



**LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION**  
***MANA KĀWANATANGA Ā ROHE***

**Background Report on Communities of Interest  
and Planning in Relation to Proposal for Union  
of Nelson City and Tasman District**

**13 June 2011**

## Introduction

This document describes levels of community of interest identified in the Nelson-Tasman area and planning activities and approaches. This information was gathered from the following sources:

- written and oral submissions presented at hearings on the proposal for the union of Nelson City and Tasman District
- a range of agency reports including council long-term council community plans (LTCCPs), other local plans and strategies
- meetings and discussions with central government agency officials
- meetings with council officers and local interest groups.<sup>1</sup>

The information is presented as follows:

- communities of interest:
  - perceived communities of interest in Nelson and Tasman
  - cross-boundary social and economic activity patterns
  - the Nelson-Tasman regional economy
- current planning activities and approaches:
  - long-term council planning
  - environmental and resource management planning.

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Appendix 1* for the groups/organisations Commission officials met with or sought comment from on the Nelson-Tasman reorganisation proposal.

## COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST

### Perceived communities of interest

In one sense, a community of interest can be said to exist where people feel a common affinity or compatibility, and have a sense of belonging to the area and the people who live there. They see each other as having similar interests and value systems.

These 'perceived' communities of interest may be influenced by such factors as geography and history as well as by individual beliefs and aspirations. They may also be influenced by certain functional linkages, such as a local school, while other functional linkages, such as place of work, may cut across perceived local communities of interest. ('Functional communities of interest' in the Nelson-Tasman area are addressed in the next section.)

A strong sense of belonging contributes to community well-being and is important in defining boundaries. Given the number and overlapping nature of communities of interest, local government boundaries typically contain a number of perceived communities of interest. A hierarchy of communities of interest can often be identified.

#### *Current Nelson and Tasman communities of interest*

Submitters on the proposal for the union of Nelson City and Tasman District identified the following four levels of community of interest in Nelson-Tasman to which they variously perceived a sense of belonging.

(a) A sense of community centred on suburbs, localities and/or settlements

The Tasman District Council (TDC) identified 17 main settlements for planning purposes. Some submitters identified these 17 settlements as a focus for community identity, which was reinforced by such factors as geography, shared values and interests, location of primary schools, commercial and recreational facilities, community newsletters/ newspapers and community organisations. (See *Appendix 2* for a profile of the 17 settlements and community facilities and services.)

In contrast, staff at the Nelson City Council (NCC) suggested that individuals and local community groups within Nelson City tended to form around particular issues and these groups often were not ongoing. However, they did identify the following 'local centres': the CBD, Stoke, Tahunanui, Atawhai, Victory Square, the Wood and Hira.

The TDC and NCC 2010 resident surveys provided one comparative measure of local community identity/resilience, as shown in the following table.

	Nelson City		Tasman District	
	Strongly Agree/ Agree	Disagree/ Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree/ Agree	Disagree/ Strongly Disagree
In times of difficulty, I believe the community would pull together and cope	67%	9%	90%	5%
Generally speaking most people in my local area can be trusted	66%	10%	89%	4%
I feel a sense of community with others in my area	56%	16%	88%	6%

(b) A sense of community at sub-district, or ward/community board level

While wards were abolished in Nelson City in 1992 and some changes have been made to Tasman District wards, the history of the structure of local government in the Nelson-Tasman area reflects a reasonably stable picture of communities of interest. (See *Appendix 3* for a brief history of local government structures in Nelson and Tasman.)

The remote nature and distinct geography of some areas, and/or a degree of self-containment separate from Nelson-Richmond services, as well as demographic factors, help to reinforce distinct community identities. This appears particularly to be the case in the Golden Bay, Lakes-Murchison and Motueka Wards of Tasman District.

Some submitters did identify distinctions between the Waimea townships and Richmond, between Richmond and Nelson City, and between Stoke and the rest of Nelson City.

(c) A sense of community defined by Tasman District and Nelson City

A majority of submitters from Tasman District perceived a clear distinction between 'rural Tasman' and 'urban Nelson' though some did perceive a distinction between 'urban Richmond' and the remainder of Tasman District. This distinction was illustrated in many ways, including by reference to landscape, community values, lifestyle and servicing requirements, as well as concerns about changes to current rural representation and influence over council revenue and funding decisions.

Some submitters commented that there was a good balance of rural and urban communities within Tasman District and that this is reflected in council membership.

Both councils have identified, at a high level, the outcomes sought by their respective district- and city-wide communities and these community outcomes and accompanying council-determined priorities are designed to act as a guide to council decision-making in respect of the district/city.

(d) A sense of regional community (combined Nelson-Tasman area)

Some submitters perceived a regional community of interest based on a shared geography, the extent of cross-boundary relationships and shared interests, and interdependence of communities within the two council areas i.e. what happens in one district impacts significantly on the other.

The sense of a 'regional' community of interest is addressed further under 'Regional economy'.

*Factors of change*

Nelson-Tasman, like most areas, is experiencing change. The following trends are identified as being likely to impact on the way that residents perceive communities of interest in Nelson and Tasman in the future.

(a) Migration trends

The Nelson-Tasman area has experienced considerable flows of people to, from, and within it. The inward migration to Nelson and Tasman recorded in the 2006 census was 23% and 24.5% of district population respectively. About one third of these migrants (approximately 6,000 people) were from overseas. Comparative outward migration to other regions in the country from Nelson and Tasman was 26.2% and 20.5% respectively. Between 2001 and 2006, a total of 3,420 residents moved from Nelson City to Tasman District, and a total of 2,229 residents moved from Tasman District to Nelson City.

The second Nelson Tasman Regional Economic Development Strategy (REDS)<sup>2</sup> noted that a younger group in their late teens and 20s are leaving Nelson-Tasman for education and career opportunities and a more mature group of families or older couples are coming to the area.<sup>3</sup> It is also evident that there is a substantial exodus of people in the 25-40 year age group pursuing career opportunities outside the area. However, on balance there has been a net inflow of people in this age group into the area over the past 20+ years.

---

<sup>2</sup> The first Nelson Tasman Regional Economic Development Strategy was commissioned in 2002 and a second report was prepared for the Nelson Economic Development Agency (EDA) in 2007. Since the release of the second report, which used 2006 statistics, the EDA identified a number of factors changing both the national economy and regional economic drivers, most notably the global recession. In light of this, the EDA considered it timely to re-evaluate the strategies that should be driving the region and to undertake a review of impacts and future requirements for infrastructure, transport access, the construction sector, retail and wholesale operations, education and health provision, and community services within the region. We have noted the recommendations from the second report but relied mainly on the review document for our analysis.

<sup>3</sup> The REDS identified that between 1996 and 2006, the number of people in the 20-24 year age group declined by 21% and 18% in the Nelson and Tasman areas respectively. During the same period, the number of people in the 45-59 age group increased by 36% and 45% in the Nelson and Tasman areas respectively.

These migratory patterns are indicative of increasing population mobility which, alongside communications technology and social media developments, will impact on traditional cultural dynamics, including residents' sense of place and desire to recognise historical geographic divisions.

In addition, like New Zealand as a whole, the Nelson-Tasman area has an increasing population of older people. This results in accessibility issues and particular service requirements, such as in relation to housing types and health services. For economic reasons, such services are seen as likely to be predominantly located within Richmond-Nelson, and this may result in further intra-district migration.

Demographic data for Nelson City and Tasman District is provided in *Appendix 4*.

#### (b) Urban expansion

Residential development/population growth within Tasman District and the Nelson-Tasman area as a whole has been, and is likely to continue to be, focused on the Richmond-Nelson urban area. These urban expansion trends are consistent with New Zealand and international trends.<sup>4</sup>

The urban conurbation is growing around Richmond and beyond into the Waimea area of Tasman District, with concentrated population growth in Wakefield, Brightwater, Wai-iti and Mapua. Between 2001 and 2006, approximately 95% of total Tasman District population growth occurred within the Richmond and Waimea-Moutere Wards.

Ward Description (based on pre-2007 boundaries <sup>5</sup> )	1996 Census, Usually Resident Population Count	2001 Census, Usually Resident Population Count			2006 Census, Usually Resident Population Count		
			Change 96-01	% Change 96-01		Change 01-06	% Change 01-06
Golden Bay Ward	4,698	4,791	93	2	4,830	39	0.8
Lakes-Murchison Ward	2,313	2,445	132	5.7	2,421	-24	-1
Motueka Ward	9,909	10,440	531	5.4	10,602	162	1.6
Moutere-Waimea Ward	9,870	10,695	825	8.4	12,366	1,671	15.6
Richmond Ward	11,178	12,981	1,803	16.1	14,406	1,425	11
<i>Tasman District</i>	<i>37,974</i>	<i>41,352</i>	<i>3,378</i>	<i>8.9</i>	<i>44,625</i>	<i>3,273</i>	<i>7.9</i>
Nelson City	40,242	41,568	1,326	3.3	42,891	1,323	3.2

<sup>4</sup> [http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse\\_for\\_stats/people\\_and\\_communities/geographic-areas/urban-rural-profile-update.aspx](http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/people_and_communities/geographic-areas/urban-rural-profile-update.aspx)

<sup>5</sup> In 2007, the Belgrove/Wai-iti settlements area was transferred from Moutere-Waimea Ward to Lakes-Murchison Ward. For consistency, population has been determined on a meshblock basis based on post-2007 boundaries.

