

Tasman Regional Policy Statement Change 1

Summary of Submissions by Topic – Erratum Version, Full Record

1-TRPS Plan Change 1 SOA

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons	Summary
1	Top of the South Dark Sky Committee and Supporters	Amend	Seeks inclusion of Dark Sky protections into TRPS C1. Refer to list of inclusions sought in documentation.	Neither Plan Change 81 or 1 address lighting requirements. As both allow for more and new development. We believe it is essential to prevent further light pollution that will result from such development. Further we are advised the LDM is not yet ready to update so request changes be made at this level in the meantime.	New Lighting requirements for all developments in the District.
2	Max Brown	Support	The council should accept TRPS Change 1.		I support TRPS Change 1.
6	Mt Hope Holdings	Support	The Submitter supports the change to the RPS		The submitter supports the change to the RPS
7	Friedrich, Gerlinde, Phil and Simon Holer	Support	Support the general intent of Change 1, consistent with FDS and NPS UD	Support the general intent of the Change 1 as a whole – on the grounds that it is consistent with the direction of the FDS and the overarching policy direction of the NPS-UD	Support the general intent of Plan Change 1, consistent with FDS and NPS UD
8	Mick Toll	Support	Support the change to the Regional Policy Statement.	Support the change to the Regional Policy Statement.	Support the change to the Regional Policy Statement.
9	Orange Family Trust and Orange Building Group	Support	Retain Proposed Change 1 as notified and without amendment.	"The Submitter supports TRPS C1 in its entirety and does not seek amendments to the provisions as notified. The submission is made to put on record the Submitter's support for the policy framework introduced by TRPS C1 and to confirm that the companion submission on PC81 is consistent with and gives effect to that framework	The submitter supports Proposed Change 1 to the Tasman Regional Policy Statement in its entirety.
11	Katie-Jane Willoughby	Oppose	Oppose the proposed high-density and medium-density residential development. Support growth that is appropriate to the character and capacity of our community. However, do not support planning provisions that encourage high-density and medium-density housing in areas that have traditionally been low-density villages with open space, established character, and a strong sense of community. Development should be managed in a way that respects the existing scale and character of the community. Any future growth should occur gradually, with infrastructure, transport, water, wastewater, stormwater, and community facilities planned and delivered before significant increases in housing density are enabled. I ask the Council to retain the village character by rejecting or significantly reducing	The proposed changes risk transforming our village into a town or urban centre, fundamentally changing its character and identity. Increased housing density would likely result in greater traffic congestion, increased pressure on infrastructure and public services, reduced privacy, loss of green space, and a decline in the village atmosphere that residents value. Mapua is also a historically significant settlement with a strong heritage identity that contributes to its unique sense of place. Its history, character buildings, and coastal village atmosphere are part of what makes it distinctive within the Tasman District. Expanding high-density development in and around Mapua risks undermining this heritage value and could negatively affect tourism, as visitors are drawn to its historic charm, relaxed village feel, and cultural identity. A loss of these qualities would reduce its appeal as a destination and weaken the local tourism economy that relies on Mapua's uniqueness. Development should	Oppose the proposed high-density and medium-density residential development. Support growth that is appropriate to the character and capacity of our community. However, do not support planning provisions that encourage high-density and medium-density housing in areas that have traditionally been low-density villages with open space, established character, and a strong sense of community. Refer to original Submission for more information

			the proposed high-density and medium-density residential zoning and provisions. Future planning should prioritise low-density development that is consistent with the existing built environment and protects the qualities that make our community an attractive place to live. Decision sought: • Decline the proposed high-density and medium-density residential provisions affecting our village. • Retain planning provisions that protect the existing village character and low-density environment. • Ensure any future growth is supported by adequate infrastructure and occurs at a scale that preserves the community's identity. • Give greater weight to maintaining amenity values, open space, heritage values, and the distinctive village character when considering future urban growth. Refer to original Submission for more information	be managed in a way that respects the existing scale and character of the community. Any future growth should occur gradually, with infrastructure, transport, water, wastewater, stormwater, and community facilities planned and delivered before significant increases in housing density are enabled. I ask the Council to retain the village character by rejecting or significantly reducing the proposed high-density and medium-density residential zoning and provisions. Future planning should prioritise low-density development that is consistent with the existing built environment and protects the qualities that make our community an attractive place to live. Decision sought: • Decline the proposed high-density and medium-density residential provisions affecting our village. • Retain planning provisions that protect the existing village character and low-density environment. • Ensure any future growth is supported by adequate infrastructure and occurs at a scale that preserves the community's identity. • Give greater weight to maintaining amenity values, open space, heritage values, and the distinctive village character when considering future urban growth. Refer to original Submission for more information	
13	Andrew and Susan Talley	Amend	Amend the housing and business land bottom lines in the plan change using robust and updated information about Tasman's urban environments, consistent with Objective 7 of the NPS-UD.	The submitter considers the section 32 report relies on outdated population, migration and housing demand information and does not adequately account for more recent population trends. The submitter is concerned this has resulted in growth projections and associated development capacity requirements that exceed those required under the NPS-UD.	Housing and business land bottom lines should be reviewed using updated population and growth information.
13	Andrew and Susan Talley	Amend	Amend the section 32 report to provide evidence and analysis demonstrating that the Future Development Strategy gives effect to current national policy direction.	The submitter considers the section 32 report assumes that the Future Development Strategy gives effect to national policy direction without adequately demonstrating this. The submitter notes the FDS was prepared before a number of current national policy instruments and amendments took effect and considers further evaluation is required.	The section 32 report should demonstrate that the Future Development Strategy gives effect to current national policy direction.
13	Andrew and Susan Talley	Amend	Amend the section 32 report so that it accurately reflects the direction in Policy 6 of the NPS-UD.	The submitter considers the section 32 report incorrectly characterises Policy 6 of the NPS-UD as an interpretation of amenity and does not accurately reflect the direction relating to planned built form and urban development. The submitter considers this interpretation has influenced the evaluation of proposed RPS provisions.	The section 32 report should accurately reflect Policy 6 of the NPS-UD.
13	Andrew and Susan Talley	Amend	Amend the section 32 report to include a comprehensive analysis of the extent to which Plan Change 1 and the operative RPS give effect to relevant National Policy Statements, including the NPS-FM, NPS-HPL, NPS-I and the NZCPS.	The submitter considers the evaluation of consistency with higher-order policy direction is cursory and does not adequately assess the extent to which the proposed provisions give effect to relevant National Policy Statements. The submitter is particularly concerned	The section 32 report should contain a more comprehensive assessment of consistency with National Policy Statements.

				about the treatment of freshwater, highly productive land, infrastructure and coastal environment matters.	
13	Andrew and Susan Talley	Amend	Amend Plan Change 1 provisions and Appendix G so that planning for growth is based on robust and up-to-date information regarding growth constraints and infrastructure delivery, provide stronger direction that not all areas are suitable for growth, amend General Objective 10 to require use of robust and frequently updated information, and update Appendix G to explain how Plan Change 1 implements Objective 7 of the NPS-UD.	The submitter considers Appendix G incorrectly records complete implementation of NPS-UD Objectives 6 and 7 and does not adequately explain how Plan Change 1 addresses infrastructure integration, growth constraints or the use of robust and frequently updated information. The submitter is particularly concerned that infrastructure constraints affecting areas such as Māpua are not adequately recognised.	Appendix G and related provisions should better demonstrate implementation of NPS-UD Objectives 6 and 7.
13	Andrew and Susan Talley	Amend	Amend the Plan Change 1 provisions to make them clearer and more certain. Ensure that there are clear linkages between objectives and policies, that objectives are drafted as desired outcomes, that policies explain how objectives are achieved, and that amendments to operative provisions retain the intended effect and meaning of the operative provisions.	The submitter considers the proposed provisions lack clarity, contain drafting deficiencies, create uncertainty regarding the relationship between objectives and policies, and in some cases alter the effect of operative provisions without adequate redrafting. The submitter considers this will make the RPS more difficult to interpret and apply.	Plan Change 1 provisions should be amended to improve clarity, certainty and consistency between objectives, policies and operative provisions.
13	Andrew and Susan Talley	Amend	Amend the provisions so that they use consistent terminology and provide clarity and certainty regarding where and how provisions are intended to apply.	The submitter considers inconsistent terminology is used throughout the proposed provisions, including differing references to towns, urban centres and Tasman's urban environment, creating uncertainty regarding the scope and application of the provisions.	Consistent terminology should be used throughout Plan Change 1.
13	Andrew and Susan Talley	Amend	Amend and restructure the provisions so that important topics such as intensification and quality urban form are addressed through a single objective supported by clearly linked implementing policies.	The submitter considers key planning topics are fragmented across multiple objectives and policies and that some policies read more like objectives, reducing transparency and making the overall policy framework difficult to apply.	Important urban planning topics should be addressed through a more coherent objective and policy framework.
13	Andrew and Susan Talley	Amend	Insert a new objective describing the strategic spatial strategy for accommodating urban development in Tasman over the medium and long term.	The submitter considers the proposed provisions rely on the Future Development Strategy without clearly expressing the strategic spatial strategy within the RPS itself. The submitter considers the spatial strategy should be set out in a standalone objective rather than relying on references to external documents.	The RPS should contain a clear strategic spatial strategy for accommodating urban growth.
13	Andrew and Susan Talley	Amend	Broaden the scope of Plan Change 1 to include amendments addressing natural hazard decision-making and climate change resilience in the context of urban growth, in line with the NPS-UD and NPS-NH.	The submitter considers the operative RPS does not adequately address climate resilience, coastal inundation, natural hazard risks or risk-based planning required by the NPS-UD and NPS-NH. The submitter considers these matters are particularly important given the growth constraints affecting Māpua and other settlements.	Plan Change 1 should more comprehensively address natural hazards and climate resilience.
13	Andrew and Susan Talley	Amend	Amend Plan Change 1 provisions to provide stronger and more directive policies that prioritise intensification over greenfield expansion and avoid unanticipated or out-of-sequence development except where such development can clearly demonstrate that it will achieve a well-functioning urban environment.	The submitter considers the proposed provisions provide inconsistent signals regarding intensification and greenfield growth and may undermine planned urban intensification by enabling out-of-sequence development.	The RPS should provide stronger direction favouring intensification over greenfield growth.
13	Andrew and Susan Talley	Amend	Amend Plan Change 1 provisions to strengthen direction on identifying and managing environmental and infrastructure constraints, including inserting a new	The submitter considers Plan Change 1 relies on growth assumptions and spatial planning work that did not adequately identify or assess infrastructure and natural	Plan Change 1 should contain stronger direction regarding environmental and infrastructure constraints on growth.

			objective in Section 5.3, or amending proposed objectives, to require such constraints to be identified and considered when making decisions regarding urban development in Tasman's urban environment.	hazard constraints, particularly in Māpua. The submitter seeks stronger policy direction requiring these constraints to be identified and considered in urban growth decision-making.	
13	Andrew and Susan Talley	Amend	Amend Plan Change 1 provisions to provide strong direction on the use of frequently updated and robust information to inform planning decisions.	The submitter considers Plan Change 1 relies on information, assumptions and growth projections that are becoming outdated and may not reflect current population trends, infrastructure constraints, natural hazard risks or other relevant matters.	Planning decisions should be based on robust and up-to-date information.
14	Ministry of Education	Amend	The Ministry has an interest in the acknowledgement for and provision of educational facilities, which are essential social and community infrastructure.	As the Tasman district continues to develop, there may be a need for additional schools in the future.	Responding to future additional need for schools
17	PT (Booster Investments) Nominees Limited	Support	Retain Plan Change 1 to the Tasman Regional Policy Statement as notified.	The submitter considers the existing Regional Policy Statement is outdated in parts and does not currently give effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development or adequately reflect the Future Development Strategy. The submitter supports the proposed changes because they provide an updated policy framework for future urban development and business growth and support sufficient and well-located business land capacity to meet future demand.	The submitter supports retaining Plan Change 1 to the Tasman Regional Policy Statement as notified. They believe the current statement is outdated and does not align with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development or the Future Development Strategy. The proposed changes provide an updated policy framework that supports urban growth and sufficient, well-located business land capacity for future demand.
22	G P Investments Ltd	Support	Support TRPS Plan Change	G P Investments Ltd supports the general intent of Plan Change 1 to the TRPS as a whole on the grounds that it is consistent with the direction of the Future Development Strategy and the National Policy Statement for Urban Development.	Submitter supports TRPS Plan Change 1. They agree with the overall intent. Support is based on alignment with the Future Development Strategy and the National Policy Statement for Urban Development.
23	Stephen Orrah	Support	Approve TRPS C1.	In relation to the subject land the outcomes of the proposed Regional Policy Statement change 1 (in conjunction with PC81), are expected to include provision of sufficient residential land capacity in Tasman's urban environment to meet expected demand in alignment with the FDS, thereby contributing to a well-functioning Nelson Tasman urban environment.	Submission Summary: The submitter supports the proposal and seeks approval of TRPS C1. They believe the change, alongside PC81, will provide enough residential land in Tasman's urban areas. This aligns with the Future Development Strategy (FDS) and helps create a well-functioning Nelson Tasman urban environment.
24	Wakatū Inc	Support		See original submission for further details.	Submitters generally support the proposal. They seek the decision outlined in their original submissions. For detailed reasons, refer to the full submissions provided.
25	Hermann Seifried	Support	Retain Proposed Change 1 to the Tasman Regional Policy Statement as notified.	The submitter considers the existing TRPS is outdated in parts and supports the proposed amendments that give effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban	The submitter supports retaining Proposed Change 1 to the Tasman Regional Policy Statement.

