

## Mapua Boat Ramp Submission Summary

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
1.	Bridget Castle	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Advantages of regaining Grossi Point outweigh disadvantages</li> <li>2. Sea scouts need a good facility, will be a good community resource</li> </ol>	S	Grant Consent – conditions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have excellent engineering design</li> <li>• Supervision during construction for HAIL land</li> <li>• Boat seeds leaving estuary</li> </ul>
2.	Elaine & Graham Fisher	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Grossi point is not ideal for several reasons including cultural significance.</li> <li>2. New ramp will relieve pressure on Grossi Point and provide safe place for boat launching.</li> <li>3. Sea scout facility is investment in young people.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
3.	Margot & Peter Syms	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Grossi point could be returned to recreational reserve as boat launching is inappropriate – issues with safety, fish waste and boat speed</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
4.	Trisha Strickland	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Easy access to coast, positive effects and opportunities for boating and water sports.</li> <li>2. Local resource and meeting place / community asset</li> <li>3. Utilise natural and physical resources</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
5.	Robert Smith	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ramp and associated buildings will be a great asset to community.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
6.	David Jeffery	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Essential for a seaside community</li> <li>2. If Grossi Point was available long term new ramp would not be required but Grossi point may not be available long term.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
7.	Stephen Sheaf	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Major change which will detract from the character of waterfront.</li> <li>2. Significantly increase traffic and congestion.</li> <li>3. Removal of car parking, those with mobility issues will be disadvantaged</li> <li>4. There is an existing community hall</li> <li>5. Only of benefit to boating fraternity with a cost to other residents.</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent – Council to undertake surveys and corrective action for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic movements and congestion</li> <li>• Impact on affected community</li> <li>• Impact on local business</li> </ul>

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
8.	Susan Butler	1. Boat ramp was always meant to be replaced.	S	Grant consent
9.	John Lister	1. Ramp is too large and in a dangerous position. 2. Better launching options in Nelson & Motueka 3. Ramp & Sea Scout building at Grossi Point could be developed	O	Decline consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Move to Grossi point</li> <li>• No sea scout building</li> <li>• No restrictions to current wharf and no exclusive use of kite park area.</li> </ul>
10.	Margaret Pidgeon	1. Community should have water access – need for safe boat ramp. 2. TDC commitment to community following closure of original boat ramp. 3. Safe & quick access to water for rescues.	S	Grant consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited access by locals and limited outsiders – to control traffic congestion.</li> <li>• Historic wharf buildings are retained in public ownership under TDC control.</li> <li>• Staged construction – boat ramp then building.</li> <li>• Ensure there is sufficient recreational open space left for other community activities.</li> </ul>
11.	Lionel & Linda Jenkins	1. Use of Grossi Point for boat launching is unsatisfactory and should be blocked off for motorised craft. 2. Reserve area is currently under utilised, boat ramp makes use of this space.	S	Grant consent
12.	Alison & Jim Muckle	1. Enable boating in an area where swimming etc are unlikely. 2. Use of Grossi point for boat launching has potential for conflict with swimmers etc.	S	Grant consent
13.	Graham Ussher	1. Health & safety 2. Ecology 3. Community values	O	Decline
14.	Elizabeth Ussher	1. Health & safety – conflict with swimmers 2. Noise 3. Traffic – increase on narrow roads 4. Public amenity – seems to cater for small percentage of population	O	Decline
15.	Jeff Quartly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grossi point is ideal to continue using.</li> <li>• Boat club / sea scouts could use museum for more space</li> <li>• Condition of government funding for clean up of</li> </ul>	O	Decline <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If boat ramp is privately run then money from Council should be repaid</li> </ul>

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		<p>contaminated land – land used for community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of reserve land for community</li> <li>• Mapua hall is available for community functions.</li> <li>• Boat ramp is a commercial operation not a community activity.</li> <li>• Traffic volume, safety – intersection with Mapua Drive.</li> <li>• Concern over boats tying up at the pontoon – conflict with other users etc. swimmers / fishing.</li> <li>• Increase in noise.</li> </ul>		
16.	Anne & Bob Phillips	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cost burden to ratepayers</li> <li>2. Public safety – contaminant bunding</li> <li>3. Loss of walkway along waterfront</li> <li>4. Loss of community public space</li> <li>5. Traffic congestion on narrow roads.</li> </ol>	O	Decline
17.	Shelia Lyons	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Other nearby boat ramps available.</li> <li>2. Sea scout building is not just for sea scouts – bar facilities.</li> <li>3. Loss of car parking, detrimental to commercial businesses.</li> <li>4. Western side of Tahī street is used for informal recreation / overflow car parking.</li> <li>5. Sea Scout building does not fit into natural landscape, inappropriate appearance.</li> <li>6. Effects of estuary birds, loss of vegetation.</li> <li>7. Noise (lives at 27B Aranui Road)</li> <li>8. Traffic – congestion &amp; safety – at present less boats using Grossi Point than would use boat ramp</li> <li>9. Pollution – dust from car parking area</li> <li>10. Health &amp; safety – conflict between boats &amp; swimmers</li> <li>11. Contaminated land</li> <li>12. No benefit to wider community</li> <li>13. Survey results are incorrect.</li> </ol>	O	Decline

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
18.	Samuel Richards	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Community good</li> <li>2. Reduce impact on Grossi Point beach</li> <li>3. Safer – delineation between beach users and boating area</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
19.	Sally Hargreaves	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sea scout benefits to children</li> <li>2. Only needed due to closure of original boat ramp and potential for closing Grossi Point to motorised craft.</li> <li>3. Contaminated land will be managed</li> <li>4. Existing car park underutilised – ramp will facilitate connection to wharf. Alternative parking is sensible and unlikely to be increase in traffic.</li> <li>5. Coastal engineer's report confirms suitability of ramp for launching.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
20.	Frederick Cassin	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Right to boat launching</li> <li>2. TDC removed access to original ramp and should allow for a replacement.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
21.	Di O'Halloran	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Survey results are incorrect</li> <li>2. No need for boat ramp – Grossi Point can continue to be used.</li> <li>3. Loss of public green space.</li> <li>4. Contaminated land disturbance.</li> <li>5. Traffic congestion.</li> <li>6. Loss of boat clubrooms from wharf risks commercial interest.</li> </ol>	O	Decline
22.	David Briggs	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of public access and open green space</li> <li>2. Release of dangerous contaminants during construction</li> <li>3. Use of cement will release greenhouse gases – we should be reducing emissions.</li> <li>4. Traffic congestion, pollution, noise &amp; safety</li> <li>5. Other alternative boat ramps (Motueka &amp; Rabbit Island)</li> <li>6. Inconsistent with other tourist &amp; recreational activities nearby – not representative of community wishes.</li> </ol>	O	Decline <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public access maintained</li> <li>• Greenhouse gas emissions (construction and use) offset</li> <li>• Vehicle access limited to daylight hours</li> <li>• Equivalent open space provided elsewhere</li> <li>• Further public consultation on traffic management</li> <li>• Construction independently monitored in relation to risk of contaminant release</li> </ul>
23.	Geoffrey & Felicity McBride	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sufficient room for traffic and parking.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		2. Safer boat launching than Grossi Point.		
24.	Dawn Carter	No reasons given	S	Grant consent
25.	Amanda Brett	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Understands importance of sea scouts operating in a safe environment.</li> <li>2. Sea scouts are allowed to use existing boat ramp and have 2 launching options. If these were to go would support new restricted ramp and community building.</li> <li>3. Lack of storage space for sea scouts.</li> </ol>	N	Grant consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exclusion area around wharf for boats over 4m between 10am-11pm &amp; speed limit.</li> <li>• Trial period – no launching November – March on peak flow of outgoing tide to reduce danger for boaties and conflict with wharf jumpers.</li> </ul>
26.	Michael Loughran	1. Alleviate parking & launching at Grossi Point – allow improvements for other uses.	S	Grant consent
27.	Susan Dasler	No reason given	S	Grant consent
28.	David Landreth	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Benefit to Mapua community</li> <li>2. Bring more people to wharf area</li> <li>3. Easier boat access and free up Grossi point for other users</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
29.	John Frizelle	1. Grossi point is inadequate for some vessels.	S	Grant consent
30.	Wayne Daniel	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concerned over delay with replacement ramp.</li> <li>2. Small opposition from those who do not boat and understand boating.</li> <li>3. Majority of boats using Mapua to launch are small (4-6.5m) people don't want to drive to Motueka or Nelson.</li> <li>4. Grossi point will continue to be used if the boat ramp doesn't go ahead – TDC will not be able to stop people.</li> <li>5. Nelson Tasman has largest growing boat use.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
31.	David Chatwin	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Need for new safe launching facility.</li> <li>2. Current use of Grossi Point has drawbacks</li> <li>3. Ramp will help improve safety in estuary.</li> <li>4. Sea scouts need new building to allowed continuance.</li> <li>5. Good use of unusable land.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
32.	Kathleen Trott	1. The ramp & sea scout / community building are important for the future of Mapua.	S	Grant consent
33.	Fish Mainland Inc.	1. Need for boat ramp – cites survey with Tasman recording highest boat ownership / usage in country. 2. Traffic will be reduced compared to use of Grossi Point. 3. Grossi Point will freed up for other activities 4. Ramp will assist involvement with Sea Scouts. 5. Local support – survey.	S	Grant consent
34.	Susan Hassall	1. Council agreed to replace the closed boat ramp – ramp is a replacement.	S	Grant consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grossi point is used for non powered craft &amp; swimming and as a park / reserve.</li> </ul>
35.	Gordon & Sue Adamson	1. Safety issue – in water and on road – conflict with wharf jumpers. 2. Increase in noise 3. Pollution from boat motors 4. Traffic congestion. 5. Lack of consultation / information. 6. Cost of barrier arm cards. 7. Concern around changing tidal flows.	O	Decline consent
36.	Brett Glass	1. High risk due to high current flow and proximity to wharf. 2. In favour of ramp and sea scout building but not in this location.	O	Decline consent
37.	Fiona Wilson	1. Launching boats at Grossi Point is hazardous & culturally insensitive 2. Travelling to Motueka or Nelson uses more fuel – environmental issue. 3. Youth are in need to activities and facilities – new building can have range of uses.	S	Grant consent No conditions
38.	Nathan Fa'avae	No reasons given	S	Grant consent
39.	Moiria Tilling	1. Concerned services which require trenching below the protective soil cap will result in health problems as a result of releasing contaminants.	O	Decline consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stormwater pipe relocated away from capped soil</li> </ul>