The TDC’s growth modelling work projects that the population of Richmond Ward alone will increase from a Statistics New Zealand estimated 15,350 in 2010, to an estimated 27,100 by 2031. By 2031, the Richmond Ward will contain approximately 42% of the total population of Tasman District.

The population projections profiled in the table below are from the councils’ 2009-19 LTCCPs using estimates prepared by Statistics New Zealand based on the 2006 census.

	<b>2006</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>2026</b>	<b>2031</b>
Tasman District	45,800	48,456	52,492	56,355	60,295	63,940
Nelson City	44,300	45,900	47,200	48,300	49,200	49,900
Total	90,100	94,356	99,692	104,655	109,495	113,840

Within Nelson City, the main focus of residential development/population growth has been in the south of the city towards Richmond including, between 1996 and 2006, increases of approximately 700 usually resident people in the Ngāwhatu and Saxton area units respectively. In the medium term, high growth to the south of Nelson is likely to continue as signalled by proposed changes in the Nelson Resource Management Plan for the Nelson South, Enner Glynn and Marsden Valley areas. This will increasingly raise questions about the appropriateness of the boundary between Nelson City and Tasman District.

The areas on both sides of the Nelson City –Tasman District boundary (Champion Road) are characterised by strong residential and some commercial development with associated infrastructure demands. This is likely to impact on residents’ perceptions of distinct communities either side of the boundary.

(c) Varying rural perspectives

There is no internationally recognised definition of a ‘rural’ area, which by default has tended toward a classification of ‘not urban’. However some common rural values can be identified such as desires to preserve rural voice, retain rural services, maintain rural environments, avoid urban sprawl and maintain primary production and protect productive land.

A paper prepared in 2004 by Statistics New Zealand, identifies and explores the reasons for an international and national trend towards increasing urbanisation, including the growth of main cities at the expense of smaller urban communities. It also notes New Zealand’s historic tendency for urban sprawl and a more recent trend toward ‘rural lifestyle’ living.

These trends are apparent in Tasman District. This has an effect of diluting or diversifying what may be considered as ‘rural interests’ in the district (e.g. a rural family living south of Murchison may have little in common with a family living on a ‘lifestyle’ block within daily driving distance of Richmond-Nelson). A further factor impacting on traditional rural perspectives, as noted below, are

high workplace commuter flows between the Wakefield, Brightwater, Wai-iti and Mapua areas and Nelson-Richmond.

(d) Changing rural economy

The Nelson-Tasman regional economy is more dependent on primary sector production than other 'like' regions and New Zealand as a whole. It also has one of the highest incidences of small to medium enterprises, many of which are family-based pastoral, horticultural or tourism businesses.

The REDS noted that the realities of the global marketplace include demand for increased scale of production, tighter quality requirements and more efficient supply chain logistics. It noted that producers are under pressure to reduce cost structures, including adoption of smart technology and mechanisation to substitute for labour. The trend, documented in the REDS, of consolidation of and cooperation between previous small-scale often family owned/operated agricultural and horticultural entities, to larger more efficient entities, is expected to continue. The ability to achieve rural economies of scale is seen in the REDS as an important regional opportunity.

(e) Economic pressures on small townships

Small towns are facing increasing economic pressures to retain services. These pressures may result in the restructuring or withdrawal of services to particular communities such as, for example, health services in the Motueka and Golden Bay communities. There may be consequential losses in employment opportunities. At the same time, labour shortages arising from other factors may present a barrier to new businesses and industries locating in these areas, as identified by the REDS in relation to potential seafood processing in Golden Bay.

A defining ongoing issue for many small-medium communities and their councils is their willingness and ability to invest in infrastructure and community services on a sustainable basis. On the other hand, the sort of challenges described above can also be seen as presenting opportunities for the community to demonstrate resilience, instigate new initiatives and generally to 'muck in'. There is not the same degree of opportunity to demonstrate these values in or near cities where services are more readily available. This 'mucking in' attitude was one of the ways that submitters distinguished 'rural culture' from 'urban culture'.

*Conclusion*

Submitters, particularly from Tasman District, expressed strong views about the perceived inherent differences between 'rural Tasman' and 'urban Nelson'. While these must be acknowledged, it is also important to note a number of social and economic factors are tending to break down or at least blur the

traditional urban-rural distinction.<sup>6</sup> These factors include migration trends, the universal trend of urban expansion, changing perspectives of what is 'rural', the changing rural economy including increasing use of technology and mechanisation, and economic pressures on small towns. As a result, careful consideration needs to be given to the extent current perceived communities of interest will continue to be as strong and distinct in the future.

### **Cross-boundary social and economic activity patterns**

A range of social and economic activities take place across both perceived community of interest boundaries and also the current Nelson City-Tasman District boundary. Key 'functional' communities of interest are identified below.

#### *Places of work*

Information from the 2006 census shows that:

- of the 22,023 employed<sup>7</sup> residents of Nelson City, 2,136 (approximately 9.7%) worked in Tasman District
- of the 23,313 employed residents of Tasman District, 4,962 (approximately 21.3%) worked in Nelson City.

The detailed breakdown (by ward and area unit) of the number and proportion of usually resident people in Tasman District with a workplace address in Nelson City is shown in *Appendix 5*. It is noted that there are higher rates of workplace commuter flows into Nelson City from Richmond Ward, and Wakefield, Brightwater, Mapua and Wai-iti<sup>8</sup> area units compared to the remainder of the district.

Between the 2001 and 2006 censuses, the number of usually resident people in Tasman District who had a workplace address in Nelson City increased by 1,227, and the number of Nelson City residents who had a workplace address in Tasman District increased by 396.

#### *Schools*

Fourteen of the 17 settlements identified in Tasman District by the TDC have their own primary school while Tapawera and Murchison have area schools catering for primary to secondary age students. There are three secondary schools: Motueka High School, Golden Bay High School and Waimea College. In Nelson City, there are 14 primary schools, 4 intermediate schools and 4 secondary schools.

---

<sup>6</sup> The complementary nature of urban and rural communities, as opposed to entrenched distinctions, was one of the drivers behind the structural reforms of local government in 1989 with the introduction of district councils combining former urban-focussed borough councils and rural-focussed county councils.

<sup>7</sup> Based on 2006 census usually resident population aged 15 years and over and employed (part time and full time)

<sup>8</sup> The Wai-iti area unit includes much of the Waimea Plains and rural area surrounding Richmond Ward

The two districts appear to be reasonably self-sufficient in schooling though it is noted that only Nelson City offers single-sex secondary education (Nelson College and Nelson College for Girls). Waimea College in Richmond is the only secondary school in the region to have an enrolment scheme restricting attendance to students resident in its zone. The enrolment scheme includes Richmond, Mapua and Wakefield areas.

### *Shopping*

At a district level, the contribution of retail trade to gross domestic product and employment is slightly higher in Nelson City (\$157.6m and 2,812 full-time equivalent employees) compared to Tasman District (\$112.1m and 2,024 full-time equivalent employees).

The 2010 review of the REDS noted that:

"Over the period October 2004 to Sept 2009 quarterly retail sales increased by 27% and 10% respectively in Nelson City and Tasman District. The fall off in retail sales since the September quarter 2008 has been more marked in Tasman than in Nelson City."

This suggests that while there may not be a large dependence of Tasman residents on Nelson retail shopping services currently, there may be a change occurring over time.

Compared to the retail trade, there is more of a weighting relatively on Nelson wholesale trade which generates \$149m and has 1,320 full-time equivalent employees, compared to Tasman's \$68m and 608 full-time equivalent employees.

### *Sport and recreation*

The Tasman Regional Sports Trust covers Buller, Tasman, Nelson, Marlborough and Kaikoura Districts with headquarters at Saxton Fields. The Trust has four satellite offices: Sports Buller, Sports Tasman (covering Nelson City and Tasman District), Sports Marlborough and Sports Kaikoura.

Most sports codes have competitions that cover the combined Nelson-Tasman area. The Tasman Makos rugby team<sup>9</sup> and Tasman netball include Marlborough District. Ten codes are based at Saxton Fields which is a regional facility managed by the Regional Sports Trust.

### *Health services*

The Nelson-Marlborough District Health Board (NMDHB) covers the three territorial authority areas in the top of the South Island: Marlborough District, Nelson City and Tasman District. It is the predominant provider of publicly

---

<sup>9</sup>At local club level, rugby is organised as two separate competitions: Nelson Bays and Marlborough.

funded health services including two base hospitals in Nelson and Blenheim, and two rural hospitals in Murchison and Golden Bay.<sup>10</sup>

Nelson Hospital, including an acute mental health unit, is located in Nelson City and serves the combined Nelson-Tasman area providing secondary level services.<sup>11</sup> A range of other local community health services and facilities are provided in both areas including Jack Inglis Friendship Hospital in Motueka.

### *Shared council facilities and services*

Some council services and facilities are provided jointly by the two councils to the whole or part of the Nelson-Tasman area. The councils have agreed ongoing common governance arrangements to provide the following services across council boundaries:

- Saxton Fields recreational facilities
- Nelson Provincial Museum
- Civil defence and emergency management services
- Nelson Regional Sewerage Business Unit facilities at Bells Island
- Port Nelson Ltd
- Nelson Airport Ltd
- Tourism Nelson Tasman Ltd

The NCC and TDC also collaborate in a number of areas with common frameworks or approaches for particular services or provision of a service on behalf of the other council, as distinct from common governance for the service concerned.<sup>12</sup>

The councils have acknowledged that there is scope for more shared service agreements and have agreed (along with Marlborough District Council) to investigate further options for shared services in 'the top of the south'.