				Development, have regard to the Future Development Strategy 2022-2052 and provide for sufficient residential land capacity to meet future growth demands. The submitter supports the overall strategic direction of Change 1, including its role in supporting residential development and a well-functioning urban environment within Tasman.	They believe the current TRPS is partly outdated. They support amendments aligning with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Future Development Strategy 2022-2052. They agree the change provides enough residential land for future growth. They endorse the strategic focus on residential development and a well-functioning urban environment in Tasman.
26	Planscapes (NZ) Ltd	Amend			The submission requests a clear decision on the matter. They seek this to ensure transparency and proper planning outcomes. No additional details were provided to clarify specific concerns.
27	Tahimana Ltd	Oppose	Make any additional amendments necessary to ensure consistency between Change 1 and the operative TRMP, and to avoid unintended limitations on Rural 3 residential development.	A consistent policy framework is essential to avoid uncertainty for landowners and decision-makers and to ensure the TRPS does not undermine established TRMP provisions.	Submitters oppose the proposal. They seek amendments to align Change 1 with the operative TRMP. This aims to prevent unintended restrictions on Rural 3 residential development. A consistent policy framework is needed to reduce uncertainty for landowners and decision-makers. They want to ensure the TRPS does not conflict with existing TRMP provisions.
28	Richmond Pohara Holding Ltd Jackie McNae	Oppose	Additional amendments to reinstate or insert clear provisions providing for housing development in other settlements in Tasman District outside the Urban Environment towns, including the coastal settlement of Pōhara, in accordance with the stated issues that the TRPS says are addressed within the TRPS.	The submitter considers the TRPS should contain clear provisions addressing housing development in settlements outside the defined urban environments.	The submitter opposes the proposal. They seek amendments to include clear provisions for housing development in settlements outside Urban Environment towns. This includes the coastal settlement of Pōhara. They believe the TRPS should explicitly address housing development in these areas.
30	Nelson City Council	Support	Retain the proposed provisions but strengthen them to more clearly demonstrate how Policy 2 of the NPS-UD will be given effect to.	The Nelson and Tasman districts form a shared urban environment with interconnected housing, business, infrastructure, and transport needs. The proposed changes are generally consistent with the Nelson/Tasman Future Development Strategy and support the provision of sufficient development capacity to accommodate projected growth. However, additional	The submitter supports the proposal but seeks stronger provisions. They want clearer demonstration of how Policy 2 of the NPS-UD will be implemented.

				clarity is sought to ensure the proposals fully implement the requirements of Policy 2 of the NPS-UD.	Nelson and Tasman districts share interconnected urban needs. The proposal aligns with the Future Development Strategy and growth capacity goals. However, more clarity is needed to fully meet Policy 2 requirements.
35	Kairos Trust	Amend	Refer to original submission for full details. The submitter seeks that consequential amendments be made to the objectives, policies, methods, explanations and reasons of TRPS C1 as necessary to give effect to their submission.	Refer to original submission for full details. The submitter seeks that consequential amendments be made to the objectives, policies, methods, explanations and reasons of TRPS C1 as necessary to give effect to their submission.	The submitter requests amendments to the objectives, policies, methods, explanations, and reasons of TRPS C1. These changes are needed to properly reflect and implement their original submission. For full details, refer to the original submission.

1-TRPS Plan Change 1 SOA > 1.1-PART 1: INTRODUCTION AND INTERPRETATION

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons	Summary
12	Ruth and Bruno Zahner	Amend	Remove "Māpua" from the description of Tasman's Urban Environment.	The submitters do not support Māpua being identified as part of Tasman's Urban Environment	The submitters oppose the proposed inclusion of Māpua within the description of Tasman's Urban Environment.
28	Richmond Pohara Holding Ltd Jackie McNae	Oppose	A specific amendment to reinstate the reference to Golden Bay in Introduction 5.1	The submitter considers the proposed amendment reduces clarity regarding housing development and growth planning in Golden Bay.	The submitter opposes the proposal. They seek to reinstate the reference to Golden Bay in Introduction 5.1. They believe the amendment reduces clarity about housing development and growth planning in Golden Bay.

1-TRPS Plan Change 1 SOA > 1.1-PART 1: INTRODUCTION AND INTERPRETATION > 1.1.1-1. INTRODUCTION

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons	Summary
10	David Briggs	Amend	Amend Section 1.3 to include an explicit commitment to making mitigation of climate impacts a primary aim of the development strategy.	The submitter considers climate impacts are a significant environmental issue and that urban development planning should place greater emphasis on reducing greenhouse gas emissions.	The submitter considers climate impacts are insufficiently recognised in the scope of the TRPS and seeks stronger climate mitigation direction.
12	Ruth and Bruno Zahner	Oppose	Remove the wording: "while recognising that urban amenity values in areas planned for intensification develop and change over time."	The submitters oppose recognising urban amenity values in areas planned for intensification as changing over time.	The submitters oppose the proposed wording in Section 1.2(g) that recognises urban amenity values in areas planned for intensification developing and changing over time.

1-TRPS Plan Change 1 SOA > 1.1-PART 1: INTRODUCTION AND INTERPRETATION > 1.1.1-1. INTRODUCTION > 1.1.1.1-1.3 Scope of the Tasman Regional Policy Statement

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons	Summary
34	Partnership CKSV Mapua Limited	Support	Support and retain Policy 1.3(ia).	This provides for the sustainable growth and development in Māpua to meet expected demands.	The submitter supports the proposal and wants Policy 1.3(ia) retained. They believe this policy helps sustainable growth and development in Māpua. It is seen as important to meet expected future demands in the area.

1-TRPS Plan Change 1 SOA > 1.1-PART 1: INTRODUCTION AND INTERPRETATION > 1.1.1-1. INTRODUCTION > 1.1.1.1-1.3 Scope of the Tasman Regional Policy Statement > 1.1.1.1.1-Resource Management Responsibilities

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons	Summary
31	Dick Bennison	Support	Retain	Essential that there is sufficient undeveloped appropriately zoned land to meet the differing needs of the entire community for an enduring period of p to 30 years	Submitters support the proposal. They seek to retain the current zoning. They believe it is essential to have enough undeveloped, properly zoned land. This is to meet the diverse needs of the whole community for up to 30 years.

1-TRPS Plan Change 1 SOA > 1.1-PART 1: INTRODUCTION AND INTERPRETATION > 1.1.1-1. INTRODUCTION > 1.1.1.2-The Issues in the Tasman Regional Policy Statement

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons	Summary
10	David Briggs	Amend	Amend Issues 5.1 and 5.1a to recognise that development targets and growth projections may need to be reduced to avoid adverse environmental impacts and to better balance competing objectives.	The submitter supports protection of environmental values and considers population growth and development projections should not take precedence over environmental and social considerations.	The submitter seeks greater recognition that development and growth targets may need to be reduced where environmental impacts cannot be avoided and that development interests are not necessarily paramount.

34	Partnership CKSV Mapua Limited	Support	Support and retain issue (ii) as notified.	These amendments provide for the sustainable growth and development in Māpua to meet expected demands. This enables change in the urban environment that comes with the required intensification to meet expected housing demands, while also providing for a sustainable natural environment.	Submitter supports the proposal and retaining issue (ii) as notified. They believe the amendments allow sustainable growth and development in Māpua. This supports urban change and intensification to meet housing demands. It also ensures the protection of the natural environment.
----	--------------------------------	---------	--	--	---

1-TRPS Plan Change 1 SOA > 1.1-PART 1: INTRODUCTION AND INTERPRETATION > 1.1.2-2.0 INTERPRETATION OF TERMS

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons	Summary
3	Tasman Bay Estates Ltd	Amend	It is requested that the definition be amended to include a new urban centre on the TBEL land at Tasman (all or part of that land shaded blue in Figure 1 above), or to more generally acknowledge that new urban areas may be added. It is also requested that any subsequent references to 'Tasman's Urban Environment' that list out specific areas, be similarly amended.	Amendments to Change 1 to include provision for growth outside of the currently identified urban centres, including accommodating a new settlement at Tasman. The relief sought in respect of this is to enable inclusion of additional deferred urban land at Tasman in the PC81 provisions or, in the alternative; to better provide for this outcome being achieved by way of a private plan change; Refer to original submission for more information.	It is requested that the definition be amended to include a new urban centre on the Tasman Bay Estate Ltd land at Tasman (all or part of that land shaded blue in Figure 1 above), or to more generally acknowledge that new urban areas may be added. It is also requested that any subsequent references to 'Tasman's Urban Environment' that list out specific areas, be similarly amended.
13	Andrew and Susan Talley	Amend	Amend the definitions to provide more precise references to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development, including the version, date and relevant clause.	Helpful to provide definitions of these terms and how they are to be interpreted in Tasman. However, where definitions reference National Policy Statements, they should include the version being referenced and accurate references to the relevant clauses.	The submitters support the proposed definitions in part but seek more precise references to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development, including identification of the relevant version, date and clause references.
13	Andrew and Susan Talley	Oppose	The definition should include a map defining the urban boundaries of the various settlements. This is important to ensure growth is directed to key areas.	The definition is vague and unhelpful for implementation. Spatially defined urban environments should be mapped or clearly described to avoid ambiguity in interpreting and applying objectives and policies.	The submitters oppose the proposed definition of Tasman's Urban Environment and seek clearer spatial identification of the urban environment through mapped settlement boundaries.
14	Ministry of Education	Amend	The Ministry requests that amendments are made to the proposed provisions to define additional infrastructure as per the NPS-UD and enable 'additional infrastructure' to support future growth through the subsequent provisions. 2.0 Interpretations of Terms additional infrastructure means:	Both 'additional infrastructure' (as defined in the NPS-UD and NPS-I) itself and engagement with providers are not specifically mentioned in the provisions and therefore may not be adequately provided for. Given the inclusion of the 'additional infrastructure' definition within the NPS-UD, it is evident that there is a clear distinction between 'infrastructure' and 'additional infrastructure' and this warrants specific inclusion within the TRPS. Educational facilities are an essential component of social infrastructure that is required to support the needs and demand of growing communities.	The existing and proposed objectives and policies of the TRPS do not explicitly enable future additional infrastructure.

			(a) public open space (b) community infrastructure as defined in section 197 of the Local Government Act 2002 (c) land transport (as defined in the Land Transport Management Act 2003) that is not controlled by local authorities (d) social infrastructure, such as schools and healthcare facilities (e) a network operated for the purpose of telecommunications (as defined in section 5 of the Telecommunications Act 2001) (f) a network operated for the purpose of transmitting or distributing electricity or gas		
34	Partnership CKSV Mapua Limited	Support	Support and retain the interpretation of Well-Functioning Urban Environment as notified.	Recognises the NPS-UD and the key areas of development that require significant investment to meet the growth demand as noted in the Tasman 10-Year Plan 2024-2034. Provides clarity and reflects requirements under the NPS-UD. CKSV particularly supports sub-clause (a).	The submitter supports the proposal and wants to keep the current interpretation of a Well-Functioning Urban Environment. They believe it aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD) and addresses key development areas needing investment as outlined in the Tasman 10-Year Plan 2024-2034. They appreciate the clarity it provides and especially support sub-clause (a).

1-TRPS Plan Change 1 SOA > 1.2-PART 2: GENERAL OBJECTIVES

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons	Summary
14	Ministry of Education	Amend	The Ministry requests that amendments are made to the proposed provisions to define additional infrastructure as per the NPS-UD and enable 'additional infrastructure' to support future growth through the subsequent provisions. 2.0 Interpretations of Terms additional infrastructure means: (a) public open space (b) community infrastructure as defined in section 197 of the Local Government Act 2002	Both 'additional infrastructure' (as defined in the NPS-UD and NPS-I) itself and engagement with providers are not specifically mentioned in the provisions and therefore may not be adequately provided for. Given the inclusion of the 'additional infrastructure' definition within the NPS-UD, it is evident that there is a clear distinction between 'infrastructure' and 'additional infrastructure' and this warrants specific inclusion within the TRPS. Educational facilities are an essential component of social infrastructure that is required to support the needs and demand of growing communities.	The existing and proposed objectives and policies of the TRPS do not explicitly enable future additional infrastructure.

			(c) land transport (as defined in the Land Transport Management Act 2003) that is not controlled by local authorities (d) social infrastructure, such as schools and healthcare facilities (e) a network operated for the purpose of telecommunications (as defined in section 5 of the Telecommunications Act 2001) (f) a network operated for the purpose of transmitting or distributing electricity or gas		
28	Richmond Pohara Holding Ltd Jackie McNae	Oppose	Amend Change 1 to provide greater clarity for urban settlements outside the defined urban environments of Richmond, Brightwater, Wakefield, Māpua and Motueka.	The submitter considers Change 1 creates uncertainty regarding how housing development and growth in other settlements, including Pōhara, will be provided for.	The submitter opposes Change 1. They seek amendments to clarify provisions for urban settlements outside defined areas like Richmond and Motueka. The reason is that Change 1 creates uncertainty about housing development and growth in other settlements, such as Pōhara.