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Another site found without capped soil or clubhouse is just for storage and no service connections.</li> </ul>
40.	Rob Edmonds	1. Consider non-intrusive foundation design.	S	Grant consent
41.	Timothy Hawthorne	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The boat ramp is too large</li> <li>Loss of public green space for wider community</li> <li>Boat noise and traffic increase</li> <li>Wharf jumping may become dangerous</li> <li>Traffic increase.</li> <li>Proposal should be scale back and limited to local community residents.</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limit access to residents of Mapua, Tasman, Mahana &amp; Lower Moutere</li> <li>Reduce size of buildings and car parking and land allocated to them.</li> </ul>
42.	William Ashley	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Beneficial to fishing club with opportunity for safe local boat launching – using Grossi Point is not easy.</li> <li>Wharf area and waterfront park is the ideal location.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
43.	Paul Harper	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Safer launching and retrieval.</li> <li>Grossi Point requires driving on the estuary to get to deep enough water with limited parking.</li> <li>Tide flow at Grossi Point is stronger than natural back eddy at new ramp – this must be safer.</li> <li>Benefit boating related organisations.</li> <li>Will replace boat ramp lost.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
44.	Grant Palliser	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Replace the original</li> <li>Free up and preserve Grossi Point – boat launching is inappropriate and cultural significance should be acknowledged.</li> <li>Meet the needs of the current and future community.</li> <li>New scout facility will meet future needs.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure environment is protected by preserving integrity of protective layer over contaminated soils.</li> <li>Freedom for community activities on the wharf are not impeded by future commercial developments on sites occupied by museum and clubroom.</li> </ul>
45.	Allison Howitt	No reason given	S (based on cover email)	
46.	Dale & Alan Stark	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Over the top – too large and no need</li> <li>Poor use of public land</li> </ol>	O	Not stated No breaking of contamination seal

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Breaking the seal on the contaminated land goes against conservation policies.</li> <li>4. Grossi Point has a perfectly good boat ramp and could be improved.</li> </ol>		
47.	Raymond Bolderson	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Grossi Point is busy with swimmers, the ramp would free up Grossi Point.</li> <li>2. Need a ramp.</li> <li>3. Use of fuel travelling to other ramps</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council provides adequate parking</li> <li>• Walking access across the ramp is provided</li> </ul>
48.	Jennifer Bolderson	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Grossi Point is too busy and doesn't have sufficient parking.</li> <li>2. Other boat ramps are too far away.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
49.	Martyn Barlow	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Stantec regional boat study contained errors.</li> <li>2. Region is not well served by boat access, compounded by loss of Mapua boat ramp.</li> <li>3. Sea scout building will allow sea scouts to meet their need and accommodate new members.</li> <li>4. Recreational fishing and boating contributes to regional economy, high boat ownership in Tasman.</li> <li>5. Positive community benefit.</li> <li>6. Positive outcome by removing powered trailer boats from Grossi Point.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
50.	Mark Hardcastle	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Strategic asset to Mapua area.</li> <li>2. Attract locals and tourists. Benefit to local economy.</li> <li>3. Encourage healthy outdoor pursuits which are good for mental health, safe launching, 'go to' destination for tourists.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
51.	Braden Stanton	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Scale of boat ramp.</li> <li>2. Loss of public reserve and open space.</li> <li>3. Proposed building will effectively privatise reserve land and prevent community use.</li> <li>4. Loss of car parking with replacement built on reserve – scale of car parking.</li> </ol>	O	Decline Consent



Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Barrier arm, signage, traffic modifications.</li> <li>6. Stormwater</li> <li>7. Traffic volume.</li> <li>8. Adverse effects on Mapua – retain Grossi Point and support Motueka ramp.</li> <li>9. Visibility of ramp – adverse visual effects.</li> <li>10. Safety – volume of vehicles, risk plan unsuitable, conflict with wharf jumping / swimming, no pontoon.</li> <li>11. Traffic effects inc. along Mapua Drive.</li> <li>12. Risk from contaminated soil.</li> <li>13. Lack of community consultation.</li> <li>14. Council conflict of interest.</li> </ol>		
52.	Esme Palliser	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Replacement boat ramp is overdue</li> <li>2. Community reserve status of Grossi Point overdue – cultural significance can be promoted &amp; respected.</li> <li>3. Sea Scout / community rooms are welcomed addition – asset to community.</li> <li>4. Storage &amp; display of watercraft / historic craft will enhance Mapua</li> </ol>	S	<p>Grant consent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No contaminated soil cap to be disturbed</li> <li>• Parking in the ‘kite park’ area well marked for boat trailers</li> <li>• Waterfront park landscaped to ensure increased activities.</li> </ul>
53.	Rachel Stanton	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Scale of boat ramp.</li> <li>2. Loss of public reserve and open space.</li> <li>3. Proposed building will effectively privatise reserve land and prevent community use.</li> <li>4. Loss of car parking with replacement built on reserve – scale of car parking.</li> <li>5. Barrier arm, signage, traffic modifications.</li> <li>6. Stormwater</li> <li>7. Traffic volume.</li> <li>8. Adverse effects on Mapua – retain Grossi Point and support Motueka ramp.</li> <li>9. Visibility of ramp – adverse visual effects.</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		<p>10. Safety – volume of vehicles, risk plan unsuitable, conflict with wharf jumping / swimming, no pontoon.</p> <p>11. Traffic effects inc. along Mapua Drive.</p> <p>12. Risk from contaminated soil.</p> <p>13. Lack of community consultation.</p> <p>14. Council conflict of interest.</p>		
54.	Alan Field	<p>1. Most convenient &amp; safe place to launch in Nelson with access to Tasman Bay</p> <p>2. Timing of boat launching will mitigate conflicts with other public.</p> <p>3. Plenty of parking which will primarily be used early in the morning.</p> <p>4. Boating is an important activity for Mapua residents.</p> <p>5. Council should allow for launching facilities given they removed access to the original ramp.</p>	S	Grant consent
55.	Lorraine Field	<p>1. Boating is a wonderful pursuit.</p> <p>2. Plenty of green space left and boaties have gone home by mid-morning.</p> <p>3. Launching at Motueka is not easy, Rough Island isn't for amateurs.</p> <p>4. Grossi Point would be a lovely picnic area without boats, safer.</p>	S	Grant consent
56.	Kevin Strickland	<p>1. Tasman Coastal Rowing Club is looking forward to utilising the new building. The new facilities will help membership grow.</p>	S	Grant consent
57.	Bruce Calteaux	<p>1. Grossi point will be reinstated as a reserve – a recent count was 48 vehicles and trailers leaving no useable space for other recreation activities.</p>	S	<p>Grant consent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduce a small fee to cover maintenance costs &amp; income for sea scouts.</li> <li>• Not supportive of a wash down bay due to engine noise.</li> </ul>
58.	Geoff McAlpine	<p>1. Limited benefits for wider community.</p> <p>2. Cost burden for ratepayers and use of TDC funding when there are higher priorities (wastewater discharge)</p>	O	Decline consent