---

<sup>10</sup> The rural hospitals are Arthur McCaa Community Hospital in Murchison and the Golden Bay Community Hospital with the latter in a state of transition toward an integrated community health centre run by a community trust.

<sup>11</sup> General secondary level services include surgical, medical, maternity, neo-natal, paediatrics, intensive care, cardiac intervention, casualty, adult rehabilitation and mental health. Maternity deliveries requiring hospital obstetric care are provided at Nelson for the Nelson/Tasman population. Tertiary level support is provided by Christchurch, Wellington and Starship (Auckland) Hospitals.

<sup>12</sup> A number of the 'shared services' identified by the councils are seen more as 'shared initiatives'. These include, for example, the Nelson Regional Economic Development Agency which was established as a NCC council controlled organisation in June 2004 funded by NCC (with additional funding provided by the TDC since 2008) with three full-time staff and a governance board of four appointed by the NCC.

## Conclusion

A range of functional social and economic activities take place across the current Nelson City – Tasman District boundary. These activities include places of work, shopping, sport and recreation pursuits, health services and some council services. Given the prevalence of these cross-boundary activities, they can be seen to offset to some extent the impact of perceived more local communities of interest.

## The Nelson-Tasman regional economy

There is a broad consensus, including among many of those who are opposed to the union proposal, that Nelson-Tasman comprises one regional economy. This is typically described in terms of Tasman District being the 'engine room' for the economy and Nelson City being the location of essential support and infrastructure services such as the port and airport to service the regional economy.

As a whole, the region increased its value-added gross domestic product from 2001 to 2006 by 18% (compared to a national increase of 20%) to a total of \$3.7 billion. During the period from 2006 to 2009, the gross domestic product generated by economic activity in Nelson City continued to expand but that in Tasman District declined by 1%. Key indicators for the 2009 year by district are set out below.

<b>Key Regional Performance Indicators 2009</b>	<b>Nelson City 2009</b>	<b>Tasman District 2009</b>	<b>Nelson Tasman Region 2009</b>	<b>New Zealand 2009</b>
Population	43,575	45,605	89,180	4,154,800
Value-added GDP (\$2009m)	\$2,054	\$1,665	\$3,719	\$184,800
GDP/capita (\$2009)	\$47,860	\$36,700	\$41,610	\$44,480
Employment (FTEs)	22,870	17,570	40,440	1,867,000
Business units	5,710	6,470	12,180	512,580

The REDS 2010 Review noted that the Nelson-Tasman region is unusual, compared to many other provincial areas with smaller populations, in being an economically diverse region with a number of strong industries driving its regional economy. It noted, however, that the region is and will continue to be dependent on primary sector production which will at times threaten the region's economy, but will also provide opportunities.

The top five industries by their employment and gross domestic product contributions to the local Nelson City and Tasman District economies are:

	<b>Employment contribution</b>	<b>Gross domestic product contribution</b>
<b>Nelson City</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Health &amp; community services</li> <li>2. Retail trade</li> <li>3. Business &amp; professional services</li> <li>4. Manufacturing</li> <li>5. Construction</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Business &amp; professional services</li> <li>2. Manufacturing</li> <li>3. Health &amp; community services</li> <li>4. Retail trade</li> <li>5. Wholesale trade</li> </ol>
<b>Tasman District</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Agriculture</li> <li>2. Manufacturing</li> <li>3. Retail trade</li> <li>4. Construction</li> <li>5. Business &amp; professional services</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Agriculture</li> <li>2. Business &amp; professional services</li> <li>3. Manufacturing</li> <li>4. Forestry</li> <li>5. Retail trade</li> </ol>

### *Economic drivers*

The REDS Review identified the following five key economic drivers<sup>13</sup> of the regional economy which make up 31% of the region's gross domestic product:

- horticulture (\$351m in 2009)
- forestry (\$339m in 2009)
- seafood (\$275m in 2009)
- pastoral (\$128m in 2009)
- tourism (\$128m in 2009)

With the exception of aquaculture (a component of the seafood industry approaching 50% of global seafood production), these are mature industries and are in a sustainable rather than growth phase in their development.

The REDS Review identified aquaculture as the fastest growing sector of the international food industry with production expanding at 15% per annum. It noted New Zealand aquaculture production has been in hiatus and has not been in a position to take advantage of this global phenomenon. While future benefits will be long term, it identified the following issues to be addressed: enabling legislation, management plans for sea farms, compliance and interaction with land-based activities such as farming and tourism.

### *Economic opportunities*

The REDS Review identified aquaculture as the most promising opportunity for development. The bulk of production, approximately 75% of the country's mussel and sea-farmed king salmon, takes place in the Marlborough Sounds and Tasman/Golden Bay. A third of mussel processing takes place in Nelson/Richmond. The review noted that three aquaculture management areas have been designated for marine farming in Tasman Bay/Golden Bay.

<sup>13</sup> These drivers are analysed using the cluster concept pulling together all of the components that make up an industry from the various industrial sectors including, for example, contributions from transport, research and other essential inputs.

In respect of other regional opportunities, the REDS Review identified the emission trading scheme as having potential to make a significant difference to the economics of the forestry sector in terms of returns and plantation management. It predicted other opportunities will arise in tourism, from the rollout of the fibre optic network for high speed broadband and from research and development capability in the region.

### *Conclusion*

A number of economic opportunities, based on recognised key drivers of the regional economy and new activities, have been identified for the Nelson-Tasman area. Local authority structures and mechanisms can assist in realising these opportunities and, as a result, promote community well-being.

## **CURRENT PLANNING ACTIVITIES AND APPROACHES**

This section looks at current planning activities and approaches of the NCC and TDC in relation to the community of interest factors and trends identified in the previous Part.

A principle of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) is for councils to take a sustainable development approach in relation to community well-being, the quality of the environment and the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations. The Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) also requires councils to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources in an integrated way.

It is noted that the application of the statutory planning requirements set out in the LGA and the RMA within the Nelson-Tasman area is unique in that a predominantly urban Nelson City and a predominantly rural Tasman District are governed by unitary authorities performing the planning functions of regional *and* territorial authorities (district/city councils). The remaining three unitary authorities in New Zealand (Marlborough, Gisborne and Auckland) combine rural and urban areas within their areas. In the remainder of the country, regions encompass multiple territorial authorities. Arguably the LGA and particularly the RMA, were written with the majority local government structural arrangements in mind.

### **Long-term council planning**

In 2005, in accordance with the requirements of the LGA, both councils undertook a process to identify community outcomes as a base for preparing their 2006-16 long-term council community plans (LTCCPs). These community outcomes are repeated in both councils' 2009-19 LTCCPs and are set out in the following table with the TDC community outcomes reordered in an attempt to align these with those of the NCC for the purposes of comparison.

Nelson City	Tasman District
<p><b>Healthy land, sea, air and water</b> We protect the natural environment</p>	<p><b>Our unique and special natural environment is bountiful, healthy, clean and protected</b></p>
<p><b>People-friendly places</b> We build healthy, accessible and attractive places and live in a sustainable region</p>	<p><b>Our built urban and rural environments are functional, pleasant, safe and sustainably managed</b></p>
<p><b>A strong economy</b> We all benefit from a sustainable, innovative and diversified economy</p>	<p><b>Our growing and sustainable economy provides opportunities for us all</b></p>
	<p><b>Our transport and essential services are sufficient, efficient and sustainably managed</b></p>
<p><b>Kind, healthy people</b> We are all part of a welcoming, safe, inclusive and healthy community</p>	<p><b>Our vibrant community is safe, well, enjoys an excellent quality of life and supports those with special needs</b></p>
	<p><b>Our diverse community enjoys access to a range of spiritual, cultural, social, educational and recreational services</b></p>
<p><b>A fun, creative culture</b> We are proud of our creative local culture and regional identity</p>	<p><b>Our community understands regional history, heritage and culture</b></p>
<p><b>Good leadership</b> Our leaders are proactive, innovative and inclusive</p>	<p><b>Our participatory community contributes to district decision-making and development</b></p>

Both councils also identified particular priorities in their 2009-19 LTCCPs and these are set out below. Again some similarity can be noted.

Nelson City Council Priorities	Tasman District Council Priorities
1. Putting Nelson's regional identity on the radar	1. Protecting the productive capacity of our best soils, while ensuring there is suitable land available for residential, business, industrial and recreational land.
2. Sustainability, particularly environmental sustainability	2. Making sure we have enough high quality drinking water and water available for irrigation to support the continued development of the primary sector.
3. Sustainable economic development	3. Making sure development is sustainable.
4. Nelson as a centre for arts creativity	4. Maintaining a high quality natural environment.
5. Building and maintaining strong relationships with iwi/Māori	5. Supporting the top five industries on which our economy is based (horticulture, forestry, fishing/aquaculture, agriculture and tourism) while encouraging new sustainable industries to locate here.
6. Safeguarding and promoting our heritage	6. Providing a good transportation network of roads, cycleways and walkways.
7. Regional programmes, working co-operatively with Tasman District Council	7. Providing infrastructure to meet residential, industrial and business growth.
8. Development of community facilities and infrastructure	8. Enhancing and protecting the garden that is Tasman and the lifestyle it offers residents and visitors, including beautifying our urban areas, enhancing and protecting our natural environment, and provision of public open space, parks and community facilities.
	9. Fostering safe and friendly communities.
	10. Maintaining the vitality of our small rural communities.
	11. Working collaboratively on a range of issues and sharing services with our neighbouring councils.