1-TRPS Plan Change 1 SOA > 1.2-PART 2: GENERAL OBJECTIVES > 1.2.1-3.0 GENERAL OBJECTIVES FOR RESOURCE MANAGEMENT IN TASMAN DISTRICT

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons	Summary
13	Andrew and Susan Talley	Amend	Amend the objective to make it clear whether it relates to the 'urban environment' as generally defined in the proposed changes to the definitions, or Tasman's Urban Environment, or at a broader level, to all communities within the district.	Support the strategic intent of the objective. However, as currently drafted, its scope is uncertain. It is unclear whether it is intended to apply more broadly or only to those settlements included within the definition of Tasman's Urban Environment.	The submitters support the intent of General Objective 2A but consider it unclear whether the objective applies to Tasman's Urban Environment, the urban environment generally, or all communities within the district.
13	Andrew and Susan Talley	Amend	Amend the objective so that it explicitly references the need for Tasman's urban environments to be resilient to the current and future effects of climate change. Insert an amendment to operative Objective 5.2 to address the requirement for urban development to only be accommodated where it can be demonstrated that the urban environment will be resilient to the current and future effects of climate change, will not create or increase climate change impacts on people,	PC1 does not give full effect to Objective 8 of the NPS-UD with respect to ensuring that Tasman's urban environment is resilient to the current and future effects of climate change. The proposed amendment to General Objective 2A does not address this requirement, and no amendments are proposed to operative Objective 5.2. Disagree with the conclusion in Appendix G that there is direct and complete implementation of this objective.	The submitters seek amendments to General Objective 2A and Objective 5.2 to explicitly address resilience to the current and future effects of climate change and the health and safety of communities.

			property or the environment, and where it will provide for the health and safety of current and future communities.		
13	Andrew and Susan Talley	Amend	Insert an amendment to operative General Objective 10 to require the Council to have robust and frequently updated information about Tasman's urban environment, including risks and constraints associated with natural hazards and the impact of climate change, and to use the best available information to inform planning decisions, particularly when planning for urban development.	PC1 does not give effect to Objective 7 of the NPS-UD regarding the use of robust and frequently updated information to inform planning decisions, or to Policy 5 of the NPS-NH regarding the use of the best available information. No amendment is proposed to Operative Objective 10, despite it relating to adequate knowledge of resource and environmental systems and processes to inform sustainable management decision-making.	The submitters seek stronger direction requiring Council to use robust, frequently updated and best available information, including information relating to natural hazards and climate change, when making urban development decisions.
14	Ministry of Education	Amend	Wording to read: Tasman's urban centres grow and develop in accordance with a planned built urban form that is well functioning, supported by efficient and effective infrastructure services, <u>additional infrastructure</u> and a well-connected transport network, while remaining responsive to unanticipated or out of sequence plan change proposals, where those proposals would supply significant development capacity.	Infrastructure is not defined in the TRPS nor is it defined in the NPS-UD, however it is defined in the RMA and does not include the types of infrastructure defined as 'additional infrastructure' in both the NPS-UD or NPS-I. The Ministry consider clear distinction is needed in this regard to avoid interpretation and subsequent implementation error.	Addition of 'additional infrastructure' in objective 5.1C
27	Tahimana Ltd	Oppose	Amend General Objective 2A to clarify that providing urban development capacity does not exclude residential development already anticipated in Rural 3 and Rural Residential zones.	The operative TRMP deliberately provides for residential development in Rural 3. Objective 2A should not unintentionally undermine or narrow existing planned development opportunities.	Submitters oppose the proposal. They seek to amend General Objective 2A. The amendment should clarify that urban development capacity excludes residential development already planned in Rural 3 and Rural Residential zones. They argue the current TRMP allows residential development in Rural 3. Objective 2A should not reduce existing development opportunities.
31	Dick Bennison	Support	Retain	It is imperative that the Tasman provides a planning environment that meets the ongoing requirements of the entire community, the emphasis being " <i>that enables all people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing and for their health and safety now and into the future</i> ".	Submitters support the proposal and seek its retention . They emphasize the need for Tasman's planning to serve the entire community. The focus is on enabling <i>all people and communities</i> to provide for their social, economic, cultural wellbeing, and health and safety now and in the future.
34	Partnership CKSV Mapua Limited	Support	Support and retain General Objective 2A and corresponding reasons as notified.	Reflects the need for additional intensification of in Tasman's Urban Environment while making necessary provision to support growth that is well functioning for the current and future community.	The submitter supports the proposal and wants to keep General Objective 2A as notified. They believe it addresses the need for more intensification in Tasman's Urban Environment.

					They emphasize the importance of supporting growth that works well for both current and future communities.
--	--	--	--	--	---

1-TRPS Plan Change 1 SOA > 1.3-PART 3: SIGNIFICANT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ISSUES IN TASMAN DISTRICT

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons	Summary
16	Chip Felton and Michelle Lang	Amend	Amend TRPS Change 1 to require a precautionary approach to urban zoning in the coastal environment, including that new urban zoning not be conferred on land identified as subject to inundation at mean high water springs or the 1% AEP storm tide level over the 100-year planning horizon, and that assessments apply the most recent Ministry for the Environment coastal hazards guidance.	The submitters consider the urban development provisions do not adequately address precaution in the coastal environment and are concerned about enabling urban development on land subject to current or future coastal inundation risk.	Seek stronger regional direction requiring a precautionary approach to urban zoning and intensification in coastal environments exposed to current or future inundation risks.

1-TRPS Plan Change 1 SOA > 1.3-PART 3: SIGNIFICANT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ISSUES IN TASMAN DISTRICT > 1.3.1-5.0 Urban Development

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons	Summary
3	Tasman Bay Estates Ltd	Amend	It is requested that the provisions in section 5 (issues 5.1, 5.1A-C) be amended to: 1. Acknowledge that private plan changes can be a mechanism for meeting growth needs whilst also achieving a well-functioning urban environment. 2. Changes to Issue 5.1A to recognise that not all growth areas currently included in PC81 are growth areas identified in the FDS, and to provide for a further growth area on the TBEL land at Tasman.	Amendments to Change 1 to include provision for growth outside of the currently identified urban centres, including accommodating a new settlement at Tasman. The relief sought in respect of this is to enable inclusion of additional deferred urban land at Tasman in the PC81 provisions or, in the alternative; to better provide for this outcome being achieved by way of a private plan change. Refer to original submission for further information.	It is requested that the provisions in section 5 (issues 5.1, 5.1A-C) be amended to: 1. Acknowledge that private plan changes can be a mechanism for meeting growth needs whilst also achieving a well-functioning urban environment. 2. Changes to Issue 5.1A to recognise that not all growth areas currently included in PC81 are growth areas identified in the FDS, and to provide for a further growth area on the TBEL land at Tasman.
5	Fulton Hogan	Amend	Add an additional matter for consideration to Policy 5.1A: <i>Takes into account the aggregate requirements of infrastructure and urban development, and recognises the critical role of aggregates for the sustainable management of communities.</i>	Fulton Hogan request recognition of the important role of a suitable supply of aggregates to facilitate urban development. Planning decisions need to consider the location and availability of aggregates to support development, and limit development and infrastructure costs. Refer to original submission for more information.	Add an additional matter for consideration to Policy 5.1A: <i>Takes into account the aggregate requirements of infrastructure and urban development, and recognises the critical role of aggregates for the sustainable management of communities.</i>
16	Chip Felton and Michelle Lang	Amend	Amend TRPS Change 1 to require that a local adaptive planning strategy be in place before urban intensification or upzoning is enabled in coastal settlements identified as vulnerable to sea-level rise.	The submitters consider adaptive planning should occur before further urban intensification is enabled in coastal settlements that may be exposed to long-term sea-level rise and coastal hazard risks.	Seek amendments requiring adaptive planning to occur before urban intensification or upzoning is enabled in vulnerable coastal settlements.

20	Adrienne Matthews	Oppose	Add mandatory gateways for infrastructure capacity, hazard avoidance, and productive-land protection before greenfield zoning proceeds.	Greenfield expansion increases long-term costs, hazard exposure, and irreversible loss of productive land.	Submitters oppose the proposal. They seek mandatory gateways for infrastructure capacity, hazard avoidance, and productive land protection before allowing greenfield zoning. Their concern is that greenfield expansion leads to higher long-term costs, increased hazard exposure, and irreversible loss of productive land.
20	Adrienne Matthews	Amend	Require settlement-specific infrastructure schedules proving funded, deliverable capacity before zoning becomes operative. Require transparent water-balance evidence for each settlement.	Growth must align with real servicing capacity, not assumptions. Source security cannot substitute for actual delivery capacity.	Summary of Submission The submitter requests that settlement-specific infrastructure schedules be provided, showing funded and deliverable capacity before zoning is approved. They also seek transparent water-balance evidence for each settlement. The reason is to ensure growth matches actual servicing capacity rather than assumptions. They emphasize source security is not a replacement for confirmed delivery capacity.
20	Adrienne Matthews	Amend	Require cumulative productive-land accounting and avoid rezoning where alternatives exist.	Productive land is irreplaceable and essential for food production.	Submitters want cumulative accounting of productive land. They seek to avoid rezoning if alternatives are available. Their reason: productive land is irreplaceable and vital for food production.
20	Adrienne Matthews	Amend	Require hazard-avoidance tests before zoning; complete Motueka adaptation planning; investigate elevated clay land for future growth.	Foreseeable hazard exposure creates long-term public liabilities.	Summary of Submission: The submitter requests hazard-avoidance tests before zoning decisions. They ask for completion of Motueka adaptation planning. They suggest investigating elevated clay land as a potential growth area. The reason is to reduce long-term public liability from foreseeable hazards.
20	Adrienne Matthews	Support	Require comparative hazard, access, insurability, and productive-land assessments before papakāinga zoning.	Papakāinga must provide long-term security, not inherited risk.	Submitters support the proposal but seek further assessments before zoning. They request comparative studies on hazard, access, insurability, and productive land.

					The reason is to ensure papakāinga offers long-term security. They want to avoid passing on inherited risks to future generations.
27	Tahimana Ltd	Oppose	Amend Issue 5.1 to acknowledge that residential development is also anticipated in Rural 3 and Rural Residential zones.	Rural 3 is a long-standing planned residential zone. Issue 5.1 should reflect the full range of anticipated residential areas.	Submission Summary: The submitter opposes the proposal. They seek to amend Issue 5.1 to include residential development in Rural 3 and Rural Residential zones. They argue Rural 3 has long been planned for residential use. Issue 5.1 should reflect all anticipated residential areas accordingly.
27	Tahimana Ltd	Oppose	Amend Issues 5.1A, 5.1B and 5.1C to explicitly recognise Rural 3 and Rural Residential zones as anticipated residential areas.	Without explicit recognition, these zones risk being overlooked in regional policy interpretation, despite being clearly enabled under the TRMP.	The submitter opposes the current proposal. They seek amendments to Issues 5.1A, 5.1B, and 5.1C. The change would explicitly recognize Rural 3 and Rural Residential zones as anticipated residential areas. They argue that without this, these zones might be overlooked in regional policy. This is despite their current enablement under the TRMP.
27	Tahimana Ltd	Oppose	Amend Issue 5.7 to acknowledge that growth also occurs in planned rural residential zones.	Rural 3 development is planned and anticipated; Issue 5.7 should not imply it is unplanned or inappropriate.	Submitters oppose the proposal. They seek to amend Issue 5.7 to recognize growth in planned rural residential zones. They argue Rural 3 development is planned and expected. Issue 5.7 should not suggest this growth is unplanned or inappropriate.
27	Tahimana Ltd	Oppose	Amend Objectives 5.1A, 5.1B and 5.1C, or insert a new objective, recognising the benefits of rural residential living opportunities in zones specifically identified for that purpose.	Rural residential development contributes to housing choice and is part of the district's planned supply. The objectives should reflect this.	Submitters oppose the current proposal. They seek amendments to Objectives 5.1A, 5.1B, and 5.1C, or a new objective. The request is to recognize benefits of rural residential living in designated zones.

					They argue rural residential development adds housing choice and supports planned district supply.
27	Tahimana Ltd	Oppose	Amend Policy 5.1B to clarify that: “already zoned land” includes Rural 3 and Rural Residential land; and - development in these zones is not unanticipated or out-of-sequence.	Residential development in Rural 3 is planned and enabled under the TRMP. Policy 5.1B should not inadvertently reclassify it as unplanned growth.	Submitters oppose the proposal. They seek to amend Policy 5.1B to clarify that “already zoned land” includes Rural 3 and Rural Residential zones. They want to confirm development in these zones is not unanticipated or out-of-sequence. This is because residential development in Rural 3 is planned and enabled under the TRMP. They argue Policy 5.1B should not wrongly label it as unplanned growth.
27	Tahimana Ltd	Oppose	Amend Section 5.4 to recognise that residential development capacity is also provided through Rural Residential and Rural 3 zones.	These zones form part of the district’s planned housing supply. Section 5.4 should reflect the full range of anticipated residential development areas.	The submitter opposes the proposal. They seek to amend Section 5.4 to include Rural Residential and Rural 3 zones as sources of residential development capacity. They argue these zones contribute to the district’s planned housing supply. Section 5.4 should reflect all anticipated residential development areas.

1-TRPS Plan Change 1 SOA > 1.3-PART 3: SIGNIFICANT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ISSUES IN TASMAN DISTRICT > 1.3.1-5.0 Urban Development > 1.3.1.1-5.1 Introduction

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons	Summary
14	Ministry of Education	Amend	include the following point (xiii) at the end of policy 5.1B to read: Early engagement with the Ministry of Education demonstrates, through documented shared outcomes, that the provision of additional infrastructure such as educational facilities has been appropriately considered and supports integrated land use and infrastructure planning.	The Ministry supports provisions being updated to give effect to the NPS-UD, however, seeks explicit direction for developers to engage with the Ministry to achieve integrated land use and infrastructure planning across the district. The requirement for early engagement with the Ministry of Education would assist with informing the planning of current and future education infrastructure needs and would support integrated land use and infrastructure planning.	Addition of new paragraph in policy 5.1B

31	Dick Bennison	Support	Retain	Important to provided process to meet the needs of the entire community.	The submitter supports the proposal. They seek to retain the current decision. They believe it is important to have a process that meets the needs of the entire community.
34	Partnership CKSV Mapua Limited	Support	Support and retain Policy 5.1 as notified.	CKSV supports the drafting of 5.1 in that the changes reflect the current Tasman Urban Environment and the need to provide for the anticipated and unanticipated growth in a way that is well-functioning, including providing a variety of types of homes.	The submitter supports Policy 5.1 as notified. They agree the policy reflects the current Tasman Urban Environment. They emphasize the need to accommodate both expected and unexpected growth. The focus is on ensuring well-functioning development with diverse housing types.