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Sea scouts are able to use existing ramp but launching in Mapua is rare due to conditions, building is too large for sea scouts needs.</li> <li>4. Impact on cultural values.</li> <li>5. Safety risk as highlighted in 2017 report from Harbour master</li> <li>6. Congestion from boat trailer parking and loss of open space for parking which is only required for short periods of time.</li> <li>7. Concern over accuracy of survey</li> </ul>		
59.	Lindsey Byrne	No reasons given	S	Grant consent
60.	Amy Deimel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Adverse effects on environment – landscape, amenity values, ecology &amp; local environment.</li> <li>2. Safety – queuing in swift moving channel, no loading pontoon, conflict with wharf &amp; pontoon.</li> <li>3. Recreational use of wharf affected – conflict with swimmers and other users, potential for future banning of wharf jumping.</li> <li>4. Loss of public open space – effective privatisation of public space.</li> <li>5. Building on Council recreation land inappropriate – concern over use for community events.</li> <li>6. Car &amp; trailer parking -scale and level of car movements create adverse visual/amenity effects, noise and safety issues.</li> <li>7. Scale of activity – disproportionate to community – Motueka is available.</li> <li>8. Concern over management of earthworks of contaminated soils – material could be carried into estuary.</li> <li>9. Contrary to Mapua Masterplan</li> <li>10. Concern over accuracy of survey.</li> </ul>	O	Decline Consent

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
61.	Michael Shirer	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ramp and sea scout building provide facilities for growing community.</li> <li>2. Positive effects of allowing for better public space at Grossi Point by separating larger boat launching.</li> <li>3. Facilities for community groups, including sea scouts</li> <li>4. Better use of public space new the wharf.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pedestrian crossing priority at ramp and carpark</li> <li>• Sea lane route for boats approaching &amp; leaving ramp, separation from wharf area.</li> </ul>
62.	Maureen Clinton-Baker	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Boat ramp and sea scout club location are part of village &amp; coastal character.</li> <li>2. Launching from Grossi Point isn't easy.</li> <li>3. Waterfront park is ideal place for ramp and western Tahī St ideal for parking.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
63.	Elizabeth Harper	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Proposal addresses loss of original ramp.</li> <li>2. Current use of Grossi Point for launching is not ideal – driving onto estuary.</li> <li>3. Location is safer due to natural back eddy which reduces tidal flow.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
64.	Gavin Arnold	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Currently launches boat from Grossi Point</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
65.	Richard Boyd	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mapua has always been a thriving boat port until the original ramp was closed.</li> <li>2. Safer than mix of boats &amp; swimmers &amp; strong currents at Grossi Point</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
66.	Helen Jeffery	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support from community for these activities.</li> <li>2. Growing community needs facilities for enjoying water safely.</li> <li>3. Will not interfere with wharf jumping.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grossi Point closed to power boats and made into picnic / swimming area with bbq facilities.</li> </ul>
67.	Grant Adamson	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Congestion along Aranui Road.</li> <li>2. Noisy for residents and nearby restaurant.</li> <li>3. Hazard with swimming &amp; fishing from wharf.</li> <li>4. Grossi Point is adequate, Rough Island could be upgraded.</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		5. Sea scouts need a new area but Mapua Channel is not ideal.		
68.	Raymond Clarke	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Benefit the wharf precinct to complement seaside recreational area.</li> <li>Growing population with high boat ownership ramp will provide safe launching area.</li> <li>Educational benefit for community.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
69.	Irene Schrieber	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enhance recreational area.</li> <li>Safe place for boats to launch &amp; sports hub for other water groups.</li> <li>Return Grossi Point for use of families &amp; swimming.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
70.	Julie Evans & Michael Burton	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Large scale of activity will change nature of the area and impact on community use.</li> <li>Increase in traffic.</li> <li>Boats, jet skis etc bring noise and hazards.</li> <li>Misleading claims on community support.</li> <li>Extensive footprint will impact on recovering coastal environment.</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent
71.	Malcolm Hepburn	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of green space for public recreation.</li> <li>Management of toxic land.</li> <li>Regular user of Grossi Point and never seen an abundance of trailers which impede public access.</li> <li>Most boats can access Grossi Point at high tide.</li> <li>No issue with using Grossi Point.</li> <li>Current parking is very busy at weekends, impact of car &amp; trailer parking.</li> <li>Traffic crossing Tahi Street.</li> <li>Public safety shouldn't be compromised for boat ramp.</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent
72.	Colin Walker	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community needs a local ramp, estimate 20% Mapua households have a boat.</li> <li>Building will be an asset to Mapua and wider district, club rooms and facilities are</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TDC pay total cost of ramp as it's a replacement ramp.</li> <li>Sea Scout / community building is a light timber structure built on floating foundation to avoid land disturbance, stormwater goes to Aranui Road.</li> </ul>

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		<p>permitted uses on recreational reserves.</p> <p>3. Parking takes up too much room within the Mapua Special Development Area – this should be used for smaller homes.</p> <p>4. Current pétanque area is unsuitable as it slopes and children's play area is needed.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No parking at 'Kite Park' parking for cars &amp; trailers angled parking on western side of Tahī St &amp; more parking on eastern side of Tahī St.</li> <li>Pétanque area relocated to flat site &amp; playground sited on land away from hazards of waterfront.</li> <li>Smaller alternative building with 3 bays.</li> </ul>
73.	Kristine Marriott	<p>1. Grossi Point has cultural significance and can revert to a family picnic area with the new boat ramp.</p> <p>2. Mapua will benefit financially and recreationally.</p> <p>3. Great asset to the community.</p>	S	Grant consent
74.	Janice Crooks	1. Council removed original boat ramp and Mapua needs a new one.	S	Grant consent – no conditions
75.	Kevin Crooks	1. Council removed original boat ramp and Mapua needs a new one.	S	Grant consent
76.	Kathryn Barlow	<p>1. Council has disregarded statutory obligations regarding several aspects of RM150521 – the consent rendered the ramp inaccessible, the proposal is for a replacement ramp. The Mapua Boat Club, Sea Scouts &amp; ramp users weren't considered in consent.</p> <p>2. TDC did have regard to RMA, MCAA, NZCPS, HNZPTA, LGA in shed 4 consent – legislation quoted</p> <p>3. TDC is governed by LTP 2015-2025, TRPS, TDC Coastal Structures AMP 2015-2045 – sections quoted.</p> <p>4. Excerpts from RCA provided.</p> <p>5. Excerpts from minutes of Council meetings 1 April 2009 – 16 November 2016 provided to some timeline &amp; inconsistencies in information provided to community &amp; within Council.</p>	S	Grant consent
77.	Michael Borden	1. Ramp will be disruptive to scale of lifestyle of community.	O	<p>Decline consent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove planter boxes along Aranui Road to provide more parking.</li> </ul>