The Controller and Auditor-General (OAG) report to Parliament on 'Matters Arising from the 2009-19 Long Term Council-Community Plans' (LTCCPs) included a review of six councils' approaches to sustainable development. In respect to the TDC's approach, the OAG report stated that:

*“Tasman District Council’s 2009-19 LTCCP has quite a strong sustainable development focus. The LTCCP notes that this focus was sought by the community, which had called for greater sustainability, protecting both the district’s natural and man-made environments. The LTCCP links the relationship between community outcomes for the district, the four dimensions of community well-being, the Council’s objectives in each of those aspects, and how its activities will contribute to achieving community outcomes. The LTCCP has a focus on balancing economic and population growth with sustainable development and environmental management, but taking a cautious approach to keep the district moving forward in a difficult economic environment. The LTCCP discusses the Council’s approach to sustainable development and environmental management in relation to managing land and land use, and projected growth and demand for land and services, and managing water resources.”*

The TDC says it is committed to supporting population and economic growth for each of 17 distinct settlement areas located across the district. The council's planning is supported by a quality growth demand and supply model, which is being reviewed for developing the outputs for the 2012-22 long-term plan (LTP).<sup>14</sup>

Infrastructure needed to meet Tasman District's projected growth demand has been modelled out to a 20-year period. This work feeds directly into the council's activity management plans, which subsequently feed into the LTCCP. An independent review of the council's transportation, solid waste, rivers, wastewater, stormwater and water supply asset management plans against Audit New Zealand criteria, found that five of the asset management plans achieved 'excellent compliance' and one achieved 'good compliance' for the financial forecasting criteria.

Audit New Zealand, on behalf of the OAG, expressed its opinion that the NCC draft 2009-19 LTCCP provided a reasonable basis for long-term integrated decision-making by the council and for participation in decision-making by the public and subsequent accountability to the community about the activities of the council.

It can be argued that planning is effective and transparent in respect of both Tasman District and Nelson City. It is also argued by some that the two-council structure enables collaborative planning and strategy development where appropriate, while enabling flexibility to undertake parts of their planning or service delivery at different levels, as appropriate. For example, the TDC

---

<sup>14</sup> It is noted that as a result of the enactment of the Local Government Act Amendment Act, long-term council community plans (LTCCPs) are now to be called long-term plans (LTPs).

has invested in more detailed growth study planning for each of its 17 settlements and made greater investment in coastal risk management processes. The NCC has invested in more detail in its regional land transport strategy, economic development activity, and arts and culture planning.

An example of the current collaborative approach of the two councils is the writing, cross-referencing and consistent layout of both councils' LTCCPs. This is managed by staff of both councils to make it easier for residents to compare and understand the respective documents.

A criticism of the shared planning approach was that it is too narrowly focused on specific projects and/or areas and too dependent on staff expertise and relationships. Officers of both councils suggested that it was rare, if ever, for one council to submit on the other's plans under the LGA. It is not clear whether this indicates strong shared understanding/agreement between the councils or a lack of political will and/or lack of effective mechanisms for identifying and presenting a case based on regional issues/priorities, at intra-council level.

Section 15 of the LGA requires local authorities within a region to enter into an agreement containing protocols for communication and coordination between themselves during the next triennium. This provision does not apply to the TDC and the NCC as unitary authorities. The lack of such a requirement for reconciling divergent regional community views at the political level means there is a reliance on the political will of the councils to achieve desired outcomes. This is likely to result in uncertainty and duplication of effort for councils, residents, central agencies and other stakeholders in addressing regional issues and achieving regional objectives. In short, while on the face of it the councils share broad objectives, there appear to be few mechanisms to ensure local government accountability to the regional community.

The councils cite REDS, the Waimea Inlet Strategy, the Nelson Tasman Regional Arts Strategy, their participation in the Regional Facilities Forum and the Top of the South Transport Liaison Forum, as examples of co-operative decision-making and accountability in respect of regionally-focused strategies and forums. Accountability, however, ultimately rests with the individual councils in their own districts, according to different sets of community funding pressures and priorities.

### *Conclusion*

Both councils' long-term planning processes have been judged to be effective by independent parties. There are a number of examples of effective co-operation, particularly at staff level, between the two councils in certain areas. A key issue for consideration is the willingness of the councils, under existing structural arrangements, to step outside of the constraints of district-focused or city-focused objective setting, strategic/policy planning and accountability mechanisms particularly in relation to truly regional issues.

## **Environmental and resource management planning**

### *Statutory documents*

Both councils have decided that integrated management of the natural and physical resources of the city/district, particularly in respect of coastal interface issues, would be best achieved by combining the district and regional plans into one document.

The Tasman Regional Policy Statement is due for review by 1 July 2012. The TDC has resolved to investigate the merger of this statement with the Tasman Resource Management Plan as provided for in section 80 of the RMA.

The Nelson Regional Policy Statement was due for review in 2007 but has been indefinitely postponed.

The purpose of a regional policy statement, under section 59 of the RMA, is to provide an overview of the resource management issues of the region, and policies and methods to achieve integrated management of the natural and physical resources of the whole region. Regional and district plans must give effect to the regional policy statement for their region (sections 67(3)(c) and 75(3)(c) of the RMA).<sup>15</sup>

It is noted that in some high growth regions elsewhere in the country (e.g. Bay of Plenty/Greater Tauranga, Greater Christchurch), the regional policy statement has been used to provide 'statutory teeth' to ensure coordination and consistency of multiple councils' planning responsibilities.

A further consideration in relation to statutory processes is the extent to which central government continues to provide national direction or guidance through the mechanism of national policy statements. This may impact on the councils' capacities to prioritise and respond to local and regional environmental planning issues and concerns.

---

<sup>15</sup> This provision, which was introduced via the 2005 amendments to the RMA, only comes into effect however, once the relevant provisions of the regional policy statement have been reviewed and/or changed and made operative (sections 65(6) and 73(4)).

### *Cross boundary issues*

Section 12 of the Nelson Resource Management Plan and chapter three of the Tasman Resource Management Plan identify the processes for dealing with issues that cross territorial authority boundaries in accordance with the RMA (sections 62(1)(h), 67(2)(f) and 75(2)(f)).<sup>16</sup>

The cross-boundary issues identified are:

- land use activities, including space needs for residential, rural-residential, industrial and commercial purposes<sup>17</sup>
- iwi interests
- management of the effects of land transport systems and modes, including roading, passenger transport, cycleways and walkways, and of the effects of land use activities on these systems and modes (management of the effects of transportation of hazardous substances)
- protection of natural values and features in the Waimea Estuary
- management of coastal water quality and coastal space
- protection of marine areas
- management of the Roding River
- solid waste (minimisation) and hazardous waste management
- integrated management of the effects of the use, development or protection of natural and physical resources (Nelson Resource Management Plan) and/or consistent approaches in resource management policies and plans (Tasman Resource Management Plan)
- environmental monitoring (including water and air quality and hazardous wastes)
- integrated management of the effects arising from, and effects on, urban services such as Bells Island oxidation ponds and the Roding River urban water supply (Nelson Resource Management Plan)
- consistent management of the effects of land disturbance activities (Tasman Resource Management Plan)

---

<sup>16</sup> The Nelson Resource Management Plan states that the NCC recognises that the Nelson-Tasman area is “a socially and economically *integrated* unit. It functions as one effective community and is geographically isolated from other communities.” By way of contrast, the Tasman Resource Management Plan states that “cross-boundary issues may be in relation to a specific resource or area that extends across district boundaries, for example, continuous urban areas and areas of high natural value, or similar processes and systems such as erosion, contamination, transport networks or water bodies that require a consistent approach to management”. Chapter three of the plan specifies the need for “consistency and co-ordination”.

<sup>17</sup> Clause 3(c) of the Tasman Resource Management Plan specifies the need for consistent management of urban land use activities in the Nelson-Stoke-Richmond urban area.

- co-ordinated management of land use effects in areas that are significant hard rock quarry aggregate sources in the Eastern Nelson Hills (Tasman Resource Management Plan)
- co-ordinated provision for specific amenity services and facilities in relation to recreation, arts, culture, tourism (Tasman Resource Management Plan).

### *Land use activities*

The drivers of, and interdependencies between, future residential and commercial/industrial growth are cross-boundary issues that require integration with transport nodes, infrastructure and facilities planning. At a general level, the councils recognise that planning for residential/business growth is a cross-boundary issue.

The Tasman and Nelson Resource Management Plans identify generally similar urban environment issues including:

- limited land, specifically flat land near to existing infrastructure, facilities and amenities, and protecting productive soils
- providing a liveable and sustainable environment for the community through the use of careful design of the urban environment (taking account of, for example, known factors such as affordability issues, an aging population, and amenity values)
- the ability to service urban growth (including new residential subdivision) cost effectively and sustainably
- the efficient use and development of the scarce industrial land resource and effective use of commercial land resource
- impact on character of coastal locations (e.g. coastal Tasman), areas bordering national parks (e.g. St. Arnaud) and ridgelines (e.g. Nelson-Richmond)
- protection from potential natural and development-related hazards (e.g. flood, coastal erosion, stormwater)
- maintaining the character of towns.

The area around the Nelson-Tasman boundary is experiencing significant residential and commercial growth. The councils have collaborated on planning for the Nelson South/Richmond East area to avoid continuing fragmented subdivision, inefficient servicing and poor urban design. A joint structure plan was prepared and the timing of RMA plan change processes has been aligned.