1-TRPS Plan Change 1 SOA > 1.3-PART 3: SIGNIFICANT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ISSUES IN TASMAN DISTRICT > 1.3.1-5.0 Urban Development > 1.3.1.2-5.2 Urban Development Issues

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons	Summary
10	David Briggs	Amend	Amend Issue 5.1b and Objectives 5.1C, 5.4 and 5.5 to provide for stronger Council direction, oversight and enforcement of development design and implementation.	The submitter considers stronger Council involvement is necessary to achieve good urban design, transport integration, environmental outcomes and well-planned development.	The submitter seeks a stronger Council role in the planning, design and implementation of urban development.

1-TRPS Plan Change 1 SOA > 1.3-PART 3: SIGNIFICANT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ISSUES IN TASMAN DISTRICT > 1.3.1-5.0 Urban Development > 1.3.1.2-5.2 Urban Development Issues > 1.3.1.2.1-Issue 5.1

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons	Summary
13	Andrew and Susan Talley	Oppose	Remove the text relating to urban design and amenity. Amend the issue statement so that it is consistent with the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (as amended December 2025).	The proposed issue statement addresses matters other than highly productive land. It is unclear why the issue statement addresses urban design and amenity values when the focus of the issue is highly productive land. The issue statement should use terminology that is	The submitters oppose amendments to Issue 5.1 that introduce urban design and amenity matters and seek a stronger focus on highly productive land consistent with the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.

				consistent with the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land and give effect to that direction.	
31	Dick Bennison	Support	Retain but with addition to enable additional urban development on undulating land adjacent to existing settlements.	Imperative that urban development doesn't encroach onto land that is highly suitable for intensive horticultural development particularly flat irrigable land. Urban expansion should however be encouraged on areas adjacent to existing urban development where contour or lack of irrigation resources precludes modern intensive horticultural practices.	Summary of submission: The submitter supports the proposal but seeks an addition to allow more urban development on undulating land near existing settlements. They emphasize protecting flat, irrigable land for intensive horticulture. Urban growth should focus on areas unsuitable for horticulture due to terrain or irrigation limits.
34	Partnership CKSV Mapua Limited	Support	Support and retain Issue 5.1 as notified	Whilst meeting expected growth demands and a changing urban environment, this change also recognises the continued importance of providing for a sustainable natural environment to ensure the efficient use of land.	Submission Summary: The submitter supports the proposal and wants Issue 5.1 retained as notified. They emphasize balancing growth demands with protecting a sustainable natural environment. The goal is to ensure efficient land use while adapting to urban changes.

1-TRPS Plan Change 1 SOA > 1.3-PART 3: SIGNIFICANT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ISSUES IN TASMAN DISTRICT > 1.3.1-5.0 Urban Development > 1.3.1.2-5.2 Urban Development Issues > 1.3.1.2.2-Issue 5.1A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons	Summary
13	Andrew and Susan Talley	Amend	Insert additional text identifying the key infrastructure constraints to accommodating the spatial growth strategy. Include a date reference so that it is clear which Future Development Strategy is being referred to.	The proposed issue statement focuses predominantly on providing for population growth. While it is helpful to provide a statement of the proposed spatial strategy for accommodating growth, the issue statement should also provide a high-level description of the key infrastructure constraints, given the title of the issue statement.	The submitters support inclusion of a statement about the spatial growth strategy but consider the issue should also identify key infrastructure constraints and clearly reference the relevant Future Development Strategy.
31	Dick Bennison	Support	Retain	Differing growth strategies support diverse outcomes that are more likely to meet the differing requirements of the community, while acknowledging the need to satisfy differing objectives.	Submitters support the proposal and seek its retention. They believe diverse growth strategies better address the unique needs of the community. Such approaches acknowledge the importance of meeting various objectives.
34	Partnership CKSV Mapua Limited	Support	Support and retain Issue 5.1A as notified. New Issue 5.1A reflects Tasman's statutory obligation to provide sufficient housing and business land capacity and	New Issue 5.1A reflects Tasman's statutory obligation to provide sufficient housing and business land capacity and implements the foundational work of the Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy.	The submitter supports the proposal and wants to retain Issue 5.1A as notified.

			implements the foundational work of the Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy.		They agree because Issue 5.1A reflects Tasman's legal duty to provide enough housing and business land. It also implements the foundational work of the Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy.
--	--	--	--	--	--

1-TRPS Plan Change 1 SOA > 1.3-PART 3: SIGNIFICANT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ISSUES IN TASMAN DISTRICT > 1.3.1-5.0 Urban Development > 1.3.1.2-5.2 Urban Development Issues > 1.3.1.2.3-Issue 5.1B

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons	Summary
31	Dick Bennison	Support	Retain	Supports diversity	The submitter supports the proposal. They seek to retain the current plan. Their reason is to support diversity.
34	Partnership CKSV Mapua Limited	Support	Support and retain Issue 5.1B as notified	New Issue 5.1B recognise that expected growth provides a diverse community and the Tasman District is in need of a variety in housing and housing affordability to enable a well-functioning environment for current and future generations.	The submitter supports the proposal and wants to keep Issue 5.1B as is. They believe growth brings diversity and the Tasman District needs a variety of housing options. Affordable housing is important for a well-functioning environment now and in the future.

1-TRPS Plan Change 1 SOA > 1.3-PART 3: SIGNIFICANT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ISSUES IN TASMAN DISTRICT > 1.3.1-5.0 Urban Development > 1.3.1.2-5.2 Urban Development Issues > 1.3.1.2.4-Issue 5.1C

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons	Summary
13	Andrew and Susan Talley	Oppose	Amend the issue statement to make it clear that the proposed spatial strategy provides for anticipated growth. Amend the issue statement so that unanticipated or out-of-sequence proposals will not be considered favourably unless it can be demonstrated that they will contribute to well-functioning urban environments. Identify the risks associated with such development, given the environmental and infrastructure constraints that apply in the district.	Acknowledge the policy direction in the NPS-UD regarding unanticipated or out-of-sequence development, The issue statement should clearly signal that sufficient development capacity is already provided for within the planned spatial strategy. Issue 5.1C fails to address the risks of unanticipated or out-of-sequence development, particularly in Māpua where effective growth management relies on planned sequencing and an integrated response to environmental and infrastructure constraints.	The submitters oppose the current framing of Issue 5.1C and seek stronger recognition that planned growth capacity already exists and that unanticipated and out-of-sequence development may create risks where infrastructure and environmental constraints apply.

31	Dick Bennison	Support	Retain	Important that any future plan is flexible enough to enable it to react to changing market conditions.	Submitters support the proposal and seek to retain it. They emphasize the need for the future plan to be flexible. This flexibility will help the plan adapt to changing market conditions.
34	Partnership CKSV Mapua Limited	Support	Support and retain Issue 5.1C as notified	Drafting of Issue 5.1C recognises the challenges of out-of-sequence development and the growth pressures it has caused for the Tasman District, while also recognising the NPS-UD requires councils to be responsive to unanticipated or out of sequence urban development.	Submitters support retaining Issue 5.1C as notified. They agree it addresses challenges of out-of-sequence development and growth pressures in Tasman District. They note the issue aligns with the NPS-UD requirement for councils to respond to unexpected urban development.

1-TRPS Plan Change 1 SOA > 1.3-PART 3: SIGNIFICANT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ISSUES IN TASMAN DISTRICT > 1.3.1-5.0 Urban Development > 1.3.1.2-5.2 Urban Development Issues > 1.3.1.2.5-Issue 5.2

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons	Summary
13	Andrew and Susan Talley	Oppose	Insert amendments to reference the need to identify areas at risk from coastal inundation, active faults, liquefaction and tsunamis. Amend the text so that it refers to risk-based assessment and proportionate management of natural hazard risk using the best available information, consistent with the direction in the NPS-NH.	No amendments are proposed to the operative text addressing natural hazard constraints to urban development. The issue should be amended to give effect to the Minister's Directions regarding updating the RPS to give effect to the NPS-UD and NPS-NH.	The submitters seek amendments to Issue 5.2 to better address natural hazard risks, including coastal inundation, active faults, liquefaction and tsunami hazards, and to introduce a risk-based approach to hazard management.

1-TRPS Plan Change 1 SOA > 1.3-PART 3: SIGNIFICANT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ISSUES IN TASMAN DISTRICT > 1.3.1-5.0 Urban Development > 1.3.1.2-5.2 Urban Development Issues > 1.3.1.2.6-Issue 5.7

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons	Summary
10	David Briggs	Amend	Amend Issue 5.7 to make clear that infrastructure funding, maintenance costs and service provision are secured before development proceeds and that service quality is maintained during development.	The submitter considers development should not proceed unless supporting infrastructure and services are available and adequately funded.	The submitter seeks assurance that infrastructure and services are funded and available before development occurs.

1-TRPS Plan Change 1 SOA > 1.3-PART 3: SIGNIFICANT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ISSUES IN TASMAN DISTRICT > 1.3.1-5.0 Urban Development > 1.3.1.3-5.3 Urban Development Objectives

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons	Summary
3	Tasman Bay Estates Ltd	Amend	It is requested that the provisions in this section be amended to: 1. Include Tasman with Māpua/ Ruby Bay in the tables detailing growth targets at Objective 5.1A. This will enable any shortfall in the delivery of dwellings through brownfield development (relevant to the Richmond and Motueka figures) to be achieved elsewhere to achieve the overall growth targets. 2. Change the reasons at Objective 5.1C to acknowledge that greenfield growth may need to occur outside of FDS areas if brownfield development uptake is not sufficient to meet growth targets, and that additional greenfield land on the TBEL land at Tasman is available to address this whilst also meeting TRPS objectives regarding avoidance of natural hazards and loss of HPL.	Amendments to Change 1 to include provision for growth outside of the currently identified urban centres, including accommodating a new settlement at Tasman. The relief sought in respect of this is to enable inclusion of additional deferred urban land at Tasman in the PC81 provisions or, in the alternative; to better provide for this outcome being achieved by way of a private plan change. Refer to original submission for more information.	It is requested that the provisions in this section be amended to: 1. Include Tasman with Māpua/ Ruby Bay in the tables detailing growth targets at Objective 5.1A. 2. Change the reasons at Objective 5.1C to acknowledge that greenfield growth may need to occur outside of FDS areas if brownfield development uptake is not sufficient to meet growth targets, and that additional greenfield land on the Tasman Bay Estate Ltd land at Tasman is available to address this whilst also meeting TRPS objectives regarding avoidance of natural hazards and loss of HPL.
3	Tasman Bay Estates Ltd	Amend	It is requested that the provisions in this section be amended to state that the scale and location of new urban development shall be consistent with already zoned land or the Future Development Strategy or adopted masterplans or structure plans, unless implementation of these has not resulted in the delivery of the housing growth targets identified in the TRPS, in which case additional urban areas may be considered. It is expected that the intent of this provision was that 'unanticipated' development, was intended to include urban development not included in the Future Development Strategy or currently adopted masterplans or structure plans.	This provision puts in place a framework against which an urban development proposal that is not anticipated by the FDS or a masterplan (or is out of sequence with these) would be assessed. This is appropriate. Should uptake of growth capacity in existing urban centres be demonstrably ineffective in providing for the stated growth targets, growth will need to be accommodated elsewhere. It is appropriate that such proposals for urban growth be assessed against a framework such as this, and Tasman Bay Estate Ltd consider that new urban growth at Tasman would perform favourably against these, as a whole. Refer to original submission for more information.	It is requested that the provisions in this section be amended to state that the scale and location of new urban development shall be consistent with already zoned land or the Future Development Strategy or adopted masterplans or structure plans, unless implementation of these has not resulted in the delivery of the housing growth targets identified in the TRPS, in which case additional urban areas may be considered.
16	Chip Felton and Michelle Lang	Amend	Amend TRPS Change 1 to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity in the context of urban development and require that plan changes enabling urban growth assess effects on indigenous biodiversity and receiving estuarine environments, including Waimea Inlet, at a catchment scale.	The submitters consider indigenous biodiversity is largely absent from the urban development framework and note that the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity is not referenced despite being in force. They consider urban growth should assess effects on indigenous biodiversity and estuarine environments before development opportunities are foreclosed.	Seek amendments to ensure the urban development framework gives effect to the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and addresses biodiversity effects associated with urban growth.
16	Chip Felton and Michelle Lang	Amend	Amend TRPS Change 1 to require that urban growth delivers net gain in indigenous biodiversity, including through indigenous revegetation of riparian margins, reserves and open space within urban growth areas, and retention of existing indigenous and mature vegetation.	The submitters consider urbanisation of undeveloped land is effectively irreversible and that opportunities for ecological restoration should be captured before development occurs. They consider urban growth should provide positive biodiversity outcomes rather than merely avoiding additional adverse effects.	Seek amendments requiring urban growth areas to contribute positively to indigenous biodiversity outcomes.
35	Kairos Trust	Amend	Refer to original submission for full details. INSERT an objective and supporting policy requiring that, where urban development is enabled on or adjoining land on which lawfully established activities operate, reverse sensitivity effects are recognised and managed through the design,	Refer to original submission for full details. INSERT an objective and supporting policy requiring that, where urban development is enabled on or adjoining land on which lawfully established activities operate, reverse sensitivity effects are recognised and managed through the design,	The submitter seeks to add an objective and policy addressing reverse sensitivity.