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Traffic increase on Aranui Road.</li> <li>3. Boat traffic will destroy peace and quiet of area.</li> <li>4. Disruption of soil could be dangerous.</li> </ol>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Speed limit of 30k/ph along Aranui Road.</li> <li>• Limited days and hours for use of ramp.</li> <li>• Launch fee should go to Mapua community for improvements as defined by community not TDC.</li> </ul>
78.	Marion Copp	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Continued access to the estuary</li> <li>2. Boating provides for social well-being of many families.</li> <li>3. No increase in traffic as boats are currently launched from Grossi Point.</li> <li>4. Parking on western side of Tahī Street will free up Gross Point for picnics &amp; swimming.</li> <li>5. Sea Scout / community building will allow them to move from busy wharf.</li> <li>6. Ramp will allow for safe emergency launching at any tide.</li> <li>7. Ramp will be located in highly modified environment.</li> <li>8. Contamination risk can be managed.</li> <li>9. Ecology of CMA will not be adversely affected.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
79.	Peter Copp	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Continued access to the estuary</li> <li>2. Boating provides for social well-being of many families.</li> <li>3. No increase in traffic as boats are currently launched from Grossi Point.</li> <li>4. Parking on western side of Tahī Street will free up Gross Point for picnics &amp; swimming.</li> <li>5. Sea Scout / community building will allow them to move from busy wharf.</li> <li>6. Ramp will allow for safe emergency launching at any tide.</li> <li>7. Ramp will be located in highly modified environment.</li> <li>8. Contamination risk can be managed.</li> <li>9. Ecology of CMA will not be adversely affected.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
80.	David Kemp	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Priority for visitors on foot and private vehicle usage is needed.</li> <li>2. Cars &amp; trailers in pedestrian area is out of place. Times of movements would be refused for other activities due to quiet residential township.</li> <li>3. No negatives provided in application.</li> <li>4. Another location would be preferable for ramp e.g. Rabbit Island.</li> </ol>	O	Not stated
81.	John Jackson	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Replacement ramp following TDC approved redevelopment of wharf area.</li> <li>2. Support enhancement and continuation of activities carried out by Boat Club and Sea Scouts.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TDC should not develop space adj to proposed Sea Scout building labelled as 'Future development space' on plans.</li> <li>• Sea Scout building should have showers.</li> </ul>
82.	Tord Kjellstrom	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Boat users are small percentage of community who could use Gross Point or other local ramps e.g. Motueka.</li> <li>2. Safety issues when tide flow is strong, limit wharf jumping &amp; swimming.</li> <li>3. Traffic increase</li> <li>4. Environmental hazard from disturbance of contaminated soils</li> <li>5. Cost and implications for TDC funding increasing rates.</li> <li>6. Shade and wind shelter facilities would be better use of funds.</li> <li>7. Loss of 'Kite Park' for car parking – more appropriate for retirement facility.</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent
83.	James Carter	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of visual amenity for Tahī Street residents from large building, additional traffic, noise from boat ramp and loss of safe beach access.</li> <li>2. Loss of amenity at waterfront park for locals &amp; visitors.</li> <li>3. Conflict between boats launching and collecting passengers from pontoon and wharf jumpers and swimmers.</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise control / reduced operating hours to minimise impacts on Tahī St residents.</li> <li>• Proper risk assessment and mitigation of safety hazard – relying on local MBC members is not effective mitigation. Signage is ineffective (base don experience in Wellington). Significant risk, applicant and TDC have PCBUs under Health &amp; Safety at</li> </ul>



Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Safety concerns from people crossing the an operating boat ramp.</li> <li>5. Has provided risk assessment. High risk to swimmers / wharf jumping. Medium risk for crossing ramp.</li> </ol>		<p>Work Act to take all reasonable steps to ensure the safety of the public.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unimpeded safe access from the wharf to the beach (not crossing ramp).</li> </ul>
84.	Kevin & Jillian Higgs	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Hard to justify support – want rather than need.</li> <li>2. Scouts have managed with existing facilities.</li> <li>3. Grossi Point offers good launching but has limits. Other facilities for larger boats are available.</li> <li>4. Increased noise from traffic arriving at 4.30am</li> <li>5. Wharf area being over developed at expense of community.</li> </ol>	O	<p>Decline consent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Upgrade cycle pedestrian crossing or impose 30k/ph limit on Higgs Road</li> <li>• No boats or trailers before 6am.</li> </ul>
85.	John Ralfe	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Urgent need for safe ramp for Mapua and wider area.</li> <li>2. Injustice from loss of access to original boat ramp.</li> <li>3. Grossi Point has been a dangerous alternative boat launching area due to conflicts with swimmers etc.</li> </ol>	S	<p>Grant consent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use restricted to 5am-9pm</li> <li>• Restricted to boats smaller than specified by Council.</li> </ul>
86.	Annette Walker <b>(Written Approval provided)</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Agree in principle but unhappy about the design and placement of the scout building, the ramp being concrete and part of Kite Park grassed being turned into a car park.</li> <li>2. Scout building is too large.</li> <li>3. 2 species of Oyster catchers (birds) have fed and hung out on the grass area at high tide – car parking at Kits Park</li> </ol>	S	<p>Grant consent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building profile changed to gable design</li> <li>• Tahī Street be redirected from Aranui Road bend across to 13 Tahī Street – the building is on residential land on the opposite side of Tahī Street.</li> <li>• The access to the ramp is gravelled not concrete.</li> </ul>
87.	Ngāti Tama Ki Te Waipounamu Trust	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mapua is a cultural significant area and Ngāti Tama have a vested interest in current and future developments in Mapua.</li> <li>2. Encouraging development in an environment that is highly sacred in the CMA and surrounding foreshore would be highly insensitive to that area.</li> <li>3. The place should maintain its sacredness as a wahi tapu.</li> </ol>	O	<p>Decline consent</p>

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
88.	Jeremy Dash	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Link to Mapua Masterplan &amp; feedback &amp; previous advice for Tasman Bay Regional Boat Ramp study.</li> <li>2. Cumulative effect of activity is major and is fundamental conflict both in scale and risk</li> <li>3. Earthworks on a remediated site &amp; risk of toxin discharge.</li> <li>4. Inconsistent with Tasman Bay Regional Boat Ramp study.</li> <li>5. Safety issues, inexperienced boaties near the wharf, large ramp and pedestrians.</li> <li>6. Traffic congestion on Aranui Road.</li> <li>7. Scale of building and no aesthetic consideration.</li> <li>8. Size of boat ramp – not a reinstatement of what was lost.</li> <li>9. Domination of Waterfront park.</li> <li>10. Process Boat Club have operated.</li> <li>11. Lack of open transparent public consultation – mismatch between what is proposed and people think is proposed.</li> <li>12. Lack of alternative scaled down option to give community choice.</li> <li>13. Danger to safety – swimming, wharf jumping etc</li> <li>14. Noise from boats</li> <li>15. Upgrades to Grossi Point could be an alternative</li> </ol>	O	<p>Decline consent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limit size of ramp consistent with small boats</li> <li>• Limit size &amp; style of building to be consistent with existing wharf buildings.</li> <li>• No disturbance of seabed.</li> <li>• Planting of trees around boat planting area.</li> <li>• Large buoys with attached ropes to the side and further out into the channel to ensure water craft do not drift towards the wharf.</li> <li>• Retain wharf as it is today with tables and wharf jumping.</li> </ul>
89.	Julie Dash	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Adverse effects on existing environment – high natural character, landscape, amenity values, ecology.</li> <li>2. Safety - increase in boats using channel, queues, debris accumulation, no loading pontoon, conflict with high use wharf area – safety risk for boat &amp; recreational users.</li> <li>3. Recreational use adverse effects – conflicts with other uses, risk of wharf jumping being banned in future.</li> <li>4. Limiting public access / privatisation of public space – ramp over foreshore, building</li> </ol>	O	<p>Decline consent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limit size of ramp consistent with small boats</li> <li>• Limit size &amp; style of building to be consistent with existing wharf buildings.</li> <li>• No disturbance of seabed.</li> <li>• Planting of trees around boat planting area.</li> <li>• Large buoys with attached ropes to the side and further out into the channel to ensure water craft do not drift towards the wharf.</li> <li>• Retain wharf as it is today with tables and wharf jumping.</li> </ul>

