

Urban Environment Effects provides a policy framework for managing the effects of urban growth, urban design and development. It is the most extensive topic in the District Plan and primarily contained in chapter 6. The provisions divide into two groups: (i) district-wide urban objectives and policies; and (ii) settlement-specific policies. The first summary addresses the general district-wide urban objectives. This second summary addresses the settlement policies 6.8 – 16.22.

Councillors are encouraged to read the settlement overviews contained in the full urban environment effects report for background.

GENERAL

General Outcomes

Plan policies and pathways directed at achieving the shared general objective of “maintaining and enhancing the distinctive character of urban settlements and integration between settlements and their adjoining landscapes” are not fully developed. Largely successful outcomes are being achieved, but not always due to the Plan.

Some settlements have experienced growth pressure and benefited from integrated urban plan changes (e.g. Mapua/Ruby Bay) that have addressed distinctive character issues. For others, distinctive character is described or provided for in the Plan (e.g. Marahau, St Arnaud). In some cases, successful outcomes are being achieved through rule provisions that address specific settlement character or site issues that support the resource consenting process and, in other cases, through sensitive resource consenting rather than the Plan.

The policy framework for some settlements that have experienced less growth pressure has not been reviewed since the inception of the Plan. The policies are out of date and need refreshing in consultation with communities.

General Inefficiencies and Gaps

Currently the settlements share one overall objective and there is no settlement hierarchy or expression of the functional relationships between the settlements within the district or within the Nelson Tasman region. Reasons for this are historical. Tasman district and the TRMP emerged from an amalgamation of county and boroughs and their plans. The District has since matured and following district growth modelling and the Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy, 2019 (FDS), the settlement chapters need refining to include objectives for each settlement and the functional relationships between them.

Some settlements with significant natural and cultural heritage values are experiencing ongoing and increasing pressure from tourism, such as St Arnaud, Motueka, Kaiteriteri, Marahau and the coastal environment between them. St Arnaud is protected by the TRMP Landscape Priority Area. The Motueka to Marahau coastal area requires further management and may require protection.

The TRMP as yet does not contain criteria for assessing ‘natural character’ outstanding natural landscapes and features which effects settlement development. This gap currently is being addressed.

Other than in the context of signage, the policy framework for the gateways of settlements is limited. As gateways have the potential to contribute to settlement and district character, this policy framework could be further developed.

The Great Taste Trail (GTT) currently is connecting several settlements and providing new opportunities for small-scale accommodation (home occupations). District-wide policy that acknowledges the GTT and supports small-scale accommodation in both rural and urban locations along the trail is needed to support this opportunity (as recently provided for in Wakefield).

RICHMOND

Issues

Council initiated the Richmond Development Study strategic growth planning process in the early 2000s to provide for the growth of Richmond. The RDS resulted in a series of Plan changes which have been implemented and most, but not all, of the outcomes have been achieved or are on track to being achieved. Outcomes achieved include: (i) planned residential expansion in Richmond South and East (PCs 5 and 20); (ii) mixed urban expansion in Richmond West (PC10); and (iii) residential intensification in central Richmond (PC66).

Outcomes not achieved include the loss of Richmond West as a consolidated future regional business park with an emerging pattern of development that is increasing the risk of cross-boundary/reverse-sensitivity effects between existing industry, new industry and new residential development. Also, there has been limited take up of opportunity for medium density housing in Richmond South and West other than by retirement complexes.

Although some of the Richmond west policies address the relationship of the Richmond West Mixed Business zone to the Richmond town centre, Richmond lacks an overall commercial/business centre hierarchy.

This policy gap has enabled two private plan changes (PPCR 49 and 62) to rezone residential land for supermarket development in the residential areas of Richmond. Although the spatial extent of the rezoned areas is limited, the location of unplanned commercial centres in Residential zones has the potential to affect the amenity of the residential area, the vibrancy of the town centre and the overall development of the town.

The Nelson-Tasman Future Development Strategy, 2019 (FDS) currently is introducing a new phase of growth planning for Richmond (and other settlements). For Richmond, the FDS promotes 'building up' around the Richmond town centre; and 'building out' — greenfield residential expansion in the Hill Street South and Paton Road foothills and a new business park adjacent to the Hope bypass designation.

Motueka

Issues

From about 2012, Council embarked on a strategic growth planning study to assess and plan for the future urban growth needs for the town. The resulting Plan Changes addressed some of the key issues facing the the town including urban consolidation and expansion that avoids or manages hazards such as flooding and the use of high productive land, where practicable. The resultant Plan Changes (43 and 44) focussed on: (i) the consolidation of the urban form, including greenfield development for new residential and industrial areas within, and on the western side of the urban footprint; and (ii) encouraging a different location for commercial development in the town centre. Many of the policy directions set by the Plan Changes have yet to be realised, particularly the development of Motueka West.