In relation to sustainable urban design, the councils have, since 2007, jointly funded stage one of a proposed three-stage intensification study, progressed

plan changes to enhance urban design<sup>18</sup>, signed the Ministry for the Environment administered Urban Design Protocol and established a joint urban design panel to provide design reviews.

While intensification is recognised as a means to address the urban environment issues identified above, a joint approach to further investigation, as outlined in the stage one report, appears to have stalled. A cross-boundary issue exists in that greenfields development provides a more cost-effective option for developers.

The REDS identified concerns about availability of industrial land, particularly within Nelson City, and considered it essential that both councils develop an overarching regional land use plan “to ensure that adequate productive, industrial and commercial land is available to meet the needs of the future” (see *Appendix 6* for a description of the constraints identified in relation to the region’s economic opportunities).

The Nelson Urban Growth Strategy identified the need to coordinate industrial and commercial land supply at a regional level. The Richmond Development Study was informed by issues raised through the Nelson strategy process about Nelson’s industrial/commercial land supply constraints. It identified a preferred option for the defined westward expansion of Richmond (lower Queen Street) to create a high amenity urban environment for residential and business development (Richmond West Development Area).

It is understood that a NCC submission suggested that a wider regional assessment of land supply/demand issues than was apparent in the land mix in the initially proposed Tasman Resource Management Plan Change 10 - Richmond West Development Area, was required. The TDC subsequently amended its proposal, reducing the quantum of residential and increasing the quantum of business/industrial land.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>18</sup> *Proposed Nelson Resource Management Plan Change 14 – Residential Subdivision, Land Development Manual and Comprehensive Housing*

- Incorporates better urban design into objectives, policies, rules and other methods in the Nelson Resource Management Plan and externally references the NCC Land Development Manual 2010. Notified 25 September 2010. Further submissions closed 4 February 2011.

*Tasman Resource Management Plan Change 5 – Sustainable Urban Design and Development*

- Amends the plan to provide for objectives, policies and methods to promote urban development that provides a liveable and sustainable environment for the community through the use of careful design. Urban design guides for Richmond South, Richmond West and Coastal Tasman areas were also incorporated in the plan. Operative October 2010.

<sup>19</sup> *Proposed Tasman Resource Management Plan Change 10 - Richmond West Development Area*

Provides for 130 ha mixed use industrial park in Lower Queen Street. Proposal was modified following consultation as outlined in table below:

<i>Development Category</i>	<i>Proposed Change 10 Notified 6/12/2007</i>		<i>Proposed Change 10 Notified 26/9/2009</i>	
Future Residential	122ha	1206 lots	60ha	590 lots
Future Mixed Business	82ha	257 lots	121ha	442 lots
Future Light Industrial	69ha	339 lots	109ha	536 lots

These examples can be seen to support the argument that the councils have demonstrated an ongoing ability to work together to address shared residential and industrial/commercial land use issues. It is argued that the processes described above have resulted in effective outcomes (e.g. supply of industrial and business land for the Nelson-Tasman region for an estimated 20-30 year period).

It is noted that council collaboration on land use issues has advanced principally as a result of positive working relationships between the staff of the two councils. At a political level, a Nelson-Richmond Working Futures Group, comprising three councillors from the TDC and from the NCC, was established in 2006 but was subsequently disbanded in 2008.

While council officers collaborate on specific issues, there remains no agreed documentation that captures a regional community perspective on residential and business/industrial land use issues. Without such a document, it is difficult to assess individual planning decisions in relation to region-wide issues.

Consideration also needs to be given to sustainability and efficiency implications of the way the councils manage, in particular, urban spill-over and regional economic land use issues. Submitters argued that the union proposal would provide greater certainty to the community, developers, and business, and would reduce duplication (e.g. councils submitting on the others plan changes), potentially diverting some planning resource to a more strategic level.

There is widespread recognition of the cost-effectiveness of collaborative and integrated land use planning in promoting the sustainable development of New Zealand's high growth urban-coastal areas. For example, SmartGrowth is a collaborative (Bay of Plenty Regional Council, Tauranga City Council, Western Bay of Plenty District Council, tangata whenua, and New Zealand Transport Agency), long-term (20-50 year) planning project aimed at managing the demands<sup>20</sup> of high population growth in an integrated way so as to improve present and future community wellbeing<sup>21</sup> while reducing overall costs. The SmartGrowth strategy framework is anchored in the Bay of Plenty Regional Council's Regional Policy Statement. Tauranga City and Western Bay of Plenty District Councils are required to give effect to the regional policy statement in their district plans.

---

<sup>20</sup> Including issues such as high population growth, unfettered rural residential development, degradation of coastal areas, increasing demand for housing and different housing types, increasing traffic congestion, building and replacing expensive infrastructure; and finding equitable funding methods.

<sup>21</sup> That is, achieving the regional community vision of enabling growth while retaining a balanced 'work, life, play' environment.

### *Iwi issues*

Iwi authority interests span the wider Te Tau Ihu area rather than being aligned to council boundaries. In terms of their ability to exercise kaitiakitanga obligations, iwi see the need to develop relationships with two councils as artificial and inefficient.

Council processes are often characterised as ad hoc and dependent on the willingness of each council to engage on particular issues. There are concerns that iwi are constantly being consulted on specific proposals, which strains resources and has the potential to undermine iwi relationships with the wider community.

Completion of the Treaty Settlement process in the area will likely increase the level of engagement between iwi and the councils, both in terms of iwi economic development activity as well as responding to iwi interests under environmental management legislation. It is noted that the Treaty Settlement process has resulted in establishment of an advisory committee on freshwater management issues affecting Te Tau Ihu, and that the RMA provides for the establishment of joint management committees.

The union proposal is seen by iwi as a means to achieve a more pro-active approach to understanding iwi interests, which will have efficiency and effectiveness benefits for local government, iwi, and other wider community stakeholders.

### *Conclusion*

Both councils appear to be meeting their statutory environmental and resource management planning responsibilities, in areas such as land use planning, in an effective manner. There is a good degree of collaboration between the two councils, particularly at a staff level, in relation to cross-boundary issues particularly in the Nelson-Richmond area. However, both councils' statutory planning documents have a city/district focus with little focus on the Nelson-Tasman region. This absence of a regional focus is mirrored at the political level of the two councils with the absence of real commitment to the region as one entity. Iwi are concerned about the impact of separate planning processes on their ability to engage with the councils.

**Groups and organisations Commission officials  
met or sought information from**

Ministry for the Environment  
New Zealand Transport Agency  
Ministry of Health  
Office of the Controller and Auditor-General  
Horticulture New Zealand  
Nelson Regional Economic Development Agency  
Tiakina te Taiao  
Senior Nelson City Council managers  
Senior Tasman District Council managers