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		<p>and all associated activities – loss of public space valued by community.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Inappropriate building on Council land – should be preserved for public use.</li> <li>6. Scale of car parking, significant adverse visual, amenity, traffic, noise and safety effects.</li> <li>7. Increase traffic effects, clogging roads, conflict and safety risks. Use of Aranui &amp; Higgs Road.</li> <li>8. Scale is out of proportion to what is appropriate for Mapua community in the location.</li> <li>9. Risks from toxic soils - risk of toxic material carried to estuary.</li> <li>10. Contrary to Mapua Masterplan.</li> <li>11. Issues with survey undertaken.</li> <li>12. Contrary to RMA, NZCPS &amp; TRMP.</li> </ol>		
90.	Ruth O'Neill	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Will serve a small group of community, can use Grossi Point or Motueka, Rabbit Island etc.</li> <li>2. Safety issue when tide flow is strong, movements close to wharf will limit swimming &amp; jumping.</li> <li>3. Increase traffic of boats &amp; trailers &amp; use of petrol station.</li> <li>4. Limitations on disturbance of polluted soil, potential for environmental hazard.</li> <li>5. Cost of proposal</li> <li>6. Community better served with shade &amp; wind-shelter facilities at waterfront park.</li> <li>7. Kite Park should not be used for car &amp; car-trailer parking.</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent
91.	Robert Lancaster	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Waterfront park given to community by Govt after remediation, should not be compromised.</li> <li>2. Contrary to 'Options for Waterfront Area – 2017' TDC report which dismissed boat ramp plan.</li> <li>3. Size of development, visible incursions of boats, trailers &amp; trucks is excessive.</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		4. Would like to retain amphitheatre seating.		
92.	Franceska Banga	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Link to Mapua Masterplan &amp; feedback &amp; previous advice for Tasman Bay Regional Boat Ramp study.</li> <li>2. Cumulative effect of activity is major and is fundamental conflict both in scale and risk</li> <li>3. Earthworks on a remediated site &amp; risk of toxin discharge.</li> <li>4. Inconsistent with Tasman Bay Regional Boat Ramp study.</li> <li>5. Safety issues, inexperienced boaties near the wharf, large ramp and pedestrians.</li> <li>6. Traffic congestion on Aranui Road.</li> <li>7. Scale of building and no aesthetic consideration.</li> <li>8. Size of boat ramp – not a reinstatement of what was lost.</li> <li>9. Domination of Waterfront park.</li> <li>10. Process Boat Club have operated.</li> <li>11. Lack of open transparent public consultation – mismatch between what is proposed and people think is proposed.</li> <li>12. Lack of alternative scaled down option to give community choice.</li> <li>13. Danger to safety – swimming, wharf jumping etc</li> <li>14. Noise from boats</li> <li>15. Upgrades to Grossi Point could be an alternative</li> </ol>	O	<p>Decline consent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limit size of ramp and facilities in scale – small boats.</li> <li>• No disturbance of seabed.</li> <li>• Respect character and scale of Mapua.</li> </ul>
93.	John Palmer	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Pétanque pitch easily relocated.</li> <li>2. Boating is growing in the area.</li> <li>3. Grossi Point is a poor alternative, conflict with children in water.</li> <li>4. Keep previous Mayors promise, growing coastal village needs same as tennis &amp; pétanque clubs.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
94.	Mary Lancaster	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Disturbance of soil cap &amp; spread of toxins.</li> <li>2. Safety risks from occasional / non-local boaties who</li> </ol>	O	None given

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		<p>underestimate speed of spring ebb tide at full flow – danger to wharf users.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Wharf jumping is an iconic activity – safety risk (people being run over by boats).</li> <li>4. Waste of public money, should have been addressed previously during remediation.</li> <li>5. Small sector will dominate character of Mapua wharf with parking &amp; trailer parking.</li> <li>6. Increase boats &amp; vehicles, loss of peace &amp; tranquillity.</li> <li>7. Loss of recreational green space at waterfront park.</li> <li>8. Sea scout building &amp; ramp much bigger than originals.</li> </ol>		
95.	Hazel Dodge	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Replacement for old boat ramp.</li> <li>2. Mapua is called 'port' and should have launching facility.</li> <li>3. Caters for growing numbers of recreational boaties, families &amp; kai moana.</li> <li>4. Provide boat storage onsite.</li> <li>5. Supports Sea Scouts – education of young people for water safety &amp; skills.</li> <li>6. Active recreation at waterfront park.</li> </ol>	S	<p>Grant consent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should not be funded by local community.</li> <li>• New ramp allows better, safer traffic management of pedestrians, cyclists, vehicles &amp; trailers.</li> <li>• Keep Kite Park for mixed residential use</li> <li>• Suggest angle parking which is more efficient.</li> </ul>
96.	Peter Mitchell	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Removal of community land from community use.</li> <li>2. Adverse visual and landscape effects – large ramp and building on community green space.</li> <li>3. Adverse amenity &amp; community effects – increase in traffic, boats &amp; boating traffic in public reserve &amp; CMA.</li> <li>4. Adverse noise effects from boats, utes, trailers, cars &amp; boats &amp; activities within the building.</li> <li>5. Safety – significant number of boats &amp; traffic into already high use area. Launching two boats simultaneously into swift flowing channel is highly dangerous &amp; incompatible with other uses.</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Building on public land – range of uses which may be incompatible with area. Another licensed premises is not needed.</li> <li>7. Adverse traffic effects – loss of community land for parking, unnecessary traffic clogging roads.</li> <li>8. Potential contamination – evacuation of soil below cap – risk of toxic material carried to estuary.</li> <li>9. TDC conflict of interest due to funding provided.</li> </ul>		
97.	Karen du Fresne	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Adverse visual and landscape effects – large ramp and building on community green space.</li> <li>2. Adverse amenity &amp; community effects – increase in traffic, boats &amp; boating traffic in public reserve &amp; CMA.</li> <li>3. Adverse noise effects from boats, utes, trailers, cars &amp; boats &amp; activities within the building.</li> <li>4. Safety – significant number of boats &amp; traffic into already high use area. Launching two boats simultaneously into swift flowing channel is highly dangerous &amp; incompatible with other uses.</li> <li>5. Loss of reserve land &amp; access to CMA – large building on reserve land, access over CMA. Loss of native plantings which are well established.</li> <li>6. Parking &amp; traffic effects – cumulative effects of car parking, large area dedicated to parking, inappropriate for community. Increase in traffic which will clog roads.</li> <li>7. Effects on birds &amp; ecology in estuary &amp; inlet – risk of pest species being introduced. Birdlife &amp; variety of shore birds are part of special character of area.</li> </ul>	O	Decline consent

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		<p>8. Climate change – increased boats &amp; cars increased impact of climate change (s7i RMA).</p> <p>9. Potential contamination – evacuation of soil below cap – risk of toxic material carried to estuary.</p>		
98.	John Stephens	1. Supports application and hopes to counteract negative views.	S	Grant consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• none</li> </ul>
99.	Ronald & Fiona Oliver	<p>1. Traffic congestion from boat &amp; trailer movements – Aranui Road is already congested. Other residential roads would become busier – increased road safety risk</p> <p>2. Strong currents require high skill &amp; boating experience – ramp will generate high safety risk for all users.</p> <p>3. Risk of contaminated soil disturbance, health risk.</p> <p>4. Loss of amenity value of Waterfront Park for existing users.</p>	O	Decline consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce permitted boat &amp; trailer movements from 160 to 40 per day.</li> <li>• Reduce size of trailer park to reflect reduced numbers.</li> <li>• No disturbance or removal of contaminated soil.</li> <li>• Speed limits for boats using Mapua Estuary strictly enforced.</li> <li>• Adequate measures are taken to ensure safety of swimmers &amp; divers using Wharf.</li> </ul>
100.	Malcolm & Vanessa Ness	<p>1. Will undermine tranquil &amp; positive experience of Mapua Wharf.</p> <p>2. Hazard to wharf jumping.</p> <p>3. Noise – loss of peace &amp; quiet from outboards &amp; multiple crafts.</p> <p>4. Traffic – hazard from boat trailers on narrow roads.</p> <p>5. Boats can launch from Gross Point or elsewhere for larger boats.</p> <p>6. Former Group leader of Sea Scouts – they have no issue with launching &amp; retrieving boats due to position on wharf.</p> <p>7. Ruin Waterfront Park.</p>	O	Decline consent
101.	David Loe	1. Has an interest in the community & would like to see it thrive.	S	Grant consent
102.	Judith & David Mitchell	<p>2. Loss of public open space – contrary to FCC Govt funding for remediation.</p> <p>3. Safety issues – roads, water, conflict with wharf, contaminated soil. People float</p>	O	Decline consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If consent for ramp is granted LU consent for building and car parking is not granted.</li> <li>• Size of ramp reduced (one lay with passing bay)</li> </ul>