Currently, a new or extended phase of growth planning is being introduced through the FDS. The FDS is focussing on the intensification of the older and existing developed parts of the town, particularly on the western side.

Takaka

Issues

In 2004/5 Council embarked on the Takaka and East Golden Bay Futures growth planning project. The Takaka growth provisions were abandoned due to the emphasis on flood modelling and low growth projections. Consequently the policies have not been substantially amended since 1996. The consenting process has addressed the spectrum of issues facing Takaka with the outcome that there has been very limited expansion of the settlement where the land is subject to flood hazard risks. New development has been located on elevated areas or in coastal settlements. Where development has occurred, minimum ground and floor level requirements have been imposed either via the Building Act or resource consent conditions. There remains a need for further industrial land for the settlement which, looking forward, the FDS has confirmed.

The FDS also has identified two residential locations in satellite areas of Takaka (Park Avenue and Rototai Road). This reflects the flood prone nature of the main Takaka township and the inability to provide for significant further development without comprehensive flood mitigation.

Takaka Eastern Golden Bay

Issues

Takaka and East Golden Bay growth planning 2004/5 resulted in the introduction of 'future direction' type policies into the Plan in 2007 that were intended to guide further Plan changes. This further work did not occur resulting in some mismatches between policy and rules such as for Rangihaeata (policies that encourage denser residential development subject to servicing coupled with Closed zone status for subdivision). Nevertheless, the general and effects-based policies that are in this section remain live and relevant. Outcomes are mixed with some achievements such as further residential and rural residential development in Pohara and Ligar Bay; commercial development at Pohara and development of the Port Tarakohe Industrial zone. Other policies have not been achieved (landscape assessment); and yet others are duplicated by other policies in the Plan.

Collingwood

Issues

New development and renewals of existing infrastructure and assets in Collingwood, largely, are occurring in line with policy directives. For example, in 2009, Council obtained consent to reclaim Ruataniwha Inlet foreshore and seabed adjacent to the campground for construction of an access boat launching ramp and jetty, thus substantially enhancing mooring facilities and onshore facilities in Aorere estuary. Also, the new residential development round Ruataniwha Drive is in accordance with policy to avoid the effects of locating development in areas subject to natural hazard.

As new residential development at Ruataniwha Drive largely is taken up, the FDS has identified a new residential area adjacent to it.

Other than from the perspective of growth, this policy set has not been reviewed or updated since the inception of the TRMP.

Settlements adjoining National Parks – (Awaroa, Marahau, Torrent Bay (Abel Tasman), St Arnaud and Rotoroa (Nelson Lakes)) and Kaiteriteri

Issues

These settlements share the common characteristics that they are gateways to or enclosed within national parks, located in sensitive natural and cultural environments; have a significant proportion of holiday homes and experience demand for this purpose.

New development and renewals of existing infrastructure and assets, largely, are occurring in line with policy directives, e.g., the location of the recently developed rural residential and residential areas in St Arnaud and the full servicing and staging of subdivisions between Stephens Bay and Little Kaiteriteri.

Whether "the maintenance and enhancement of the distinctive characters of urban settlements and integration between settlements and their adjoining landscapes" (objective 6.7.2) is being achieved as settlements grow and services are upgraded in response to growth and tourism pressure is not assessed. Also, the issues and policies do not describe or specifically protect some of the distinct and significant features or landscapes of the settlements. This makes it hard to assess whether they are being protected and enhanced. The following warrant description in the Plan: (i) St Arnaud - the significant wetlands, Alpine fault system, the glacial terraces all within or close to the settlement; and (ii) Marahau and Kaiteriteri - the significant natural, heritage and cultural values of the coastal environment within and adjoining the settlements and toward Motueka. If distinctive character outcomes are being achieved, it is due to the successful implementation of the resource consent process.

Other than from the perspective of growth, this policy set has not been reviewed or updated since the inception of the TRMP. The Marahau community has requested that strategic planning be undertaken for their settlement.

Mapua / Ruby Bay

Issues

Plan Change 22 (made operative in 2015) is providing for the growth and integrated urban development of Mapua. The Plan Change thoroughly reviewed and updated the policy set for the settlement. Largely, the policies are still relevant and being implemented.

New development and renewals of existing infrastructure and assets are occurring in line with policy directives. Key outcomes being achieved include: (i) the direction of new residential development away from hazard prone coastal margins to more elevated land north west of the township; (ii) provision of additional land for business growth (in part through remediation of the Fruitgrower Chemical Company site); (iii) the redevelopment of the Māpua wharf into a vibrant and active destination; (iv) a growing linked network of open space and access ways that encourage people to walk and cycle.