## Tasman District '17 Settlements' Profiles

### Appendix 2

Settlement Name	Shops	Schools	Council facilities	Other	Commercial
<b>Richmond Ward</b>					
<b>Richmond</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• settlement population</li> <li>• Distance to urban area</li> <li>• community board/association overlap</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pop. 12,953</li> <li>• Richmond Community Forum</li> </ul>	Many	Many primary schools Waimea College (Yrs 9-15, Roll08=1391, D8)	Many including <u>TDC Headquarters</u>	Many Alexandra Hospital and Older Persons Care	Many
<b>Moutere-Waimea Ward</b>					
<b>Brightwater</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pop. 1898</li> <li>• To Richmond 7.5km, 10 minutes</li> <li>• Brightwater Community Association</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supermarket</li> <li>• Other small shops</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary school</li> <li>• Preschool</li> <li>• Playcentre</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rugby (x3)</li> <li>• Cricket (x2)</li> <li>• Soccer (x2)</li> <li>• Hall</li> <li>• Volleyball</li> <li>• Tennis</li> <li>• Skate park</li> <li>• Playgrounds</li> <li>• Public toilets</li> <li>• Walkways</li> <li>• BMX</li> <li>• Cemetery</li> <li>• Reserves (x8)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Volunteer rural fire force</li> <li>• Lord Rutherford Memorial Hall</li> <li>• Churches</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Petrol/garage</li> <li>• Hotel/taverns</li> <li>• Local festivals including art and craft show</li> </ul>
<b>Wakefield</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pop. 1,844</li> <li>• To Richmond 14 km, 17 minutes</li> <li>• Wakefield Community Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supermarket</li> <li>• Chemist</li> <li>• Other shops</li> <li>• Café</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary school</li> <li>• Playcentre</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rugby</li> <li>• Soccer (x2)</li> <li>• Cricket</li> <li>• Hall</li> <li>• Tennis</li> <li>• Playgrounds</li> <li>• Public toilets</li> <li>• Community library</li> <li>• Walkways</li> <li>• Faulkner Bush</li> <li>• Reserves (4)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Golf course</li> <li>• NZ Fire Service Brigade</li> <li>• Bowls</li> <li>• Police station</li> <li>• Doctor's surgery</li> <li>• Church</li> <li>• Vet</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Petrol garage</li> <li>• Hotel</li> <li>• Local festivals</li> </ul>
<b>Mapua/Ruby Bay</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pop. 1,944</li> <li>• To Richmond 19 km, 17 minutes</li> <li>• Mapua and Districts Community Association</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supermarket</li> <li>• Many other shops</li> <li>• Hairdresser etc</li> <li>• Restaurants</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community library</li> <li>• Bowls</li> <li>• Soccer</li> <li>• Tennis</li> <li>• Reserves (x7)</li> <li>• Playgrounds</li> <li>• Public toilets</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hall</li> <li>• Wharf</li> <li>• Churches</li> <li>• Doctor's surgery</li> <li>• NZ Fire Service Brigade</li> <li>• Local festivals</li> <li>• Vets</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taverns</li> <li>• Camping ground</li> <li>• Artists</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Skate park</li> <li>• Boat launching</li> <li>• McKee Camp</li> <li>• Walkway</li> <li>• BMX</li> </ul>		
<b>Settlement Name</b>	<b>Shops</b>	<b>Schools</b>	<b>Council facilities</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Commercial</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• settlement population</li> <li>• distance to urban area</li> <li>• community board/association overlap</li> </ul>					
<b>Coastal Tasman</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pop. 719+1439 (comprises two large coastal-rural residential areas surrounding Mapua and Tasman settlements)</li> <li>• To Richmond 15-30 minutes</li> <li>• Partial overlap with Tasman Area Community Association and Mapua and Districts Community Association</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Walkways</li> <li>• Cemetery</li> <li>• Cycle ways</li> <li>• Reserves (x2)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wineries</li> <li>• Artists</li> <li>• Camping ground</li> </ul>
<b>Tasman</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pop. 162</li> <li>• To Richmond 26 km, 26 minutes</li> <li>• To Motueka 9 km, 10 minutes</li> <li>• Tasman Area Community Association</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All purpose store</li> <li>• Restaurant &amp; cafe</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reserves (x2)</li> <li>• BMX</li> <li>• Playgrounds</li> <li>• Walkway</li> <li>• Kina campground</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Churches</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Artists</li> </ul>
<b>Upper Moutere</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pop. 148</li> <li>• To Motueka 18 km, 16 minutes</li> <li>• To Richmond 28 km, 27 minutes</li> <li>• Dovedale Residents Committee</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supermarket/store</li> <li>• Other small shops</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rugby</li> <li>• Soccer</li> <li>• Community Facility</li> <li>• Indoor gym</li> <li>• Tennis</li> <li>• Playground</li> <li>• Reserve</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NZ Fire Service Brigade</li> <li>• Local festivals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Artists</li> <li>• Hotel</li> <li>• Petrol garage</li> <li>• Church</li> <li>• Wineries</li> </ul>
<b>Lakes-Murchison Ward</b>					
<b>Murchison</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pop. 479</li> <li>• To Richmond 111 km, 82 minutes</li> <li>• Murchison and Districts Community Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supermarket</li> <li>• Restaurants</li> <li>• Other small shops</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Murchison Area School (Yrs 1-15, Roll08=158, D4)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TDC Service Centre</li> <li>• Library</li> <li>• Rugby (x2)</li> <li>• Tennis courts</li> <li>• Bowling green</li> <li>• Indoor stadium</li> <li>• Hall/community facility</li> <li>• Walkways</li> <li>• Playgrounds</li> <li>• Public toilets</li> <li>• BMX</li> <li>• Cemetery</li> <li>• Pony club</li> <li>• Camping ground</li> <li>• Transfer station</li> <li>• Reserves (x2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Murchison Hospital and Health Centre</li> <li>• Police</li> <li>• NZ Fire Service</li> <li>• DOC office</li> <li>• Info Centre</li> <li>• Museum</li> <li>• Ambulance</li> <li>• Vets</li> <li>• Local festivals including A&amp;P Show</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Petrol/garage</li> <li>• Hotels</li> <li>• River Adventure tours</li> </ul>

<b>Settlement Name</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• settlement population</li> <li>• distance to urban area</li> <li>• community board/association overlap</li> </ul>	<b>Shops</b>	<b>Schools</b>	<b>Council facilities</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Commercial</b>
<b>St Arnaud</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pop. 431</li> <li>• To Richmond 75 km, 60 minutes</li> <li>• Rotoiti District community council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local store</li> <li>• Restaurants</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hall/indoor stadium</li> <li>• Tennis</li> <li>• Walkways</li> <li>• Reserves</li> <li>• Volunteer rural fire</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large DOC estate</li> <li>• DOC headquarters</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Petrol at shop</li> <li>• Hotel</li> <li>• Backpackers</li> <li>• Commercial water taxi on Lake Rotoiti</li> </ul>
<b>Tapawera</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pop. 309</li> <li>• To Richmond 45 km, 36 minutes</li> <li>• To Motueka 47 km, 34 minutes</li> <li>• Tapawera and Districts community council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supermarket</li> <li>• Small shops</li> <li>• Café</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tapawera Area School (Yrs 1-15, Roll08=245, D4)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School/community library</li> <li>• Sports fields</li> <li>• Skate park</li> <li>• Cemetery</li> <li>• Playgrounds</li> <li>• Reserves (x2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NZ Fire Service</li> <li>• Ambulance</li> <li>• Local festivals including A&amp;P Show</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Petrol/garage</li> </ul>
<b>Golden Bay Ward</b>					
<b>Takaka</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pop. 1,133</li> <li>• to Motueka 52km, 43 minutes</li> <li>• to Richmond 90km, 80 minutes</li> <li>• Golden Bay Community Board</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full range from supermarket to coffee, sports, shops etc</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary</li> <li>• Preschool</li> <li>• Golden Bay High School (Yrs7-13, Roll08=307, D6)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council Service Centre</li> <li>• Library</li> <li>• Bowls</li> <li>• Rugby</li> <li>• Soccer</li> <li>• Tennis</li> <li>• Reserves (x15)</li> <li>• Playgrounds</li> <li>• Public toilets</li> <li>• Museum</li> <li>• Cemetery</li> <li>• Skate park</li> <li>• BMX</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Golden Bay Community Hospital</li> <li>• RSA Hall</li> <li>• Senior Citizens Hall</li> <li>• NZ Fire Service Brigade</li> <li>• Police station</li> <li>• DOC headquarters</li> <li>• Doctor's surgery</li> <li>• Churches</li> <li>• Info Centre</li> <li>• Pony Club</li> <li>• Ambulance</li> <li>• Vets</li> <li>• Various local festivals</li> <li>• Onetahua Marae</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hotels (x2)</li> <li>• Petrol/garages</li> <li>• B&amp;Bs</li> <li>• Movie theatres</li> <li>• Camping ground</li> <li>• Weekly market</li> </ul>
<b>Pohara, Tata Beach, Ligar Bay, Tarakohe</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pop. 738</li> <li>• Golden Bay Community Board</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General store</li> <li>• Bars and restaurants</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Camping ground</li> <li>• Tennis courts</li> <li>• Hall</li> <li>• Bowls</li> <li>• Port Tarakohe</li> <li>• Boat launching</li> <li>• Public toilets</li> <li>• Playground</li> <li>• Beach and other reserves (x6)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local festivals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• B&amp;Bs</li> <li>• Motels</li> </ul>

<b>Settlement Name</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• settlement population</li> <li>• distance to urban area</li> <li>• community board/association overlap</li> </ul>	<b>Shops</b>	<b>Schools</b>	<b>Council facilities</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Commercial</b>
<b>Collingwood</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pop. 229</li> <li>• To Takaka 31km, 26 minutes</li> <li>• Golden Bay Community Board</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supermarket and other small shops</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Collingwood Area School (Yrs 1-15, Roll08=129, D6)</u></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Camping ground</li> <li>• Tennis courts</li> <li>• Hall</li> <li>• Boat launching</li> <li>• Public toilets</li> <li>• Playground</li> <li>• Beach and other reserves (x2)</li> <li>• Museum</li> <li>• Cemetery</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Farewell Spit tours</li> <li>• NZ Fire Service</li> <li>• Resthome</li> <li>• Local festivals and arts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Petrol garage</li> <li>• B&amp;Bs</li> <li>• Church</li> </ul>
<b>Motueka Ward</b>					
<b>Motueka</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pop. 6,242</li> <li>• To Richmond 35 km, 34 minutes</li> <li>• Motueka Community Board</li> </ul>	Many	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Four primary schools</li> <li>• <u>Motueka High School (Yrs9-15, Roll08=619, D4)</u></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Many</u></li> <li>• <u>TDC Service Centre</u></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Motueka Community Hospital</u></li> <li>• Others</li> </ul>	Many
<b>Kaiteriteri</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pop. 404</li> <li>• To Motueka 15 km, 19 minutes</li> <li>• Motueka Community Board</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supermarket/store</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reserve – mainly coastal (x4)</li> <li>• Walkways</li> <li>• Public toilets</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large camping ground (DOC)</li> <li>• Boat launching</li> <li>• Playgrounds</li> <li>• Toilets</li> <li>• Boat washing facilities</li> <li>• NZ Fire Service</li> <li>• Summer festivals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commercial smaller camping grounds</li> <li>• B&amp;Bs</li> <li>• Restaurants &amp; cafes</li> </ul>
<b>Marahau</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pop. 194</li> <li>• To Motueka 19 km, 24 minutes</li> <li>• Marahau Sandy Bay Ratepayers and Residents Association</li> <li>• Motueka Community Board</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shop at camp</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public toilets</li> <li>• Small reserves (x2)</li> <li>• Boat launching</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outdoor Education Centre</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commercial camps</li> <li>• Commercial water taxis</li> <li>• Restaurants</li> <li>• Commercial backpackers etc</li> <li>• Camping ground</li> </ul>
<b>Riwaka</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pop. 535</li> <li>• To Motueka 7.5 km, 11 minutes</li> <li>• Motueka Community Board</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small number of shops</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hall</li> <li>• Sports fields (x4)</li> <li>• Bowls</li> <li>• Croquet</li> <li>• Tennis</li> <li>• Reserves (x3)</li> <li>• Coastal reserves</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cemetery</li> <li>• Local arts festival</li> <li>• Church</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• B&amp;Bs</li> <li>• Petrol garage</li> </ul>