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		<p>from Grossi Point to Leisure Park.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Amenity effects (high natural character area, noise) – scale of activity &amp; location.</li> <li>5. Nature of community consultation.</li> <li>6. Climate change.</li> <li>7. Cost.</li> <li>8. Ecological effect on wildlife &amp; biodiversity.</li> <li>9. Traffic effects – Mapua Drive intersection, Aranui Road / Higgs Road additional traffic.</li> <li>10. Misleading public engagement by applicant.</li> <li>11. Boat ramp is of greater scale than original ramp.</li> </ol>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wharf preserved for public use &amp; recreation eg. Wharf jumping, fishing, swimming etc.</li> <li>• Limited hours of operation on boat ramp.</li> <li>• Jet Skis &amp; similar banned from estuary due to safety, noise &amp; ecology. At very least registered.</li> </ul>
103.	John Burland	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Incompatible with TDC's responsibility to safeguard estuary environment which has high ecological value &amp; important for birdlife.</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent
104.	Nicqui Kurzeja	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety risk – questions whether adequate safety measures are proposed.</li> <li>2. Disturbance of contaminated site.</li> <li>3. Ensure boats don't endanger wharf jumpers, swimmers, kayaks etc.</li> </ol>	N	Decline consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More research into safety aspects</li> </ul>
105.	Kathryn Alborough	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Risk of contaminants – recreational &amp; ecological damage.</li> <li>2. Cost</li> <li>3. Safety risk – risk to children – vehicle movements &amp; from boats. Wharf jumping could be banned.</li> <li>4. Grossi Point is sufficient for boat launching, Motueka is close.</li> <li>5. Loss of public space &amp; damage to natural features.</li> <li>6. Loss of parking.</li> <li>7. Sea Scouts will be minimal users of new facility, small numbers and limited times sailing / rowing per year.</li> <li>8. Consider alternative uses of public land.</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Boat ramp trust has full liability insurance and/or sufficient resource in advance to pay for cost of ramp, buildings, soil remediation. TDC does not incur these costs.</li> </ul>



Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
106.	Bridget Miller	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Contrary to s5 &amp; 6 RMA.</li> <li>2. Risk to public – swimming, unpowered crafts &amp; wharf jumping.</li> <li>3. Inhibit public open space and access along CMA.</li> <li>4. Disturb contaminated soil – risk to swimmers &amp; estuary bird &amp; sea life.</li> <li>5. Inconsistent with Policy 13(a) NZCPS – ramp is located in an area with high natural character &amp; disturb contaminated soils.</li> <li>6.</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent
107.	Nicola Aerakis	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Contrary to Part 2 RMA, NZCPS, TRPS &amp; TRMP.</li> <li>2. Scale of activity in area with high natural character, amenity &amp; ecological values.</li> <li>3. Adverse effects on Mapua – traffic, conflicts with pedestrians &amp; cyclists.</li> <li>4. Significant adverse effects on visual amenity &amp; natural character.</li> <li>5. Loss of reserve land for public use.</li> <li>6. Safety – volume of vehicles at Waterfront Park &amp; Wharf area. Risk plan is not suitable for scale of activity. Dangerous for boat &amp; recreational users alike.</li> <li>7. No pontoon to secure boats – launching &amp; retrieving issues &amp; risks. Inexperienced boaties with high flow water creates risks.</li> <li>8. Queues of boats &amp; vehicles.</li> <li>9. Conflict between swimmers &amp; wharf jumpers.</li> <li>10. Mapua sandbar.</li> <li>11. Scale of car parking &amp; traffic effects.</li> <li>12. Risk from contaminated soils.</li> <li>13. Lack of genuine community consultation.</li> <li>14. Original ramp wasn't well used due to being too steep, too close to wharf &amp; currents.</li> <li>15. Climate change.</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent
108.	Kathleen Hardy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Contrary to Part 2 RMA, NZCPS, TRPS &amp; TRMP.</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Scale of activity in area with high natural character, amenity &amp; ecological values.</li> <li>3. Adverse effects on Mapua – traffic, conflicts with pedestrians &amp; cyclists.</li> <li>4. Significant adverse effects on visual amenity &amp; natural character.</li> <li>5. Loss of reserve land for public use.</li> <li>6. Safety – volume of vehicles at Waterfront Park &amp; Wharf area. Risk plan is not suitable for scale of activity. Dangerous for boat &amp; recreational users alike.</li> <li>7. No pontoon to secure boats – launching &amp; retrieving issues &amp; risks. Inexperienced boaties with high flow water creates risks.</li> <li>8. Queues of boats &amp; vehicles.</li> <li>9. Conflict between swimmers &amp; wharf jumpers.</li> <li>10. Mapua sandbar.</li> <li>11. Scale of car parking &amp; traffic effects.</li> <li>12. Risk from contaminated soils.</li> <li>13. Lack of genuine community consultation.</li> <li>14. Original ramp wasn't well used due to being too steep, too close to wharf &amp; currents.</li> <li>15. Climate change.</li> </ol>		
109.	Anthony Hardy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Contrary to Part 2 RMA, NZCPS, TRPS &amp; TRMP.</li> <li>2. Scale of activity in area with high natural character, amenity &amp; ecological values.</li> <li>3. Adverse effects on Mapua – traffic, conflicts with pedestrians &amp; cyclists.</li> <li>4. Significant adverse effects on visual amenity &amp; natural character.</li> <li>5. Loss of reserve land for public use.</li> <li>6. Safety – volume of vehicles at Waterfront Park &amp; Wharf area. Risk plan is not suitable for scale of activity. Dangerous for boat &amp; recreational users alike.</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. No pontoon to secure boats – launching &amp; retrieving issues &amp; risks. Inexperienced boaties with high flow water creates risks.</li> <li>8. Queues of boats &amp; vehicles.</li> <li>9. Conflict between swimmers &amp; wharf jumpers.</li> <li>10. Mapua sandbar.</li> <li>11. Scale of car parking &amp; traffic effects.</li> <li>12. Risk from contaminated soils.</li> <li>13. Lack of genuine community consultation.</li> <li>14. Original ramp wasn't well used due to being too steep, too close to wharf &amp; currents.</li> <li>15. Climate change.</li> </ul>		
110.	Vincent Revell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Traffic effects – conflicts with walking &amp; cycling (Aranui Road).</li> <li>2. Kite Park prevented from future development due to car parking.</li> <li>3. Compounded risk to boat ramp being more popular than anticipated – traffic greater than predicted – combined with future growth provided for in FDS.</li> </ul>	O	Decline consent
111.	Colin Taylor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mapua &amp; Tasman Bay urgently need modern safe boat ramp for boat owners within growing community.</li> </ul>	S	Grant consent
112.	David & Jan Petterson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Grossi Point should be upgraded and redeveloped as swimming &amp; recreational area.</li> <li>2. Waterfront Park is underutilised, not a welcoming area.</li> <li>3. Kite Park zoning should be changed to secure it as a green space for the future.</li> <li>4. Proposal will transform Waterfront Park – good opportunity for future generations.</li> </ul>	S	Grant consent
113.	Jane Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concerned about nesting sea birds &amp; dwindling foreshore wildlife.</li> </ul>	O	Decline consent

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Grossi Point is dangerous to use due to number of boaties – moving the activity closer to Mapua centre is not a good thing.</li> <li>3. Grossi Point should be car free area, reserved for non-engine powered craft &amp; swimmers.</li> <li>4. Building on capped contaminated land.</li> <li>5. Use of Waterfront Park which is reserve land.</li> <li>6. Increased traffic effects down Higgs &amp; Aranui Road.</li> <li>7. Conflict between pedestrians crossing the ram &amp; reversing trailers.</li> <li>8. Conflict with wharf jumping, swimming, non-powered craft.</li> <li>9. Noise nuisance – for residents and wildlife.</li> <li>10. Queueing boats.</li> <li>11. Large scale seems unnecessary.</li> <li>12. Climate change effects from fossil fuelled vehicles (cars &amp; boats).</li> </ul>		
114.	Rhian Gallagher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Boat ramp is contrary to regeneration (restoring degraded biodiversity) which was an outcome of the FCC remediation.</li> <li>2. Ironic destruction of Chris Fell's poem which is quoted on steps of amphitheatre.</li> <li>3. Concern over spread of marine pests – no wash down station. Impacts on marine &amp; bird life.</li> <li>4. Noise pollution from power boats &amp; jet skis – impact on fish &amp; bird life, people &amp; character of wharf.</li> <li>5. Activity is for a minority.</li> <li>6. Traffic effects.</li> <li>7. Risks to swimmers and wharf jumpers with high volume boat traffic. Unsafe for kayakers.</li> <li>8. Climate crisis.</li> </ul>	O	Decline consent
115.	Michael Weller	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A safe launching ramp is needed for local boating community.</li> </ul>	S	Grant consent