Outcomes still to be achieved are a high quality gateway experience for Mapua.

An identified policy gap is the lack of plan provisions that protect cultural heritage. The area is highly sensitive from a cultural heritage and archaeological point of view. These values are not well represented in the current Plan provisions for this settlement. Cultural heritage find-sites and precincts are present in the TRMP but are probably inadequate.

Looking forward, to accommodate expected growth, the FDS has identified the intensification of residential development in the Seaton Valley area and a new commercial area broadly in the vicinity of the intersection of Māpua Drive and Seaton Valley Road.

Brightwater

Issues

Recently, the planning framework for Brightwater was strategically reviewed and replaced by Plan Change 57 – which was made operative in 2016. It is too soon to evaluate the outcomes of the new provisions.

Issues around water supply and stormwater are relevant for uplifting deferred zonings.

There are particular flooding rules that relate to sites in Brightwater. This is an inconsistent way of dealing with flood hazard through the TRMP.

Looking forward, some amendments will be required to Brightwater's policy guidance as a result of the FDS.

Wakefield

Issues

Recently, the planning framework for Wakefield was strategically reviewed and replaced by Plan Change 65, made operative in 2017. It is too soon to evaluate the outcomes of the new provisions.

Looking forward, some amendments will be required to Brightwater's policy guidance as a result of the FDS.

Murchison

Issues

Policy outcomes are achieved in that: (i) carparking facilities have been redeveloped; and (ii) in line with the policy directive, development at the northern end of Grey and Fairfax streets has not occurred.

Submissions to the FDS suggested that there is potential for further growth in Murchison. There is demand for additional commercial land in the CBD and for further residential land. There is pressure to enable further growth and to increase housing options in and around Murchison. Some of this demand for growth has been based on the passage of traffic following the Kaikoura earthquake, and some due to the growing tourism industry. Updated demographic information will clarify this further.

Deferred zoned land in Murchison has not been developed due to servicing constraints.

Looking forward, the FDS is considering options for residential growth in Fairfax Street and business growth in Grey and Hotham streets.

Best Island

Issues

Policies have not been achieved in this small historical settlement due to constraints relating to legal access to properties although, due to a recent change in land ownership, this issue may be resolved (May 2020 update). There is also an ongoing issue of odour from the sewage plant. Looking forward, the extent of inundation on properties located on the coastal margin is likely to increase with sea level rise. Due to this constraint, the settlement is unlikely to grow.

The policy set has not been amended since the inception of the Plan, nor has the community been consulted about settlement issues and future direction.

Tapawera

Issues

Policy outcomes are being achieved in part in that: (i) ex- forestry headquarters is privately owned and utilized; and (ii) no productive rural land has been taken up for urban development. Possibly the latter is due to little growth rather than the policy directive.

Tapawera is well serviced, with a high degree of open space and reserve land, as well as school, shops and facilities. The town has potential for further residential development. To date, the uptake of residential sections in the town has been slow, but recently property interest in Tapawera has increased, possibly due to the consented Kohatu Motorsport Park, formation of Tasman's Great Taste Trail and increased investment in hops. The land currently zoned for further residential development is not being released to the market.

Looking forward, the FDS has earmarked a Rural 1 site on the southern edge of the town for residential expansion. The FDS site is productive land but lies close to the main road.

The policy set has not been amended since the inception of the Plan. It has been effective but circumstances have changed and it needs updating.

Tasman

Issues

Policy outcomes are being achieved for Tasman, e.g.: (i) high standards for on-site wastewater are required by the Plan; and development is contained to the western side of Aporo Road and has not expanded onto surrounding productive land.

The lower part of Tasman is located on poorly draining Moutere clay soils. These soils pose a constraint on any increase in the density of development, unless significant infrastructure is supplied to service the settlement.

Historically, SH60 transected the village and had an adverse effect on Tasman centre in terms of traffic impacts and associated noise. Consequently urban development was contained on the west side of the main highway, predominantly for safety reasons. The rerouting of the Coastal Highway, SH60 has removed this constraint.

Today, the recently developed Great Taste Trail traverses Tasman and brings tourists to the settlement. Also, growth in the Rural 3 zoned area to the east of the settlement is changing its context and impacting on its social services such as the school.

Tasman community is strong and has the potential to grow. However, proposals for further residential or urban development are not pursued due to the constraints on further unserviced (wastewater) development, or, alternatively, the high cost of providing network services to settlement.

The policy set has not been amended since the inception of the Plan, nor has the community been consulted about settlement issues and future direction.

In summary, the policy set has been effective but needs updating.