### **Community Halls provided by Tasman District Council**

- Bainham Hall, Golden Bay
- Brightwater Public Hall, Brightwater
- Collingwood Memorial Hall, Golden Bay
- Golden Bay Community Centre, Golden Bay
- Hope Recreation Hall, Richmond
- Kotinga Hall, Golden Bay
- Lake Rotoiti Hall, St Arnaud
- Lower Moutere Hall, Lower Moutere
- Motueka Community House, Motueka
- Motueka Memorial Hall, Motueka
- Murchison RSA Hall, Murchison
- Ngatimoti Memorial Hall, Ngatimoti
- Onekaka Hall, Golden Bay
- Pakawau Memorial Hall, Golden Bay
- Pohara Hall, Golden Bay
- Richmond Town Hall, Richmond
- Riwaka Memorial Hall, Riwaka
- Spring Grove Hall, Spring Grove
- Tapawera Memorial Hall, Tapawera
- Waimea West Hall, Brightwater

### **Community Centres provided by Tasman District Council**

- Murchison Recreation and Cultural Centre
- Moutere Hills Community Centre
- Motueka Recreation Centre

### **Local Newspapers, Newsletters and online News-Sites serving Tasman District**

<b>Newspapers</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Circulation</b>
Nelson Mail Regional including Nelson	Daily	15,500 – 16,000
Richmond Leader	Weekly	8,000
Waimea Weekly	Weekly	Urban 5,250 Rural 3,840
Motueka Guardian	Weekly	10,000
Motueka/Golden Bay News	Weekly	9,500
Golden Bay Weekly	Weekly	2,550
<b>Newsletters</b>		
Wakefield Village News	Monthly	2,320
Coastal News (Mapua)	Monthly	700
Brightwater News (carried within Waimea News)	Monthly	10,1000
Motueka Valley News	Monthly	400
St Arnaud Residents	Seasonally	300
Tapawera Community Council	Monthly	200
Dovedale Residents Committee	Monthly	500
Murchison & Districts Community Council	Monthly	300

### **Online**

Motueka Online (community online news and info service)  
[www.motuekaonline.org.nz](http://www.motuekaonline.org.nz)

Tasman Community Online (Tasman, Moutere, Kina, Mariri)  
[www.tasmancommunity.org.nz](http://www.tasmancommunity.org.nz)

## **Appendix 3**

### **Local government structures in Nelson-Tasman**

In 1876, when the system of boroughs and counties was established, the Nelson-Tasman area was divided into Collingwood County, Waimea County and Nelson City while the Murchison area was part of Inangahua County.

The area was further divided over the next 50 years as follows.

- In 1903 Collingwood County was divided in two, into Takaka County and a new Collingwood County.
- In 1908 a Murchison County was constituted.
- In 1891 Richmond Borough was constituted.
- In 1899 Motueka Borough was constituted.
- In 1915 Takaka Town District was constituted.
- In 1920 Tahunanui Town District was constituted.

In the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s the structure of local government consolidated somewhat as –

- Nelson City absorbed Tahunanui Town District in 1950 and small areas of Waimea County between 1949 and 1967.
- Takaka and Collingwood Counties and Takaka Town District combined to form Golden Bay County in 1956.
- Murchison County was included in Waimea County in 1965.

The current structure of territorial authorities developed in the late 1980s.

In 1988 Richmond and Motueka Boroughs and Waimea County<sup>22</sup> were combined to form Tasman District. Parts of Waimea County (the Appleby Riding and the Whangamoā Riding) were included in Nelson City.

In 1989 Golden Bay County was included in Tasman District.

### **Wards**

In 1989, the Commission constituted four wards for Nelson City – Whangamoā (one member), Maitai (four), Fifehire (five), and Stoke (four). These wards appear to have been determined by the then Commission based on community of interest, except that the newly acquired Whangamoā rural area was kept as a separate ward rather than being divided and joined with adjacent communities of interest. The Council abolished its wards with effect from the 1992 local elections.

---

<sup>22</sup> Waimea County included the areas of what is now the Lakes-Murchison and Moutere-Waimea Wards of Tasman District.

In 1989, the Commission constituted six wards for Tasman District – Lakes (two members), Richmond (four), Waimea (two), Moutere (two), Motueka (four), and Golden Bay (two). These wards were based on what the then Commission identified as being the communities of interest in Tasman District. These were described as being –

- the Nelson Lakes area and the upper Motueka and Buller river catchments, including Murchison and the lower Maruia Valley
- the immediate vicinity of Richmond
- the Waimea Plains and the hillsides that lie adjacent to it
- the Moutere Hills and areas adjacent to them
- in the vicinity of Motueka in Golden Bay<sup>23</sup>

In 1992 the Lakes Ward was renamed the Lakes-Murchison Ward and the Moutere and Waimea Wards were combined to create a Moutere-Waimea Ward. The combining of these two wards was made on the basis that –

*“the various communities of interest within the two present wards are within an area which is not divided by any marked geographical barriers ... but have similar concerns and similar expectations in the delivery of local government services”<sup>24</sup>*

In 2007, the Commission transferred part of the Moutere-Waimea Ward (the Belgrove and Wai-iti settlements south of Wakefield) to the Lakes-Murchison Ward to ensure that the latter ward complied with the +/-10% requirement.

## **Regional Government**

A form of regional government for the area was established in 1979 with the formation of the Nelson Bays United Council. This covered an area more or less identical to the current area of Nelson City and Tasman District.

In 1989 the area was included in a larger Nelson-Marlborough Region, although the upper Buller catchment (including Murchison), while remaining in Tasman District, was included in the West Coast Region. In 1992 the Nelson-Marlborough Region was abolished with the Nelson City Council and the Tasman and Marlborough District Councils becoming unitary authorities. The upper Buller catchment was excluded from the West Coast Region with the Tasman District Council exercising regional council functions over its entire district.

---

<sup>23</sup> LGC, Draft Reorganisation Schemes – Nelson-Marlborough Region, December 1988

<sup>24</sup> LGC, Representation Review determination for Tasman District, 1992

## **Demographic information on Tasman District Wards and Nelson City**

A file of demographic data from the 1996, 2001 and 2006 census was prepared as a basis for comparison between the five Tasman District Wards (Richmond, Moutere-Waimea, Motueka, Lakes-Murchison, and Golden Bay) and Nelson City (available on request). Key observations to emerge from analysis of this information include:

### *Ethnicity*

The Motueka Ward contains a proportionally higher number of Māori residents (1,182 or 11.6% at 2006) compared to the remainder of the region (e.g. 3,612 or 8.7% of Nelson City, 795 or 5.6% of the Richmond Ward, and 597 or 5.0% of the Moutere-Waimea Ward at 2006). Approximately 39% of the Māori ethnic population of the Tasman District reside within the Motueka Ward.

### *Residence five years previously*

Based on the 2006 census, a total of 1,005 or 8.1% of residents of the Moutere-Waimea Ward were living overseas at the time of the 2001 census. This compares to 3,108 or 7.2% of Nelson City residents, 774 or 5.4% of Richmond Ward residents, 651 or 6.1% of Motueka residents, 105 or 4.3% of Lakes-Murchison residents, and 312 or 6.5% of Golden Bay residents.

### *Age*

At the 2006 census, there was some difference in the proportion of residents aged over 65 for the Lakes-Murchison (9.7%) and Moutere-Waimea (9.4%) wards compared to the more 'urban' wards/city of Nelson (14.5%), Richmond (15.7%), Motueka (16.5%) and Golden Bay (13.6%).

The median age for both Tasman District and Nelson City is higher than the national average and is projected to increase over time. Statistics New Zealand projected age structure for both territorial authority areas is as follows.

Projected Population Age Structure and Components of Change											
Territorial authority areas											
1996–2031 (2006-base) update, medium series											
Territorial authority area <sup>(1)</sup>	Year	Population <sup>(2)</sup> by age group (years), at 30 June					Components of population change, five years ended 30 June				Median age <sup>(7)</sup> (years) at 30 June
		0–14	15–39	40–64	65+	Total	Births <sup>(3)</sup>	Deaths <sup>(4)</sup>	Natural increase <sup>(5)</sup>	Net migration <sup>(6)</sup>	
Tasman District	1996	9,100	13,300	11,600	4,800	38,800	...	...	...	...	35.3
	2001	9,700	13,100	14,100	5,500	42,400	2,500	1,400	1,100	2,600	37.6
	2006	9,700	12,900	16,900	6,200	45,800	2,700	1,500	1,100	2,200	40.3
	2011	9,600	12,700	18,000	7,700	47,900	2,700	1,600	1,100	1,000	42.4
	2016	9,400	12,600	17,900	9,700	49,600	2,500	1,800	700	1,000	44.4
	2021	9,100	13,100	17,300	11,600	51,100	2,400	2,000	500	1,000	45.9
	2026	8,900	13,400	16,400	13,600	52,300	2,500	2,200	200	1,000	46.8
	2031	8,800	13,200	15,900	15,200	53,200	2,500	2,500	-100	1,000	47.3
Nelson City	1996	8,500	15,300	11,500	5,800	41,200	...	...	...	...	35.0
	2001	8,900	14,500	13,400	6,100	42,900	2,700	1,700	900	800	37.1
	2006	8,400	14,100	15,400	6,400	44,300	2,700	1,900	800	600	39.4
	2011	8,400	13,900	16,400	7,100	45,900	3,000	1,900	1,100	500	41.0
	2016	8,600	13,600	16,600	8,400	47,200	2,800	2,000	800	500	42.3
	2021	8,700	13,600	16,100	9,900	48,300	2,700	2,100	600	500	43.4
	2026	8,300	14,000	15,300	11,500	49,200	2,700	2,300	400	500	44.1
	2031	8,200	13,700	15,100	13,000	49,900	2,600	2,500	200	500	44.8

### Median Income

In 1996, Richmond Ward, Nelson City and Moutere-Waimea Ward had the highest median incomes of the six areas at \$15,600, \$15,100, and \$14,700 respectively. In 2006, this order had changed to Moutere-Waimea (\$23,800), Nelson City (\$23,100) and Richmond Ward (\$22,800). Based on the 2006 census, there is a notable difference in median income between the three wards identified above and the Motueka (\$19,700), Golden Bay (\$19,100) and Lakes-Murchison (\$20,500) Wards. This difference is consistent with the 2001 and 1996 census.