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Local boating community saved the wharf.</li> <li>3. Old ramp provided safe launching but was closed by Council with a replacement promised.</li> <li>4. Improved facility for Sea Scouts.</li> </ul>		
116.	Charmaine Taylor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports ramp and relevant activities.</li> </ul>	S	Grant consent
117.	Rebecca Patchett, Adrienne Taylor & Anna Crosbie	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety – inexperienced boaties may not be able to navigate swift currents – other uses at risk. Debris build up.</li> <li>2. Proximity to wastewater pump station, main sewer &amp; gravity sewer.</li> <li>3. Risk of toxic chemicals from soil disturbance.</li> <li>4. Disturbance to bird life &amp; quiet enjoyment of estuary.</li> <li>5. Loss of public green space to buildings and car parking.</li> <li>6. Traffic congestion on road &amp; water.</li> <li>7. Cost to ratepayers.</li> <li>8. Survey validity questioned.</li> <li>9. Questions the 'need' for the Sea Scout building. Sea Scouts only occasionally sail due to tides &amp; currents.</li> <li>10. Another boat ramp is not needed as there are other local places to launch.</li> </ul>	O	Decline consent
118.	James Lane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ramp is not required – Grossi Point is adequate.</li> <li>2. Concern about contaminated substrate.</li> <li>3. Loss of open space – growth in village means open space is needed to maintain character.</li> <li>4. Boat congestion – current will make boat management very tricky, design creates a 'choke point' &amp; increased risk between pedestrians and boaties.</li> </ul>	O	Not stated
119.	Lucy Clark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of open space</li> <li>2. Adverse effects on high natural character, amenity &amp; ecological values.</li> </ul>	O	Decline consent

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Scale and size will attract people from far afield leading to increased safety risks – no pontoon.</li> <li>4. High risk of accident – potential for wharf jumping to be banned.</li> <li>5. Increased traffic.</li> <li>6. Size and scale will detract from visual amenity of Waterfront Park – views will be compromised.</li> <li>7. Questions accuracy of survey.</li> <li>8. Contrary to Pt 2 RMA, NZCPS, TRPS &amp; TRMP.</li> </ul>		
120.	Bruno Lemke	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Detrimental impact on wildlife (esp birdlife) from increased motorboat activity.</li> <li>2. Huge 'shed' – contradicts Colin Fell poem in amphitheatre.</li> <li>3. Cost &amp; funding already given to club by TDC.</li> <li>4. No audit of GHG emissions from construction.</li> <li>5. Proposal already rejected by Council in 2017.</li> <li>6. Increased demand from outside of Mapua – promoted to pay for costs.</li> <li>7. Noise from boats and vehicles</li> <li>8. Not in TDC Mapua Masterplan.</li> <li>9. Removal of great strand of trees along eastern boundary of park.</li> <li>10. Safety concerns – safety of community – swimmers, boats mooring at wharf waiting to access ramp. Pedestrians on / crossing ramp.</li> <li>11. Safety risks to cyclists from increased traffic. Congestion along Aranui or Higgs Rd.</li> <li>12. Disturbance of contaminated soil and breaking cap.</li> <li>13. Provided evidence on Mapua Growth Plan Change that public green space in Mapua was 2% - reduced further with proposal.</li> <li>14. Government condition of funding for FCC remediation.</li> <li>15. Inaccurate survey information – proper survey needed.</li> <li>16. Boat ramp is not for community.</li> </ul>	O	Decline consent

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		17. Not a replacement ramp – larger than original.		
121.	Jolene Petre	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Scale of ramp and building incompatible and inappropriate with location – area of high natural character, amenity &amp; ecological value.</li> <li>2. Contrary to RMA, NZCPS, TRPS, TRMP.</li> <li>3. Visual and Landscape effects – views.</li> <li>4. Traffic &amp; boating traffic – amenity &amp; community effects.</li> <li>5. Noise from boats &amp; traffic.</li> <li>6. Safety – simultaneous launching, high use and conflicts with other activities.</li> <li>7. Loss of reserve land and access to CMA.</li> <li>8. Car &amp; boat parking &amp; traffic effects – loss of open space for car parking, clogged roads.</li> <li>9. Birds &amp; ecology in estuary &amp; inlet – noise and introduction of pest species.</li> <li>10. Climate change – increased traffic &amp; boats.</li> <li>11. Contaminated soil risks – wind and rain will carry material into the estuary.</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent
122.	David Pratt	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Boat owners are a small group who can use either Grossi Point or other local ramps eg. Motueka.</li> <li>2. Safety issues when tide flow is strong, conflicts with swimming &amp; wharf jumping.</li> <li>3. Traffic effects of increased vehicles &amp; boats.</li> <li>4. Risks from contaminated soil disturbance.</li> <li>5. Cost to ratepayer.</li> <li>6. Community better served by shade &amp; wind shelter facilities at Waterfront Park.</li> <li>7. Loss of 'Kite Park' to parking.</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent
123.	Tamaha Sea Scout Group	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Put forward a requirement for a 200-250m<sup>2</sup> building close to a launching ramp (within 200m).</li> </ol>	N	Grant consent

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		2. Refer also to letter from Sea Scouts submitted with application.		
124.	Jenny Easton	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Disturbance of contaminated soil below cap. Most contaminated soil is in SE corner and park was not designed for boat ramp.</li> <li>2. Inappropriate placement of stormwater system &amp; risk of discharging contaminants – risk to marine life.</li> <li>3. Does not cover risk of contaminated soil on beach during ramp pole excavation.</li> <li>4. Inadequate information in discharge consents.</li> <li>5. Sea Scout / community building – reduced amenity values, unnecessary expense on HAIL site, loss of car parking &amp; future use of car parks.</li> <li>6. Parking on western side of Tahī Street – manoeuvring, inconvenience to residents, privatisation of public land.</li> <li>7. Clarity on who will control the ramp and where the revenue goes – needs to be clear.</li> <li>8. Hazards to swimmers and other users.</li> <li>9. Induced demand – will attract boaties from outside district who wont be familiar with tidal patterns &amp; sandbar.</li> <li>10. Fish waste.</li> <li>11. Noise (boats &amp; traffic) – reliance on WHO standards not appropriate when TRMP creates expectation from community.</li> <li>12. Consultation / survey issues.</li> <li>13. Conflict with 2017 Council report re. Waterfront Park &amp; Mapua Masterplan.</li> <li>14. RCA does not consider opportunity loss from loss of public open space.</li> <li>15. Climate change.</li> <li>16. Loss of amenity value</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent



Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		<p>17. Ecological report focuses on Coastal Environment not other established flora &amp; fauna.</p> <p>18. No cost benefit analysis – no consideration for other users of Park.</p> <p>19. Grossi Point – bollards to stop boat trailers accessing beach &amp; launching boats.</p> <p>20. Section 128 review – keep record of all accidents, near misses, maintenance issues &amp; complaints.</p>		
125.	Augustine Mathews	<p>1. Inconsistent with village community &amp; vision for wharf precinct.</p> <p>2. Benefit to boat club but loss of public open space, car parking &amp; business downturn for others.</p> <p>3. Conflict with wharf use.</p> <p>4. Methodology around risk assessment is flawed &amp; biased &amp; mitigation measures do not reassure.</p> <p>5. TDC decision make is questionable.</p>	O	<p>Decline consent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maximum of 20 car &amp; railer parks with Kite Park to remain unsealed.</li> <li>• No additional building construction.</li> <li>• Single lane ramp.</li> <li>• Strict enforcement of speed limits for boats.</li> <li>• Clearly defined boat lanes.</li> </ul>
126.	David Allen	<p>1. Inconsistent with village community &amp; vision for wharf precinct.</p> <p>2. Benefit to boat club but loss of public open space, car parking &amp; business downturn for others.</p> <p>3. Conflict with wharf use.</p> <p>4. Methodology around risk assessment is flawed &amp; biased &amp; mitigation measures do not reassure.</p> <p>5. TDC decision make is questionable.</p>	O	<p>Decline consent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maximum of 20 car &amp; railer parks with Kite Park to remain unsealed.</li> <li>• No additional building construction.</li> <li>• Single lane ramp.</li> <li>• Strict enforcement of speed limits for boats.</li> <li>• Clearly defined boat lanes.</li> </ul>
127.	Patrick Gelling	<p>1. Grossi Point launching is impossible for size of boat.</p> <p>2. Council said they would provide a replacement ramp years ago and has not.</p> <p>3. Sea Scouts need a better facility that doesn't clash with general public – retrieving &amp; launching boats from scout shed can be dangerous with public getting in the road.</p>	S	Grant consent