			location and control of the new sensitive activity, rather than through additional constraint on the established activity.	location and control of the new sensitive activity, rather than through additional constraint on the established activity.	They want urban development near lawful activities to manage effects through design and location of new sensitive activities. They oppose imposing extra restrictions on existing established activities. The aim is to balance enabling development while protecting established uses from reverse sensitivity impacts.
--	--	--	--	--	---

1-TRPS Plan Change 1 SOA > 1.3-PART 3: SIGNIFICANT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ISSUES IN TASMAN DISTRICT > 1.3.1-5.0 Urban Development > 1.3.1.3-5.3 Urban Development Objectives > 1.3.1.3.2-Objective 5.1A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons	Summary
9	Orange Family Trust and Orange Building Group	Support	Retain Objective 5.1A as notified.	The submitter considers the objective gives effect to the NPS-UD by establishing housing bottom lines and supports providing sufficient development capacity for Richmond.	The submitter supports Objective 5.1A.
10	David Briggs	Amend	Amend Objective 5.1A to recognise the need for development to contribute to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.	The submitter considers climate impacts should be a central consideration in urban development and that development should reduce rather than increase greenhouse gas emissions.	The submitter seeks greater recognition of greenhouse gas reduction within the objective.
13	Andrew and Susan Talley	Amend	Review and amend the proposed housing bottom lines, particularly for Māpua/Ruby Bay, based on an updated demand assessment using the 2023 Census, recent consents, titles and development uptake. Update the reasons text to reference the source of the housing bottom lines. Insert a new objective in Section 5.3, or amend Objective 5.1A, to require constraints to growth to be identified and considered when making decisions on urban development in Tasman's urban environment.	Concerned that the housing bottom lines, particularly for Māpua/Ruby Bay, are based on out-of-date population projections and that the Council did not rely on the most recent available data when considering population, migration trends and housing demand. Concerned that growth constraints, including natural hazards and infrastructure constraints, have not been adequately recognised or reflected in the Future Development Strategy, the Māpua Masterplan and Plan Change 1.	The submitters oppose the proposed housing bottom lines, particularly for Māpua/Ruby Bay, and seek updated demand assessments together with stronger recognition of infrastructure and natural hazard constraints affecting future growth.
16	Chip Felton and Michelle Lang	Amend	Amend Policy 5.1A, or insert a new policy, to require that plan-enabled development capacity be aligned with infrastructure capacity that is confirmed, funded and programmed, and that district plans include sequencing mechanisms or infrastructure triggers where infrastructure capacity is not available.	The submitters consider development capacity should be closely aligned with infrastructure servicing capacity to ensure growth occurs in a coordinated and efficient manner.	Seek amendments to ensure planned development capacity is aligned with available infrastructure capacity and that appropriate growth sequencing mechanisms are used where infrastructure is not yet available.
18	Vicmatt Properties Ltd	Support	Retain Objective 5.1A as drafted	The submitter considers the objective is consistent with the Future Development Strategy and the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and supports sufficient business land capacity to meet future demand.	The submitter supports retaining Objective 5.1A as currently drafted.

					They believe it aligns with the Future Development Strategy and the National Policy Statement on Urban Development. They highlight that the objective ensures sufficient business land capacity to meet future demand.
31	Dick Bennison	Support	Retain with emphasis in minimum sufficient development capacities.	There needs to be provision for growth across all the urban areas of the district. On the basis of previous population growth these estimates seem very conservative and are likely to be exceeded.	Submission Summary: The submitter supports the proposal but requests retention with a focus on minimum sufficient development capacity. They emphasize the need for growth provision across all urban areas. They believe current growth estimates are conservative and likely to be exceeded based on past population trends.
32	Te Runanga o Ngati Rarua	Amend	Support in part. Retain Objective as notified, amend to include cultural values for the reasons for this objective. Refer to original submission for full details.	Refer to original submission for full details. There is an ongoing unmet need for housing Maori within the Tasman District, including housing provided through papakainga development. Currently, the operative provisions of the TRPS are silent with respect to papakainga development, The proposed papakainga provisions in the TRPS C1 establish a clear policy framework that enables tanagata whenua to exercise ranagatiratanga over their ancestral land. They support development that strengthens cultural connections while promoting social, cultural, environmental, and economic wellbeing. In accordance with section 62(2A)(a) of the RMA, Council must take into account recognised iwi planning documents when preparing or changing a regional policy statement. The proposed papakainga provisions give effect to a number of outcomes sought through Poipoia Te Ao Turoa and are therefore supported. The papakainga provisions also recognise and provide for part 2 RMA matters, in particular the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wahi tapu, and other taonga (section 6(e)); the exercise of kaitiakitanga (section 7(a)); and the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (section 8). The introduction of the National Environmental Standards for Papakainga development (NES-P) provides a nationally consistent regulatory framework to facilitate papakainga development. However, as the NES-P does not contain objectives or policies, there remains a need for a complementary local policy framework within the TRPS. The proposed objectives fill this gap by articulating the desired outcomes for papakainga development in Tasman, ensuring that local values, aspirations, and environmental context are reflected in decision making.	Submitters support amending the objective to include cultural values, addressing unmet housing needs for Māori, especially papakainga development. They note current TRPS provisions lack papakainga policy, and the proposal enables tangata whenua to exercise rangatiratanga over ancestral land. The provisions align with iwi planning documents and RMA Part 2 principles, supporting cultural, social, environmental, and economic wellbeing. Local objectives complement the NES-P by reflecting Tasman-specific values and aspirations.
33	Kristie Paki Paki	Amend	Support in part. Retain objective as notified. Add cultural values to the reasons for this objective.	Refer to the full submission for full details.	The submitter supports retaining the objective as notified but seeks to add cultural values to its reasons. They highlight a housing shortage for Māori, especially

				1. There is a recognised and ongoing shortage of housing for Māori in the Tasman District, including housing delivered through papakāinga development. 2. The current Tasman Regional Policy Statement does not contain specific provisions for papakāinga development, creating a gap in the policy framework. 3. The proposed papakāinga provisions in TRPS Change 1 are supported because they provide a clear policy framework that enables tāngata whenua to exercise rangatiratanga over ancestral land and support cultural, social, environmental, and economic wellbeing. 4. The provisions are consistent with Council's obligations under section 62(2A)(a) of the RMA to take iwi planning documents into account. They help implement outcomes sought in the Te Ātiawa Iwi Environmental Management Plan. 5. The provisions recognise and provide for key Part 2 RMA matters, including: • the relationship of Māori with ancestral lands, waters, wāhi tapu, and taonga (s6(e)); • the exercise of kaitiakitanga (s7(a)); and • the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (s8). 6. Although the National Environmental Standards for Papakāinga provide a nationally consistent regulatory framework, they do not include objectives or policies. The proposed TRPS objectives are therefore necessary to provide local policy direction, articulate desired outcomes for papakāinga development, and ensure local values, aspirations, and environmental considerations are reflected in decision-making.	papakāinga development, and note the current policy gap. The proposed provisions enable Māori rangatiratanga, align with RMA obligations, and support iwi environmental plans. They address key RMA matters and provide necessary local policy direction beyond the national standards.
34	Partnership CKSV Mapua Limited	Support	Support and retain Objective 5.1A	CKSV supports the RPS recognising the minimum sufficient development capacity needed to meet projected housing demand, and the need for a diverse range of housing types for the efficient use of land and to meet needs of a growing community, including with the local Māori population. The Changes reflect the need to strategically support well-functioning infrastructure services that will provide for expected development demands and unanticipated proposals that would supply significant development capacity.	Submission Summary: The submitter supports retaining Objective 5.1A. They agree the RPS should recognise minimum development capacity to meet housing demand. They highlight the importance of diverse housing types for efficient land use and community needs, including local Māori. They also support strategic infrastructure planning to accommodate expected and unexpected development demands.

1-TRPS Plan Change 1 SOA > 1.3-PART 3: SIGNIFICANT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ISSUES IN TASMAN DISTRICT > 1.3.1-5.0 Urban Development > 1.3.1.3-5.3 Urban Development Objectives > 1.3.1.3.3-Objective 5.1B

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons	Summary
9	Orange Family Trust and Orange Building Group	Support	Retain Objective 5.1B as notified.	The submitter considers the objective supports a range of housing types, including medium-density housing, and is consistent with the submitter's proposed development enabling a variety of housing choices	The submitter supports Objective 5.1B.
13	Andrew and Susan Talley	Oppose	Delete Objective 5.1B and replace it with a policy that is consistent with and gives effect to Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. Alternatively, redraft the objective so that it gives effect to and is consistent with Objective 3 of the NPS-UD, or provide alternative relief that ensures the provision gives full effect to the NPS-UD.	The objective is narrowly worded and does not fully address the requirements of a well-functioning urban environment. In particular, it does not adequately address housing choice in terms of type, price and location, accessibility, resilience to climate change, or support for reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. The reference to "quality urban design outcomes" is too vague to provide sufficient direction.	The submitters oppose Objective 5.1B because it does not fully address the characteristics of a well-functioning urban environment, including housing choice, accessibility, climate resilience and greenhouse gas reduction.
31	Dick Bennison	Support	Retain	Diversity	The submitter supports the proposal. They seek to retain it as is. Their reason is to maintain diversity.
32	Te Runanga o Ngati Rarua	Support	Support and retain as notified. Refer to original submission for full details.	Refer to original submission for full details. There is an ongoing unmet need for housing Maori within the Tasman District, including housing provided through papakainga development. Currently, the operative provisions of the TRPS are silent with respect to papakainga development. The proposed papakainga provisions in the TRPS C1 establish a clear policy framework that enables tangata whenua to exercise rangatiratanga over their ancestral land. They support development that strengthens cultural connections while promoting social, cultural, environmental, and economic wellbeing. In accordance with section 62(2A)(a) of the RMA, Council must take into account recognised iwi planning documents when preparing or changing a regional policy statement. The proposed papakainga provisions give effect to a number of outcomes sought through Poipoi Te Ao Turoa and are therefore supported. The papakainga provisions also recognise and provide for part 2 RMA matters, in particular the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wahi tapu, and other taonga (section 6(e)); the exercise of kaitiakitanga (section 7(a)); and the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (section 8). The introduction of the National Environmental Standards for Papakainga development (NES-P) provides a nationally consistent regulatory framework to facilitate papakainga development. However, as the NES-P does not contain objectives or policies, there remains a need for a complementary local policy framework within the TRPS. The proposed objectives fill this gap by articulating the desired outcomes for papakainga development in	The submitter supports retaining the proposed papakainga provisions in the TRPS as notified. They highlight an unmet need for Māori housing in Tasman, including papakainga development. The provisions enable tangata whenua to exercise rangatiratanga and strengthen cultural connections. They align with RMA requirements and iwi planning documents, supporting social, cultural, environmental, and economic wellbeing. The submitter notes the need for local policies alongside the NES-P to reflect Tasman's unique values and context.

				Tasman, ensuring that local values, aspirations, and environmental context are reflected in decision making.	
33	Kristie Paki Paki	Support	Support and retain Objective 5.1B as notified. Refer to full submission for full details.	7. Refer to the full submission for full reasons. There is a recognised and ongoing shortage of housing for Māori in the Tasman District, including housing delivered through papakāinga development. 8. The current Tasman Regional Policy Statement does not contain specific provisions for papakāinga development, creating a gap in the policy framework. 9. The proposed papakāinga provisions in TRPS Change 1 are supported because they provide a clear policy framework that enables tāngata whenua to exercise rangatiratanga over ancestral land and support cultural, social, environmental, and economic wellbeing. 10. The provisions are consistent with Council's obligations under section 62(2A)(a) of the RMA to take iwi planning documents into account. They help implement outcomes sought in the Te Ātiawa Iwi Environmental Management Plan. 11. The provisions recognise and provide for key Part 2 RMA matters, including: - the relationship of Māori with ancestral lands, waters, wāhi tapu, and taonga (s6(e)); - the exercise of kaitiakitanga (s7(a)); and - the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (s8). 12. Although the National Environmental Standards for Papakāinga provide a nationally consistent regulatory framework, they do not include objectives or policies. The proposed TRPS objectives are therefore necessary to provide local policy direction, articulate desired outcomes for papakāinga development, and ensure local values, aspirations, and environmental considerations are reflected in decision-making.	The submitter supports retaining Objective 5.1B as notified. They highlight a housing shortage for Māori in Tasman, especially for papakāinga development. The current policy lacks specific provisions for papakāinga, which the proposal addresses by enabling rangatiratanga and supporting wellbeing. The provisions align with RMA obligations, iwi planning documents, and key Treaty principles. Local objectives are needed to guide papakāinga outcomes beyond national standards.
34	Partnership CKSV Mapua Limited	Support	Support and retain Objective 5.1B	CKSV supports the RPS recognising the minimum sufficient development capacity needed to meet projected housing demand, and the need for a diverse range of housing types for the efficient use of land and to meet needs of a growing community, including with the local Māori population. The Changes reflect the need to strategically support well-functioning infrastructure services that will provide for expected development demands and unanticipated proposals that would supply significant development capacity.	Summary of Submission: The submitter supports retaining Objective 5.1B. They agree the RPS should ensure enough development capacity to meet housing demand. They emphasize the importance of diverse housing types to efficiently use land and serve a growing community, including local Māori.