### Source of income

In 2006, a higher proportion of residents of Golden Bay, Lakes-Murchison, and Moutere-Waimea Wards compared to Nelson, Richmond and Motueka had a source of income from 'self-employment or business' (see following table).

Ward	Self-employment of Business	Percentage %
Golden Bay	1,200	31.2%
Lakes-Murchison	636	33.9%
Moutere-Waimea	2,484	26.4%
Motueka	1,527	17.7%
Richmond	1,932	17.2%
Nelson	5,508	15.9%

### Occupation

At the 2006 census, the number and proportion of the usual resident population with an occupation in the NZSCO category 'Agriculture and Fishery Workers' were as follows:

Ward	Agriculture and Fishery Workers	Percentage %
Golden Bay	561	23.0%
Lakes-Murchison	480	35.3%
Moutere-Waimea	1,167	17.3%
Motueka	948	17.4%
Richmond	585	8.0%
Nelson	831	3.8%

The following is an overview of specific statistics by district/city:

2006 census	Tasman District	Nelson City	New Zealand
% European ethnic group	82.7	80.4	67.6
% Māori ethnic group	7.1	8.7	14.6
No. Māori residents (% change since 2001 census)	3,063 (+10.3%)	3,615 (12.3%)	
No. occupied dwellings	17,475	17,328	
No. unoccupied dwellings	2,538 <sup>25</sup>	1,185	
Median age	40.3	39.4	35.9
Median income	21,600	23,100	24,400
% 15+ yrs income <-\$20,000	47.1	44.3	43.2
% 15+ yrs income +\$50,000	13.0	14.1	18.0
% home ownership	62.7	57.4	54.5
Access to internet	59.3	60.3	60.5
Access to fax	31.1	23.5	26.0
Access to telephone	91.4	92.2	91.6
Access to cellphone	69.6	71.9	74.2

<sup>25</sup> The majority of unoccupied 'holiday homes' are located in the Kaiteriteri, St. Arnaud and Golden Bay areas.

## Nelson City workplace location of Tasman residents by wards

	2006 census total usually resident employed (part/full time).	2006 census usually resident with workplace address in Nelson City	% of employed usually resident with workplace address in Nelson City	2006 census median income for usually resident by area unit
<i>Richmond Ward</i>				
Richmond East	2802	1128	40%	22100
Richmond West	3000	1188	40%	22300
Hope	648	207	32%	25000
Richmond Hill	39	15	38%	30800
Aniseed Hill	318	93	29%	27500
Ranzau	441	114	26%	26700
Best Island	54	24	44%	24300
<i>Moutere-Waimea Ward</i>				
Wai-Iti <sup>26</sup>	2889	723	25%	25100
Brightwater	957	351	37%	26100
Wakefield	909	294	32%	23100
Mapua	963	246	26%	23600
<i>Motueka Ward</i>				
Motueka Outer <sup>27</sup>	2079	189	9%	19900
Motueka West	1758	105	6%	19500
Motueka East	1737	111	6%	19300
Kaiteriteri	423	30	7%	21300
Riwaka	489	12	2%	19900
<i>Lakes-Murchison Ward</i>				
Golden Downs	513	54	11%	19600
Lake Rotoroa	372	6	2%	22300
Murchison	288	6	2%	19300
Tapawera	189	27	14%	21000
<i>Golden Bay Ward</i>				
Golden Bay	1857	24	1%	19000
Takaka	585	15	3%	19300

<sup>26</sup> In 2007, the Commission included part of the Wai-iti area unit in Lakes-Murchison Ward

<sup>27</sup> The Outer Motueka area unit is split between the Motueka and Moutere-Waimea Wards

### **Constraints on realising economic opportunities**

The Nelson Tasman Regional Economic Development Strategy (REDS) and the REDS Review produced by the Nelson Regional Economic Development Agency, identified future infrastructure requirements to help achieve the region's economic potential and constraints and issues relating to these, along with a series of recommendations. These requirements, constraints and recommendations are summarised as follows:

- a. Appropriately zoned land:
  - The REDS identified the supply of appropriately zoned retail, commercial and industrial activity as a key requirement in achieving the region's economic potential. It noted that the Nelson Urban Growth Strategy is specific to population growth and residential land use needs across Nelson City and that the strategy does not deal with future industrial and retailing/commercial land needs. Zoning for light to medium industrial activities was not being given sufficient priority in council plans.
  - The principal demand will be for commercial/office space for the service sector. In addition, retail development particularly for large format retail buildings was projected to increase significantly. Expansion of manufacturing/ processing, transport/storage, construction/trade outlet companies and the wholesale trade were also forecast to require additional land in Tasman.
  - To ensure that adequate productive, industrial and commercial land is available, the REDS recommended development of an overarching regional land-use plan based on long-term population trends and sector requirements also to include infrastructure requirements.
- b. Resource Management Act:
  - The REDS noted concerns about bureaucratic and inflexible interpretations of the Resource Management Act, excessive detail being required, delays and the cost of compliance.
  - To address these concerns, the REDS recommended that both councils review opportunities for their district plans to have a consistent interpretation for development options spanning the region.
- c. Affordable housing:
  - The REDS noted affordable housing as a factor in recruitment and staff retention concerns in the region. This was in light of Nelson and Tasman wage and salary levels being below the national median and housing therefore being a significant portion of income.

- To address these concerns, the REDS recommended the two councils liaise on strategies to provide a supply of affordable housing in the Nelson-Tasman Region in conjunction with the Affordable Housing Project.

d. Infrastructure:

- Power:
  - The REDS noted that Golden Bay has 3 hydro stations providing power for the Bay and selling to the National Grid, there is also a small plant near Motueka. It noted that a small generation plant is also an option for the Lee Dam proposal.
  - To address concerns and issues raised including the 2-3% annual increase in demand, the REDS recommended the region needs to establish sustainability of energy infrastructure for distributed generation – this incorporates diversification of generation sources including affordable small-scale units.
  - The REDS noted that solar power is being investigated.
- Water:
  - The REDS noted that water is a strategic issue for the whole region as it is a critical resource for population growth and economic development.
  - It noted that the Waimea Basin was under stress as there is a severe water shortage (with irrigation the main use). It stated that a solution is needed within 5 years. Lee Dam would provide potentially long-term regional water supply. The estimated cost is \$38.1m or, combined with a hydro facility, \$42.35m. It noted the proposal is supported by a cost-benefit study.
  - It noted that Motueka township has limited reticulation and Motueka West is not reticulated and is reliant on wells. Supplies for emergency services are a major concern. It noted plans to access Motueka aquifer water resources to supply the growing urban entities of Tasman and Mapua (the Upper Motueka catchment is water short with water fully allocated) are going through planning processes.
  - It noted plans to provide fire-fighting water supplies to Takaka given its present inadequate supply. There is no piped supply in Clifton or Port Tarakohe. Additional infrastructure would be required for new or expanded industries such as aquaculture.
  - The REDS recommended support for the Waimea Augmentation Committee's initiatives and development of strategic water initiatives elsewhere in the region to

ensure that planning and implementation of future water storage and usage meet the region's needs.

- Roading and transport:
  - The REDS noted the region has one of the highest export road freight levels in the country for its population (NB it has no railway). It also noted the relatively high level of road freight operations employment dedicated to the primary sectors.
  - The REDS Review noted that the major issue that continues to exercise planners is improving road capacity access into and through Nelson City and alleviating vehicle congestion in the Richmond to Hope corridor. It noted road transport operators are constrained by congested access to the Port for export cargo, by payload issues and the state of the road between Nelson and Picton.
- Port Nelson and Nelson airport:
  - The REDS noted the importance of both facilities for the economy and particularly for primary sector exporters and tourism. It noted concerns that encroachment from residential pressure for infill and redevelopment around the airport, coupled with the impact of the airport on residents, may restrict airport operations in future.

e. Public sector investment:

- The REDS noted that there are instances where seed investment in a facility will generate complementary investment in facilities which have considerable economic impacts. One example noted is investment in a conference centre and performing arts capability to stimulate private sector investment in accommodation and other facilities. The conference centre is also seen as important to extend seasonal visitation to the region.
- The REDS recommended that priority be given to expedite construction of a conference centre to provide essential tourism infrastructure for the region.

The REDS also recommended that within the next 12 months the Nelson Regional and Marlborough Regional Development Trust hold a forum for the purpose of developing and establishing a strategy for sustainable development (in line with councils' legislative requirements): detailing objectives, purpose and a plan of action to be undertaken in the subsequent 12 months.