (Tasman) area, but the same arguments could be said for other areas affected by urban sprawl/ greenfield land development. The covenants imposed on us will be unfairly lifted of other developers. We chose to invest in a home here because of the "Rural Character" of the area and this is now threatened. Lack of availability of required infrastructure. Effects on Climate Change. Increased contaminant and flood risk. There is no denying that there needs to be something done about New Zealand's current housing crisis. However, developing large, residential areas with low population density is not the answer. There is growing evidence that high density, multistorey development is the best was to combat the housing shortage and provide affordable homes. These areas need to be close to amenities such as supermarket, schools, and Medical centre's to encourage active transport, and reduce the number of cars on the roads. Is there any reason why we must relieve the pressure on housing in New Zealand by providing housing in this relatively unspoilt area? There must be more suitable land in other areas in New Zealand for growth without sprawling subdivisions across the hills around here. |
| 31826 Dan Hames | N/A | See attachement - requests that the master plan for Port Tarakohe and surrounding land is noted in the FDS, that the FDS flags that the existing urban area identified at Tarakohe is subject to a TDC led master plan and these boundaries may change as a result of landowner consultation, PTSL/PTL are included in the Tasman Coastal Group, the Tarakohe Harbour Area is shown as Council reserve land on the FDS maps. Port Tarakohe Ltd limits its submission to: Pohara to Ligar Bay area, Golden Bay. TDC planners have consistently underestimated the growth of this area. This area is a thriving, growing community. |

| | plan that considers the wellbeing of the communities and the operation of Port Tarakohe. The reports from these meetings have been shelved and the residents, recreation Port users and industry opinions all need to be heard. • A master plan for this area should include Port Tarakohe, the adjacent communities and the adjacent PTL land. The TDC has concentrated on development plans for their Port land and the aquaculture industry's specific requirements in isolation without consideration of the wider community interests. This land offers a unique opportunity to provide a mixed-use development area to support an adjacent Port and meets every outcome sought by the FDS. • The property should be included in this FDS consultation and the current FDS map needs to be updated to reflect the feasible opportunities for urban land use by adjusting the zoning boundaries presently drawn on the property while considering cross-boundary sensitivity issues with the neighbouring residential communities. |
|-----|---|
| N/A | Nobody I know wants our region to grow to the extent that is being envisaged. Tauranga would be a good (negative) example of large scale growth. There is no guarantee that intensification will happen "very slowly over time", "Build it and they will come". The FDS is a blueprint for developers to destroy the character and values of our region forever; for the rich to get richer at the expense of the poor. |
| N/A | Please see attached for further detail |
| N/A | Please see attached for further detail - additional attachments included: Yes I am interested in why peopl come to live in Nelson - Tasman and who they are. Who are these people. Council needs to do some social science and find out so you can plan appropriately. |
| N/A | The Richmond - Mapua - Tasman - Motueka coast route is one of the most scenic in Nelson. It's what visitors want to see so DO NOT create Tasman Village. On this route put more cycle areas, picnic spots, beach access, cafes, NOT residential houses. People don't drive or travel to see residential houses. They want scenery. |
| | N/A N/A |