					They also support strategic infrastructure planning to handle expected and unforeseen development needs.
--	--	--	--	--	--

1-TRPS Plan Change 1 SOA > 1.3-PART 3: SIGNIFICANT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ISSUES IN TASMAN DISTRICT > 1.3.1-5.0 Urban Development > 1.3.1.3-5.3 Urban Development Objectives > 1.3.1.3.4-Objective 5.1C

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons	Summary
9	Orange Family Trust and Orange Building Group	Support	Retain Objective 5.1C as notified.	The submitter considers the objective is consistent with development integrated with planned infrastructure and a coordinated urban form	The submitter supports Objective 5.1C.
12	Ruth and Bruno Zahner	Amend	Remove the wording in Objective 5.1C requiring responsiveness to unanticipated or out-of-sequence plan change proposals that would supply significant development capacity, and remove the associated explanatory text supporting this approach.	The submitters oppose the proposed approach that Council should remain responsive to unanticipated or out-of-sequence plan change proposals that would add significant development capacity. They also oppose the explanation that such responsiveness is required by the NPS-UD and that proposals not anticipated by Council may appropriately provide significant development capacity because developers play an important role in providing for growth.	The submitters oppose the proposed amendments to Objective 5.1C and the related explanatory text that require Council to remain responsive to unanticipated or out-of-sequence plan change proposals that would supply significant development capacity.
13	Andrew and Susan Talley	Oppose	Amend the objective to more closely reflect the direction in Objective 6 of the NPS-UD that decisions on urban development affecting urban environments are integrated with infrastructure planning and funding decisions and are strategic over the medium and long term. Amend the reasons text to make it clear that unanticipated or out-of-sequence proposals will not be considered favourably unless it can be demonstrated they will contribute to well-functioning urban environments, and identify the risks associated with such development.	The proposed objective risks undermining the outcomes of the Future Development Strategy and broader strategic planning work. The emphasis on responsive planning should not be used to justify ad hoc plan changes that circumvent agreed development sequencing. The direction in Objective 6 of the NPS-UD regarding strategic and integrated decision-making is not adequately reflected in the objective.	The submitters oppose Objective 5.1C because they consider it may undermine planned growth sequencing and does not adequately reflect the need for strategic and integrated urban development planning.
16	Chip Felton and Michelle Lang	Amend	Amend Objective 5.1C and Policy 5.1C so that responsiveness to unanticipated or out-of-sequence private plan change proposals is conditional on confirmation that servicing capacity exists, or is funded and programmed within the first ten years of the Long Term Plan, to support the additional capacity proposed.	The submitters consider the current objective emphasises responsiveness to development proposals without requiring confirmation of infrastructure capacity. They consider infrastructure availability should be a condition of enabling additional development capacity and note evidence relating to infrastructure constraints and growth management in Māpua.	Support responsiveness to unanticipated or out-of-sequence development proposals in principle, but seek stronger direction requiring infrastructure capacity to be confirmed before additional development capacity is enabled.
18	Vicmatt Properties Ltd	Support	Retain Objective 5.1C as drafted.	The submitter considers the objective is consistent with the Future Development Strategy and National Policy Statement	The submitter supports retaining Objective 5.1C as it is.

				on Urban Development and supports the provision of land to meet future growth needs.	They believe it aligns with the Future Development Strategy and National Policy Statement on Urban Development. They emphasize the importance of providing land to meet future growth needs.
31	Dick Bennison	Support	Retain	Important the plan is able to respond to market signals and be flexible enough to enable out of sequence development.	Summary of Submission: The submitter supports the proposal. They seek to retain the current approach. They emphasize the plan should respond to market signals. Flexibility to allow out-of-sequence development is important.
34	Partnership CKSV Mapua Limited	Support	Support and retain Objective 5.1C	CKSV supports the RPS recognising the minimum sufficient development capacity needed to meet projected housing demand, and the need for a diverse range of housing types for the efficient use of land and to meet needs of a growing community, including with the local Māori population. The Changes reflect the need to strategically support well-functioning infrastructure services that will provide for expected development demands and unanticipated proposals that would supply significant development capacity.	Submitter supports retaining Objective 5.1C. They agree the RPS should ensure enough development capacity to meet housing demand. They emphasize diverse housing types to efficiently use land and meet community needs, including Māori. They also support infrastructure planning to handle expected growth and unexpected large development proposals.

1-TRPS Plan Change 1 SOA > 1.3-PART 3: SIGNIFICANT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ISSUES IN TASMAN DISTRICT > 1.3.1-5.0 Urban Development > 1.3.1.3-5.3 Urban Development Objectives > 1.3.1.3.5-Objective 5.2

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons	Summary
13	Andrew and Susan Talley	Oppose	Amend Objective 5.2 to give effect to the statutory direction in Objective 8 of the NPS-UD.	No amendments are proposed to this objective despite the purpose of Plan Change 1 being to implement direction in the NPS-UD. The objective should address climate change resilience as required by Objective 8 of the NPS-UD and should also give effect to the statutory direction in the NPS-NH.	The submitters seek amendments to Objective 5.2 to address climate change resilience and natural hazard matters in a manner consistent with national direction. .

1-TRPS Plan Change 1 SOA > 1.3-PART 3: SIGNIFICANT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ISSUES IN TASMAN DISTRICT > 1.3.1-5.0 Urban Development > 1.3.1.3-5.3 Urban Development Objectives > 1.3.1.3.6-Objective 5.3

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons	Summary
19	Katania Terraces Ltd	Support	Retain Objective 5.3 and associated urban development policies and definitions as notified.	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to the Tasman Regional Policy Statement because they implement the Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy 2022-2052, support planned urban growth and provide the strategic basis for residential development areas such as the Brightwater Development Area.	The submitter supports retaining Objective 5.3 and related urban development policies as notified. They agree with the amendments because these align with the Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy 2022-2052. The changes support planned urban growth and provide a clear strategy for residential areas like the Brightwater Development Area.

1-TRPS Plan Change 1 SOA > 1.3-PART 3: SIGNIFICANT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ISSUES IN TASMAN DISTRICT > 1.3.1-5.0 Urban Development > 1.3.1.3-5.3 Urban Development Objectives > 1.3.1.3.7-Objective 5.4

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons	Summary
9	Orange Family Trust and Orange Building Group	Support	Retain Objective 5.4 as notified.	The submitter supports recognition of the relationship between urban form and the transport system, including public and active transport, and considers the proposal provides walking and cycling connections and transport integration	The submitter supports the amendments to Objective 5.4.

1-TRPS Plan Change 1 SOA > 1.3-PART 3: SIGNIFICANT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ISSUES IN TASMAN DISTRICT > 1.3.1-5.0 Urban Development > 1.3.1.3-5.3 Urban Development Objectives > 1.3.1.3.8-Objective 5.5

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons	Summary
9	Orange Family Trust and	Support	Retain Objective 5.5 as notified.	The submitter supports recognition that amenity values in areas planned for intensification can change over time and	The submitter supports the amendments to Objective 5.5.

	Orange Building Group			considers the proposal is designed to respond to a changing urban environment.	
12	Ruth and Bruno Zahner	Amend	Remove the wording in Objective 5.5 stating that amenity values and urban built form in areas planned for intensification should be recognised and allowed to develop and change over time, and remove the associated explanatory text supporting this approach	The submitters oppose the approach that amenity values and urban built form in intensification areas should be allowed to change over time. They also oppose the explanation that some urban development may reduce amenity values appreciated by some people while improving amenity values for others through increased and varied housing densities and types, and oppose the statement that amenity values are not of themselves an adverse effect.	The submitters oppose the proposed amendments to Objective 5.5 and the associated explanatory text that recognise and allow for amenity values and urban built form in areas planned for intensification to develop and change over time
13	Andrew and Susan Talley	Oppose	Delete the proposed amendment to Objective 5.5 and retain the operative text. If the amendment is retained, redraft the objective and supporting reasons text so that it gives full effect to and accurately reflects Objective 4 of the NPS-UD. Amend Policy 5.7 so that it is consistent with Policy 6 of the NPS-UD.	The proposed amendment inappropriately narrows the scope of the objective and weakens its direction. Recognition of changing amenity values is better addressed at a policy level than as an objective. Also the reasons text inaccurately paraphrases and misinterprets the intent of Policy 6 of the NPS-UD.	The submitters oppose the proposed amendment to Objective 5.5 because they consider it weakens the objective, narrows its scope, and incorrectly addresses changing amenity values at the objective level.
16	Chip Felton and Michelle Lang	Amend	Retain the reference to "the character of small towns" in amended Objective 5.5 and further amend the objective to indicate how the two limbs should be reconciled where a small town is also an area planned for intensification. Alternatively, insert a policy under Objective 5.5 providing that direction.	The submitters support retention of the protection of small town character but consider the objective provides no direction on how to resolve conflicts between maintaining small town character and allowing amenity values to develop and change over time in intensification areas. They consider this creates uncertainty, particularly in Māpua, where both directions apply simultaneously.	Support retention of the reference to maintaining and enhancing amenity values and the character of small towns within Objective 5.5, but seek amendments to clarify how this objective should apply where a settlement is both a small town and an area planned for intensification. The submitters consider the objective currently contains competing directions without explaining how they should be reconciled.
31	Dick Bennison	Support	Retain	Enables diversity	Submitters support the proposal. They seek to retain the current provisions. The reason is that it enables diversity.
34	Partnership CKSV Mapua Limited	Support	Retain Objective 5.5 and corresponding reasons as notified.	Reflects Tasman's changing urban environment and provides clarity on amenity values in relation to urban development under the NPS-UD, and aligns with the proposals in PC81.	The submitter supports retaining Objective 5.5 as notified. They believe it reflects Tasman's evolving urban environment. It clarifies amenity values related to urban development under the NPS-UD. The objective also aligns with proposals in PC81.

1-TRPS Plan Change 1 SOA > 1.3-PART 3: SIGNIFICANT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ISSUES IN TASMAN DISTRICT > 1.3.1-5.0 Urban Development > 1.3.1.4-5.4 Urban Development Policies and Methods

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons	Summary
9	Orange Family Trust and Orange Building Group	Support	Retain Policy 5.2 as notified.	The submitter states the proposal is consistent with the existing policy.	The submitter supports Policy 5.2.
10	David Briggs	Amend	Amend Policies 5.1, 5.1A, 5.1B, 5.6 and 5.7 to: - ensure environmental and social needs are considered; - monitor and assess environmental and social impacts of development; and - monitor compliance with policy objectives.	The submitter considers policies should more clearly demonstrate how development outcomes will be assessed, monitored and implemented	The submitter seeks amendments to ensure environmental and social effects are considered and monitored, and that developments are assessed for compliance with policy objectives.
13	Andrew and Susan Talley	Amend	Amend Policy 5.2 to give effect to the NPS-UD regarding climate change resilience. Amend the policy so that it is clear how it applies to urban development proposals within Tasman's urban environment and how it is to be applied alongside Policies 5.1A and 5.1B. Amend the policy so that it is consistent with national policy direction on natural hazards in the NPS-NH.	The policy enables urban growth in areas that may be subject to significant natural hazard risks, including risks arising from climate change. The policy is unclear in its relationship with proposed Policies 5.1A and 5.1B. The policy does not reflect key directions in the NPS-NH regarding risk assessment, proportionate risk management, avoidance of development in areas of very high risk and management of risks transferred to other sites.	The submitters seek amendments to Policy 5.2 to strengthen the management of natural hazard risks, address climate change resilience, and clarify how the policy operates alongside proposed urban development policies.
20	Adrienne Matthews	Support	Prioritise intensification and brownfield redevelopment before any greenfield expansion.	Compact centres reduce infrastructure burden, protect productive land, and support walkable, well-served neighbourhoods.	Submitter supports the proposal. They seek prioritising intensification and brownfield redevelopment over greenfield expansion. They argue compact centres lower infrastructure costs, protect productive land, and create walkable, well-served neighbourhoods.

1-TRPS Plan Change 1 SOA > 1.3-PART 3: SIGNIFICANT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ISSUES IN TASMAN DISTRICT > 1.3.1-5.0 Urban Development > 1.3.1.4-5.4 Urban Development Policies and Methods > 1.3.1.4.1-Policy 5.1

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons	Summary
9	Orange Family Trust and Orange Building Group	Support	Retain Policy 5.1 as notified.	The submitter considers the amendments balance protection of highly productive land with obligations under the NPS-UD, support sufficient urban development capacity, and recognise that amenity values may change over time in areas planned for intensification.	The submitter supports the amendments to Policy 5.1.