Upper Moutere

Issues

Few environmental constraints and hazards exist in Upper Moutere other than the existence of clay soils which causes drainage difficulties and result in flooding. Poorly draining soils pose a constraint to any increase in density of development, unless infrastructure is supplied to service the settlement.

The policy set has been effective. Special Domestic Wastewater Disposal Area (SDWDA) provisions assist to manage onsite wastewater systems in the area. Also, business zonings and development have consolidated in line with the policy directive - new commercial development on the western side of the Moutere Highway and industrial development on the eastern side.

The FDS 2019 consulted with the Upper Moutere community about growth planning issues and options for the town. Community feedback on growth options was mixed. Issues raised by the community included lack of servicing and provision of community footpaths and cycleways.

Recommendations

General recommendations

1. Rationalise chapter so that all settlement policies are located within the settlement area sub-chapters and the general objectives 6.1 - 6.7 contain only general policies.
2. Consult with communities to develop objectives for each settlement with aligned policies that better reflect and support the 'distinctive' character of the settlement.
3. Address policy gaps (design of settlement gateways, natural and built character values).
4. Introduce policy to help protect and manage the use of locations with significant heritage, cultural and natural values under pressure from tourism such as the coastal environment between Motueka and Marahau.
5. Develop new policy that acknowledges the impact of the Tasman Great Taste Trail and supports the provision of small-scale guest accommodation, attractions and commercial opportunities (with appropriate limits) in locations along the trail, as recently provided for in Wakefield.

Richmond

6. Provide for a business or town centre hierarchy for Richmond (and other Tasman settlements) to help manage business development in Richmond (and other towns) in accordance with the town's strategic growth objectives - that accounts for Nelson.

Motueka

7. Encourage opportunities for the regeneration of buildings along High Street using good urban design outcomes.

Takaka

8. Address a significantly wider range of issues than is currently the case, such as the issue of connectivity for the smaller population centres beyond the main town centre to Takaka and the distinctive character of Takaka town.

Takaka Eastern Golden Bay

9. Consider whether the TEGB area needs to be extended to include Wainui Bay and review the relevance and adequacy of the policy set to respond to current issues.

Collingwood

10. Consult the community about planning issues and priorities for their settlement and thereafter update the policy set.

Settlements adjoining National Parks – (Awaroa, Marahau, Torrent Bay (Abel Tasman), St Arnaud and Rotoroa (Nelson Lakes)) and Kaiteriteri

11. Identify specific significant features and landscapes in the Plan, e.g. for St Arnaud - the significant wetlands, alpine fault system, glacial terraces all within or close to the settlement.
12. As mentioned in chapter 6.7 (of the District-wide section), consider introducing policy to specifically protect and manage environments with significant historic, cultural, natural values that are under pressure from tourism, such as the coastal area between Motueka and Marahau.
13. Consult the communities about planning issues and priorities for their settlement and thereafter update the policy set.
14. Council partner with the Kaiteriteri Recreation Reserve Board when reviewing the policy set for Kaiteriteri.

Mapua/Ruby Bay

15. A key recommendation for Mapua/Ruby Bay is the provision of further cultural heritage precincts and better information about the sensitivities.
16. Further spatial planning is needed to accommodate the considerable growth expected in the area. The sites identified by the FDS for development require further investigation and additional services and facilities need to be planned for.
17. Consult the community about planning issues and priorities for their settlement and review the policy set after feedback is received. With development pushing more intensively inland, there is an opportunity to establish a wider community vision for Seaton Valley area that could include areas for restoration and revegetation.

Brightwater

18. Standardise the treatment of flood hazard rules across the Plan.
19. Amend the policy framework to align with the FDS recommendations for intensification within and for further residential and rural residential development around Brightwater.

Wakefield

20. Delete policy provisions (relating to the protection of trees and historic places) that are not particular to Wakefield but apply across the District.
21. Amend the policy framework to align with FDS recommendations for the intensification of central Wakefield and to provide the community with an opportunity to respond to the proposals.

Murchison

22. Review issues comprehensively and investigate areas for additional Commercial and Industrial zones.

Best Island

23. As part of this review process, consult the community about planning issues and priorities for their settlement, including future direction. Thereafter update the policy set.
24. On review, update the issues and include a policy that: (i) recognises the constraint of inadequate access (if not resolved) and risk of inundation due to the low level of the island, and (ii) limits or closes the opportunity for further urban development on the island for these reasons.
Alternatively:
Consider whether Best Island requires its own policy set given its current capacity and its constraints to further development.

Tapawera, Tasman and Upper Moutere

25. Consult the community about planning issues and priorities for their settlements and thereafter update policy sets.