12	Ruth and Bruno Zahner	Oppose	"do not agree with any proposed changes"	The submission states that the submitters do not agree with any of the proposed changes to Policy 5.1.	The submitters oppose all proposed changes to Policy 5.1.
13	Andrew and Susan Talley	Oppose	Amend the policy so that it is consistent with the direction in clauses 3.6 to 3.10 of the NPS-HPL. Amend the policy so it is clear how it is to be applied alongside proposed Policies 5.1A and 5.1B and resolve the current conflicts between these provisions.	The proposed amendment to the chapeau weakens the policy and creates uncertainty about how it should be interpreted and applied alongside Policies 5.1A and 5.1B. The amendments, particularly clause (iii), do not give effect to the NPS-HPL and paraphrase the threshold tests in clause 3.6 in a way that significantly weakens the policy direction.	The submitters oppose amendments to Policy 5.1 because they consider the changes weaken protection of highly productive land, create uncertainty, and are inconsistent with the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.
18	Vicmatt Properties Ltd	Support	Retain Policy 5.1 as drafted.	The submitter considers the policy is consistent with the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land and provides clear direction regarding the balance between highly productive land protection and enabling urban development.	The submitter supports retaining Policy 5.1 as currently drafted. They believe the policy aligns with the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land. The policy offers clear guidance on balancing protection of productive land with urban development needs.
31	Dick Bennison	Support	Retain	Vital to protect flat irrigable highl productive land that is suitable for intensive modern horticultural production, while enabling urban development to spread on lesser productive undulating land y	The submitter supports the proposal. They seek to retain the current approach. They emphasize the importance of protecting flat, highly productive irrigable land for intensive modern horticulture. They agree urban development should occur on less productive, undulating land instead.
31	Dick Bennison	Support	Retain	Important to protect flat irrigable highly productive land that is suitable for modern intensive horticultural production while enabling urban development on lesser productive undulating land.	Submitter supports the proposal. They seek to retain the current plan. They emphasize protecting flat, irrigable, highly productive land for intensive horticulture. They also support urban development on less productive, undulating land.
34	Partnership CKSV Mapua Limited	Support	Support and retain Policy 5.1	This policy suite recognises the importance of protecting Tasman's natural environment and resources while also meeting expected urban development capacity where other options may not be available. Reflects the Council's statutory obligations in providing for urban growth through a range of implementation methods, including zoning sufficient residential and business land, while recognising Tasman's cultural and natural environment and its resources. Recognises sequencing of new urban development as provided for in the Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy and provides criteria to which unanticipated development must be assessed against to ensure quality of urban development and protection of cultural and environmental values.	The submitter supports retaining Policy 5.1. They value its role in protecting Tasman's natural environment while allowing necessary urban growth. The policy aligns with the Council's duties to provide enough residential and business land. It respects cultural and environmental values and follows the Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy.

					Unplanned developments are assessed to ensure quality and protection of key values.
--	--	--	--	--	---

1-TRPS Plan Change 1 SOA > 1.3-PART 3: SIGNIFICANT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ISSUES IN TASMAN DISTRICT > 1.3.1-5.0 Urban Development > 1.3.1.4-5.4 Urban Development Policies and Methods > 1.3.1.4.2-Policy 5.1A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons	Summary
4	Fonterra Limited	Amend	Amend Policy 5.1A as shown: Policy 5.1A <i>Council will zone sufficient residential and business land capacity to meet expected demand in its urban environment, using spatial planning tools that seek to achieve the following overall:</i> <i>(i) An urban form that supports reductions in greenhouse gas emissions by integrating land use and transport;</i> <i>(ii) Consolidation and intensification of existing main commercial centres;</i> <i>(iii) Main commercial centres are supported by a network of smaller centres;</i> <i>(iv) New housing is focused 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;</i> <i>(v) New housing areas are planned and located to avoid reverse sensitivity and compatibility effects with business and industrial zones and activities.</i> <i>(vi) A range of housing choices are provided that meet different needs of the community, including papakāinga and smaller, more affordable options;</i> <i>(vii) New infrastructure is planned, funded and delivered efficiently to integrate with growth, and existing infrastructure is used efficiently;</i> <i>(viii) Sufficient public open space, reserves and other community facilities</i> <i>(viii)</i> <i>(ix) Impacts on the natural environment are minimised and opportunities for restoration are realised;</i> <i>(ix) Tasman is resilient to and can adapt to the likely future effects of climate change;</i> <i>(xi) Tasman is resilient to the risk of natural hazards;</i> <i>(xii) Highly productive land is prioritised for primary production; and</i> <i>(xiii) Revive and enhance the mauri of te Taiao.</i>	PC1 introduces new objectives and policies aimed at ensuring sufficient housing and business land capacity is provided within the urban environment to meet current and future demand, while protecting environmental and cultural values. Fonterra generally supports the proposed changes in PC1, particularly proposed Policy 5.1A, which recognises the importance of providing sufficient business land capacity. However, Fonterra considers that Policy 5.1A would benefit from additional direction regarding the relationship between new residential development and existing business and industrial areas. In particular, the policy should better recognise the need to ensure new sensitive activities are appropriately located and designed to avoid incompatibility with established business and industrial activities. Strengthening the policy in this way would provide clearer strategic direction when identifying and zoning future urban growth areas. It would also help minimise reverse sensitivity effects and provide greater certainty for the continued operation, maintenance and future expansion of established business and industrial activities.	Support in part. Amend policy to better recognise the need to ensure new sensitive activities are appropriately located and designed to avoid incompatibility with established business and industrial activities.
9	Orange Family Trust and Orange Building Group	Support	Retain Policy 5.1A as notified.	The submitter considers the proposal is consistent with the policy and supports planned development integrated with infrastructure and community facilities	The submitter strongly supports Policy 5.1A.
13	Andrew and Susan Talley	Oppose	Amend the policy by redrafting the outcomes into an objective and providing a supporting policy that provides clear direction on how conflicts between outcomes will be	Support the intent of the policy. However, it reads more like an objective than a policy and that several matters have been inaccurately paraphrased from the NPS-UD. The policy does not	The submitters support the intent of Policy 5.1A but consider it functions more as an objective than a policy, does not accurately

			resolved and whether any outcomes have a higher priority than others. Amend the outcomes so they are consistent with and accurately reflect Policy 1 of the NPS-UD.	provide direction for resolving conflicts between the various outcomes it seeks to achieve.	reflect national direction, and provides insufficient guidance for resolving conflicts between policy outcomes.
18	Vicmatt Properties Ltd	Support	Retain Policy 5.1A as drafted.	The submitter considers the policy is consistent with the Future Development Strategy and National Policy Statement on Urban Development and supports the provision of sufficient and well-located business land to accommodate future growth and employment needs.	Submission summary: The submitter supports the proposal and seeks to retain Policy 5.1A as drafted. They believe the policy aligns with the Future Development Strategy and the National Policy Statement on Urban Development. The policy is supported for providing enough well-located business land to meet future growth and employment needs.
29	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi	Amend	Amend text as below. <i>New infrastructure is planned, funded and delivered efficiently to integrate with growth, and existing infrastructure is used <u>safely and efficiently</u>.</i>	Aligns with NZTA priorities. Existing infrastructure (including the transport network) should be used efficiently and safely.	Submission Summary: The submitter seeks to amend the decision text to emphasize that new infrastructure must be planned, funded, and delivered efficiently to support growth. They also want existing infrastructure to be used safely and efficiently. This aligns with NZTA priorities focusing on effective use of the transport network.
31	Dick Bennison	Support	Retain	Comprehensive	Submitters support the proposal and seek its retention. They believe the plan is comprehensive and well-prepared.
31	Dick Bennison	Support	Retain	Comprehensive	The submitter supports the proposal. They seek to retain the current provisions. Their reason is that the proposal is comprehensive.
32	Te Runanga o Ngati Rarua	Support	Support and retain Policy 5.1A (v) and (xii). Refer to original submission for full details.	Refer to original submission for full details. There is an ongoing unmet need for housing Maori within the Tasman District, including housing provided through papakainga development. Currently, the operative provisions of the TRPS are silent with respect to papakainga development. The proposed papakainga provisions in the TRPS C1 establish a clear policy framework that enables tanagata whenua to exercise ranagatiratanga over their ancestral land. They support development that strengthens cultural connections while promoting social, cultural, environmental, and economic wellbeing. In accordance with section 62(2A)(a) of the RMA, Council must take into account recognised iwi planning documents when preparing or changing a regional policy statement. The proposed papakainga provisions give effect to a number of outcomes sought through Poipoia Te Ao Turoa	The submitter supports retaining Policy 5.1A (v) and (xii) to address the unmet need for Māori housing, including papakāinga development. They emphasize the importance of a clear policy framework enabling tangata whenua to manage ancestral lands and uphold cultural connections. The submission highlights legal obligations under the RMA and the Treaty of Waitangi.

				and are therefore supported. The papakainga provisions also recognise and provide for part 2 RMA matters, in particular the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wahi tapu, and other taonga (section 6(e)); the exercise of kaitiakitanga (section 7(a)); and the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (section 8). The introduction of the National Environmental Standards for Papakainga development (NES-P) provides a nationally consistent regulatory framework to facilitate papakainga development. However, as the NES-P does not contain objectives or policies, there remains a need for a complementary local policy framework within the TRPS. The proposed objectives fill this gap by articulating the desired outcomes for papakainga development in Tasman, ensuring that local values, aspirations, and environmental context are reflected in decision making.	They note the need for local policies to complement the National Environmental Standards for Papakāinga development.
33	Kristie Paki Paki	Support	Refer to original submission for full details. Support and retain Policy 5.1A (v) and (xii) as notified.	Refer to original submission for full details. 13. There is a recognised and ongoing shortage of housing for Māori in the Tasman District, including housing delivered through papakāinga development. 14. The current Tasman Regional Policy Statement does not contain specific provisions for papakāinga development, creating a gap in the policy framework. 15. The proposed papakāinga provisions in TRPS Change 1 are supported because they provide a clear policy framework that enables tāngata whenua to exercise rangatiratanga over ancestral land and support cultural, social, environmental, and economic wellbeing. 16. The provisions are consistent with Council's obligations under section 62(2A)(a) of the RMA to take iwi planning documents into account. They help implement outcomes sought in the Te Ātiawa Iwi Environmental Management Plan. 17. The provisions recognise and provide for key Part 2 RMA matters, including: • the relationship of Māori with ancestral lands, waters, wāhi tapu, and taonga (s6(e)); • the exercise of kaitiakitanga (s7(a)); and • the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (s8). 18. Although the National Environmental Standards for Papakāinga provide a nationally consistent regulatory framework, they do not include objectives or policies. The proposed TRPS objectives are therefore necessary to provide local policy direction, articulate desired outcomes for papakāinga development, and ensure local values, aspirations, and environmental considerations are reflected in decision-making.	The submitter supports retaining Policy 5.1A (v) and (xii) as notified. They highlight a housing shortage for Māori in Tasman, particularly for papakāinga development. The current policy lacks specific provisions for papakāinga, which the proposed changes address. These provisions enable rangatiratanga, support wellbeing, and align with RMA obligations and iwi planning documents. They also recognize key RMA matters and local values, unlike national standards that lack policy direction.

34	Partnership CKSV Mapua Limited	Support	Support and retain Policy 5.1A	This policy suite recognises the importance of protecting Tasman's natural environment and resources while also meeting expected urban development capacity where other options may not be available. Reflects the Council's statutory obligations in providing for urban growth through a range of implementation methods, including zoning sufficient residential and business land, while recognising Tasman's cultural and natural environment and its resources. Recognises sequencing of new urban development as provided for in the Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy and provides criteria to which unanticipated development must be assessed against to ensure quality of urban development and protection of cultural and environmental values.	Submitter supports retaining Policy 5.1A. They value its role in protecting Tasman's natural environment while allowing for necessary urban growth. The policy aligns with Council's obligations to provide sufficient residential and business land. It supports planned urban development sequencing per the Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy. The policy also sets criteria to assess unexpected developments, ensuring quality and protection of cultural and environmental values.
----	--------------------------------------	---------	--------------------------------	---	---

1-TRPS Plan Change 1 SOA > 1.3-PART 3: SIGNIFICANT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ISSUES IN TASMAN DISTRICT > 1.3.1-5.0 Urban Development > 1.3.1.4-5.4 Urban Development Policies and Methods > 1.3.1.4.3-Policy 5.1B

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons	Summary
9	Orange Family Trust and Orange Building Group	Support	Retain Policy 5.1B as notified.	The submitter considers the proposal is consistent with the Future Development Strategy and, if treated as out of sequence, would meet the criteria for significant urban development capacity.	The submitter strongly supports Policy 5.1B.
13	Andrew and Susan Talley	Oppose	Insert a new objective establishing the strategic spatial strategy for accommodating urban growth in the district. Amend the policy by splitting it into separate policies dealing with strategic growth and unanticipated or out-of-sequence proposals. Amend the policy to strengthen direction on growth sequencing, infrastructure readiness, and implementation of higher-order national direction. Remove the reference to the FDS annual implementation plan. Clarify how the policy is to be interpreted alongside operative provisions and amend the explanatory text.	The policy does not provide clear direction on the district's long-term spatial strategy or where growth should be focused. It combines two separate matters, implementing strategic growth and dealing with unanticipated development, creating duplication, conflict and uncertainty. The policy does not provide strong enough direction to limit unanticipated or out-of-sequence development and does not clearly recognise growth constraints, infrastructure requirements, or the hierarchy between the RPS, the FDS and implementation tools such as zoning, structure plans and masterplans.	The submitters oppose Policy 5.1B because they consider it does not clearly establish the district's strategic spatial growth pattern, inadequately addresses growth sequencing, and creates uncertainty about how growth should be managed and prioritised.
29	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi	Support	None	Integration of new developments with existing and improved transportation networks is essential.	Submitter supports the proposal. No specific decision is sought.

					They emphasize the importance of integrating new developments with existing and improved transportation networks.
29	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi	Amend	None	Makes it clear that funding for new infrastructure needs to be provided by the developer. Highlights the need to tie in with other planned infrastructure.	Summary of Submission: The submitter requests no specific decision but emphasizes that developers should fund new infrastructure. They highlight the importance of coordinating new infrastructure with existing planned projects.
31	Dick Bennison	Support	Retain	Provides diversity and enables market forces to influence urban development.	Submitter supports the proposal. They seek to retain the current approach. They believe it encourages diversity. They also think it allows market forces to shape urban development.
32	Te Runanga o Ngati Rarua	Support	Support and retain Policy 5.1B (xii) as notified. Refer to original submission for full details.	Refer to original submission for full details. There is an ongoing unmet need for housing Maori within the Tasman District, including housing provided through papakainga development. Currently, the operative provisions of the TRPS are silent with respect to papakainga development, The proposed papakainga provisions in the TRPS C1 establish a clear policy framework that enables tanagata whenua to exercise ranagatiratanga over their ancestral land. They support development that strengthens cultural connections while promoting social, cultural, environmental, and economic wellbeing. In accordance with section 62(2A)(a) of the RMA, Council must take into account recognised iwi planning documents when preparing or changing a regional policy statement. The proposed papakainga provisions give effect to a number of outcomes sought through Poipoia Te Ao Turoa and are therefore supported. The papakainga provisions also recognise and provide for part 2 RMA matters, in particular the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wahi tapu, and other taonga (section 6(e)); the exercise of kaitiakitanga (section 7(a)); and the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (section 8). The introduction of the National Environmental Standards for Papakainga development (NES-P) provides a nationally consistent regulatory framework to facilitate papakainga development. However, as the NES-P does not contain objectives or policies, there remains a need for a complementary local policy framework within the TRPS. The proposed objectives fill this gap by articulating the desired outcomes for papakainga development in Tasman, ensuring that local values, aspirations, and environmental context are reflected in decision making.	Submitters support retaining Policy 5.1B (xii) to address unmet housing needs for Māori, especially papakainga development. They highlight the TRPS currently lacks provisions for papakainga, and the new policy framework enables tangata whenua to manage their ancestral land. The provisions align with RMA requirements, iwi planning documents, and Treaty principles, and complement the National Environmental Standards for Papakainga by reflecting local values and aspirations.
33	Kristie Paki Paki	Support	Support and retain Policy 5.1B (xii).	Refer to original submission for full details.	The submitter supports retaining Policy 5.1B (xii) to address the housing shortage for Māori in Tasman. They

				19. There is a recognised and ongoing shortage of housing for Māori in the Tasman District, including housing delivered through papakāinga development. 20. The current Tasman Regional Policy Statement does not contain specific provisions for papakāinga development, creating a gap in the policy framework. 21. The proposed papakāinga provisions in TRPS Change 1 are supported because they provide a clear policy framework that enables tāngata whenua to exercise rangatiratanga over ancestral land and support cultural, social, environmental, and economic wellbeing. 22. The provisions are consistent with Council's obligations under section 62(2A)(a) of the RMA to take iwi planning documents into account. They help implement outcomes sought in the Te Ātiawa Iwi Environmental Management Plan. 23. The provisions recognise and provide for key Part 2 RMA matters, including: - the relationship of Māori with ancestral lands, waters, wāhi tapu, and taonga (s6(e)); - the exercise of kaitiakitanga (s7(a)); and - the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (s8). 24. Although the National Environmental Standards for Papakāinga provide a nationally consistent regulatory framework, they do not include objectives or policies. The proposed TRPS objectives are therefore necessary to provide local policy direction, articulate desired outcomes for papakāinga development, and ensure local values, aspirations, and environmental considerations are reflected in decision-making.	back the proposed papakāinga provisions in TRPS Change 1 for enabling rangatiratanga and supporting wellbeing. These provisions align with RMA obligations, iwi planning documents, and Treaty principles. While national standards lack policy detail, the TRPS objectives provide essential local guidance reflecting community values and desired outcomes.
34	Partnership CKSV Mapua Limited	Support	Support and retain Policy 5.1B	This policy suite recognises the importance of protecting Tasman's natural environment and resources while also meeting expected urban development capacity where other options may not be available. Reflects the Council's statutory obligations in providing for urban growth through a range of implementation methods, including zoning sufficient residential and business land, while recognising Tasman's cultural and natural environment and its resources. Recognises sequencing of new urban development as provided for in the Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy and provides criteria to which unanticipated development must be assessed against to ensure quality of urban development and protection of cultural and environmental values.	The submitter supports retaining Policy 5.1B. They value its balance between protecting Tasman's natural environment and allowing urban growth. The policy aligns with Council's obligations to provide for development while safeguarding cultural and environmental values. It also supports planned sequencing of urban growth and sets criteria for assessing unexpected developments.
35	Kairos Trust	Amend	AMEND the first paragraph of Policy 5.1B so that the scale and location of new urban development is to "have regard to", or be "generally consistent with", already	AMEND the first paragraph of Policy 5.1B so that the scale and location of new urban development is to "have regard to", or be "generally consistent with", already zoned land, the Future	The submitter seeks to amend Policy 5.1B to require new urban development to <i>have regard to</i> or be <i>generally</i>

			zoned land, the Future Development Strategy, adopted masterplans or structure plans, rather than “shall be consistent with”; and • INSERT into Policy 5.1B, or its explanation, a provision to the effect that land which was raised with the Council during preparation of the Future Development Strategy but was not assessed on its merits is not, for that reason alone, to be treated as “unanticipated” urban development. Refer to original submission for full details.	Development Strategy, adopted masterplans or structure plans, rather than “shall be consistent with”; and • INSERT into Policy 5.1B, or its explanation, a provision to the effect that land which was raised with the Council during preparation of the Future Development Strategy but was not assessed on its merits is not, for that reason alone, to be treated as “unanticipated” urban development. Refer to original submission for full details.	<i>consistent with</i> zoned land and planning documents, rather than <i>shall be consistent with</i> . They also want a provision clarifying that land mentioned during the Future Development Strategy but not assessed should not automatically be considered <i>unanticipated</i> urban development. This aims for more flexibility in development decisions.
35	Kairos Trust	Amend	Refer to original submission for full details. AMEND Policy 5.1B so that criteria (i) to (xii) are expressed and applied as matters to be considered in an overall evaluative judgement, consistent with their description as “unranked criteria”, rather than as cumulative requirements each of which must be met — by replacing the conjunctive “and” linking the criteria with wording such as “Council will have particular regard to the following matters”; and • AMEND criterion (vi) so that a proposal’s contribution to development capacity may be demonstrated qualitatively as well as by scale — including by reference to the diversity of housing types and typologies provided, the provision of visitor accommodation, and the contribution to a well-functioning urban environment — rather than by reference to scale alone.	Refer to original submission for full details. AMEND Policy 5.1B so that criteria (i) to (xii) are expressed and applied as matters to be considered in an overall evaluative judgement, consistent with their description as “unranked criteria”, rather than as cumulative requirements each of which must be met — by replacing the conjunctive “and” linking the criteria with wording such as “Council will have particular regard to the following matters”; and • AMEND criterion (vi) so that a proposal’s contribution to development capacity may be demonstrated qualitatively as well as by scale — including by reference to the diversity of housing types and typologies provided, the provision of visitor accommodation, and the contribution to a well-functioning urban environment — rather than by reference to scale alone.	The submitter seeks to amend Policy 5.1B so criteria (i) to (xii) are considered as unranked matters for overall judgement, not cumulative requirements. They propose changing the linking word from “and” to “Council will have particular regard to the following matters.” They also want criterion (vi) to allow qualitative demonstration of development capacity, including housing diversity and visitor accommodation, not just scale.
35	Kairos Trust	Amend	Refer to original submission for full details. INSERT into Policy 5.1B, or a related policy, a requirement that the identification and assessment of development capacity within the Nelson Tasman urban environment be undertaken on an integrated, cross-boundary basis between Tasman District Council and Nelson City Council, consistent with the NPS UD and with the joint basis on which the Future Development Strategy was prepared, and that land is not to be discounted from consideration by reason only of its position relative to the territorial boundary.	Refer to original submission for full details. INSERT into Policy 5.1B, or a related policy, a requirement that the identification and assessment of development capacity within the Nelson Tasman urban environment be undertaken on an integrated, cross-boundary basis between Tasman District Council and Nelson City Council, consistent with the NPS UD and with the joint basis on which the Future Development Strategy was prepared, and that land is not to be discounted from consideration by reason only of its position relative to the territorial boundary.	The submitter seeks to amend Policy 5.1B to require joint, cross-boundary assessment of development capacity between Tasman District and Nelson City Councils. This aligns with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS UD) and the collaborative Future Development Strategy. They want to ensure land is not excluded solely based on territorial boundaries.

1-TRPS Plan Change 1 SOA > 1.3-PART 3: SIGNIFICANT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ISSUES IN TASMAN DISTRICT > 1.3.1-5.0 Urban Development > 1.3.1.4-5.4 Urban Development Policies and Methods > 1.3.1.4.4-Policy 5.1C

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons	Summary
------------------------	-----------	----------	--------------------	---------	---------

13	Andrew and Susan Talley	Oppose	Insert a new objective establishing the strategic hierarchy of commercial centres. Amend the policy so that it provides direction on how the hierarchy is to be achieved and delivered. Amend the policy so that its scope is clear.	Support the intent of establishing a hierarchy of commercial centres. However, the policy is ineffective because it refers to a hierarchy without identifying what that hierarchy is. I also consider it unclear which objective the policy implements and whether it applies only to Tasman's urban environment or more broadly.	The submitters support the concept of a commercial centre hierarchy but oppose the current drafting because it does not clearly identify the hierarchy, explain how it will be achieved, or define the scope of the policy.
35	Kairos Trust	Amend	Refer to original submission for full details. AMEND Objective 5.1C so that responsiveness to unanticipated or out of sequence plan change proposals is not confined to proposals supplying "significant development capacity" measured by scale, and extends to proposals that make a significant qualitative contribution to housing choice, typology diversity or a well-functioning urban environment, consistent with Objective 5.1B.	Refer to original submission for full details. AMEND Objective 5.1C so that responsiveness to unanticipated or out of sequence plan change proposals is not confined to proposals supplying "significant development capacity" measured by scale, and extends to proposals that make a significant qualitative contribution to housing choice, typology diversity or a well-functioning urban environment, consistent with Objective 5.1B.	The submitter seeks to amend Objective 5.1C. They want it to include responsiveness to unanticipated or out-of-sequence plan changes beyond just those providing significant development capacity by scale. The amendment should also cover proposals that contribute significantly to housing choice, diversity of typologies, or a well-functioning urban environment, aligning with Objective 5.1B.

1-TRPS Plan Change 1 SOA > 1.3-PART 3: SIGNIFICANT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ISSUES IN TASMAN DISTRICT > 1.3.1-5.0 Urban Development > 1.3.1.4-5.4 Urban Development Policies and Methods > 1.3.1.4.5-Policy 5.3

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons	Summary
13	Andrew and Susan Talley	Oppose	Reinstate the explanatory text proposed to be deleted.	The deletion fails to acknowledge that water supply constraints can limit urban growth in parts of Tasman's urban environment, including Māpua. I am also concerned the proposed deletion may create inconsistency with freshwater management direction and it is unclear why the deletion is required.	The submitters oppose the deletion of explanatory text associated with Policy 5.3 because they consider it reduces recognition of water supply limitations and growth constraints in parts of Tasman's urban environment.
34	Partnership CKSV Mapua Limited	Support	Support and retain Policy 5.3	While CKSV supports the drafting change to make urban intensification and sustainable supply of water both anticipated outcomes of the Policy, rather than set out in the explanations. This change provides flexibility as to what is 'sustainable' in each development proposal.	Submitters support the proposal and seek to retain Policy 5.3. They agree with the change making urban intensification and sustainable water supply anticipated outcomes, not just explanations. This offers flexibility in defining what is 'sustainable' for each development.

1-TRPS Plan Change 1 SOA > 1.3-PART 3: SIGNIFICANT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ISSUES IN TASMAN DISTRICT > 1.3.1-5.0 Urban Development > 1.3.1.4-5.4 Urban Development Policies and Methods > 1.3.1.4.6-Policy 5.6

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons	Summary
9	Orange Family Trust and Orange Building Group	Support	Retain Policy 5.6 as notified.	The submitter states the proposal is consistent with the existing policy.	The submitter supports Policy 5.6.

1-TRPS Plan Change 1 SOA > 1.3-PART 3: SIGNIFICANT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ISSUES IN TASMAN DISTRICT > 1.3.1-5.0 Urban Development > 1.3.1.4-5.4 Urban Development Policies and Methods > 1.3.1.4.7-Policy 5.7

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons	Summary
13	Andrew and Susan Talley	Oppose	Amend operative Policy 5.7 by inserting an additional clause to give effect to the policy direction in Policy 6 of the NPS-UD.	The amendment to Policy 5.1 inappropriately alters a policy relating to highly productive land by introducing matters relating to changing amenity values. This has resulted in awkward and unclear drafting and would be better addressed through amendments to Policy 5.7.	The submitters oppose the introduction of amenity value provisions into Policy 5.1 and consider these matters should instead be addressed through amendments to Policy 5.7.
13	Andrew and Susan Talley	Amend	Amend Policy 5.7 to insert policy direction that changes to urban built form may involve significant changes to an area, acknowledging that such changes may detract from amenity values appreciated by some people but improve amenity values appreciated by others, including future generations, and that such changes are not of themselves an adverse effect.	Policy 5.7 is a more appropriate location than Policy 5.1 for addressing changes to urban built form and amenity values arising from intensification. Without such an amendment, there is a conflict between Policy 5.7 and the proposed amendments to Policy 5.1.	The submitters seek amendments to Policy 5.7 to recognise that intensification may change urban built form and amenity values over time and that such changes are not, by themselves, adverse effects.