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
128.	Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Contaminated land – FCC remediation.</li> <li>2. Adverse effects on inlet which is of international importance for migratory bird species &amp; national significance for other endangered or threatened species. Inlet could be remediated.</li> <li>3. 2017 decision against boat ramp, nothing environmentally has changed.</li> <li>4. Interference with views of inlet.</li> <li>5. Loss of natives, exposure of contaminated soils.</li> <li>6. Risk to swimmers near wharf or round from Grossi Point.</li> <li>7. Scouring from ramp by strong tidal currents.</li> <li>8. Kite Park is important resting &amp; feeding area for Oystercatchers &amp; other waders.</li> <li>9. Grossi Point should not be used for boat landing – disturbance to nesting and roosting birds.</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent
129.	Kelly Taylor	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Contrary to Part 2 RMA, NZCPS, TRPS &amp; TRMP.</li> <li>2. Adverse effects on Mapua – traffic, conflicts with pedestrians &amp; cyclists.</li> <li>3. Significant adverse effects on visual amenity &amp; natural character – prominent when viewed from wharf.</li> <li>4. Noise effects, including on birds &amp; wildlife.</li> <li>5. Safety – volume of vehicles at Waterfront Park &amp; Wharf area. Risk mitigation measures are not adequate.</li> <li>6. No pontoon to secure boats – launching &amp; retrieving issues &amp; risks. Inexperienced boaties with high flow water creates risks.</li> <li>7. Conflict between swimmers, wharf jumpers and other activities.</li> <li>8. Loss of reserve land for public use.</li> </ol>	O	<p>Decline consent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No conditions which would mitigate the impacts of a boat ramp of the scale proposed in the location.</li> </ul>

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		9. Scale of car parking & traffic effects. 10. Unknown risks on environment – calculations used on site plan are based on levels valid at Port Nelson – tidal levels at site should be established – no modelling on channel bathymetry to understand actual effects. 11. Risk from contaminated soils. 12. Community consultation was biased.		
130.	Hamish Ballantyne	1. Ramp will use under-utilised public land. 2. Ample car parking available at Kite Park. 3. Building will enhance community facilities. 4. Grossi Point will be free to picnickers & swimmers – no boats will make it safer. 5. Future proof the growing community.	S	Grant consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Investigate green parking solutions for Kite Park.</li> </ul>
131.	Rebecca Cameron	1. Scale of building and boat ramp & level of traffic generation incompatible with location. 2. High natural character, amenity & ecological values 3. Conflicts with other uses – swimming, wharf jumping. 4. Contrary to Part 2 RMA, NZCPS, TRPS, TRMP. 5. Environmental effect – adverse effects on ecology. 6. Contaminated land effects. 7. Loss of native trees.	O	Decline consent
132.	Mapua Boat Club	1. Background on boat club membership & activities. 2. Inclusion of Grossi Point in Mapua Masterplan – remove power boat launching. 3. Kite Park is extensively used – zoning change would allow land to remain open green space. 4. Information on investigation into alternative boat ramps locally. 5. Proposal is good for community youth including Sea Scouts. 6. Will not change enjoyment of wharf including wharf jumping.	S	Grant consent

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
133.	Peter Clinton-Baker	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Grossi Point is challenging for boat launching due to tie and slope profile.</li> <li>2. Ramp, parking and Sea Scout building will be positive for wharf and community.</li> <li>3. Area ramp is proposed is underutilised.</li> <li>4. Will enhance Mapua.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
134.	Rene Kampman	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Utilisation of public reserve land.</li> <li>2. Real impacts of parking not addressed – loss of overflow parking area.</li> <li>3. Change the use of Waterfront Park from open recreation to an area dominated by a building and boat ramp.</li> <li>4. Grossi Point is available for boat launching and is free – charging for launching does not recognise social &amp; economic effects. People could launch at Motueka.</li> <li>5. Missing information in survey.</li> <li>6. Conflict with pedestrians crossing ramp.</li> <li>7. Conflict with swimmers, kayakers etc. risk of injury.</li> <li>8. Conflict with wharf jumping.</li> <li>9. Noise, loss of sleep.</li> <li>10. Queries long term consequences of minor tidal flow change due to ramp – any coastal aggregation or degradation in future.</li> <li>11. Boat safety – inexperienced boat operators.</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent
135.	Michael Ashby	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Application is flawed.</li> <li>2. Grossi Point has less risks and more benefits.</li> <li>3. Scale of proposal – cumulative effect &amp; loss of character and enjoyment of waterfront.</li> <li>4. Ecological effects.</li> <li>5. Safety Risks – risk mitigation strategy is insufficient.</li> <li>6. Benefits boat users but cost to community.</li> <li>7. Ramp is larger than one it replaces.</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8. Consistency with 2010 Mapua Structure Plan, 2018 Mapua Master Plan, Tasman Regional Boat Study.</li> <li>9. TDC funding.</li> </ul>		
136.	Michael Crehan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Grossi Point is unsatisfactory for boat launching – inconsistent with cultural and historical use.</li> <li>2. Driving to other boat ramps (Motueka &amp; Nelson) adds to traffic congestion – detrimental on environment.</li> <li>3. Land is not reserve or park within legal meaning of works under Reserves legislation.</li> <li>4. Use retains much of the character of open space as there's little vertical impact. Masterplan alternatives include buildings.</li> <li>5. Earthworks will be subject to proper management by experts.</li> <li>6. Negligible effect on flora and fauna due to modified nature of area.</li> <li>7. Safety risks are no different from original or other ramps and novice boaties will learn – launching at Grossi Point is more hazardous.</li> <li>8. Wharf jumping is already hazardous and that will not change. Separation between swimmers at Grossi Point and launching.</li> <li>9. Parking is in areas already used for parking, proposal formalises this.</li> </ul>	S	Grant consent
137.	Paul Bensemann	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Volume of information presented is confusing for submitters.</li> <li>2. Contradicts one of the Mapua Masterplan options.</li> <li>3. Scale of activity and inclusion of building.</li> <li>4. Risks to children and wharf usage.</li> </ul>	O	Decline consent
138.	Hamish Wilson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Risks from toxic soil – effects will not stop once construction</li> </ul>	O	Decline consent

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		<p>is complete – boat propellor churn.</p> <p>2. Significant adverse amenity &amp; natural character affects.</p>		
139.	Emily Roper	<p>1. Hazard assessment incomplete &amp; mitigate inadequate.</p> <p>2. Wharf is significant community resource more stringent &amp; effective hazard management required.</p>	O	Decline consent
140.	Geoffrey Vause	<p>1. No monitoring for contaminant soil disturbance &amp; clean up.</p> <p>2. Design &amp; operation of ramp not fit for purpose of replacing Grossi Point.</p> <p>3. Lack of pontoon will create significant hazards.</p> <p>4. Adverse amenity effects – scale of ramp &amp; parking &amp; frequency of launches.</p> <p>5. Validation of survey</p> <p>6. Lack of balanced view on alternatives.</p>	O	<p>Decline consent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program to monitor groundwater, estuary sediment &amp; aquatic invertebrates for contaminants, overseen by SQEP. Establish contaminant trigger point for stop release. Financing to ensure appropriate clean up from any contaminant leech into estuary. Insurance or bond.</li> <li>• Design that makes it safe for launching of trailer yachts and other non-powered craft OR assurance from TDC &amp; Iwi that Grossi Point launching for non-powered craft will continue.</li> <li>• Independent peer review survey of community opinion on ramp.</li> <li>• Independent review by TDC of alternative sites highlighted in application.</li> </ul>
141.	Goedele Van Cauteren	<p>1. Scale and operation of ramp doesn't represent needs of community &amp; will impact wider community.</p> <p>2. Risk of developing on contaminated site.</p> <p>3. Scale will hamper safety and village feel of current wharf environment.</p>	O	<p>Decline consent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Boat club and any contractors are required to take out clean up cover.</li> </ul>
142.	John Leydon	<p>1. Grossi Point should not be used for vehicle launching.</p> <p>2. Ramp replaces the one at the wharf and is the only site available which meets TDC conditions.</p> <p>3. Tidal influence is minimal when compared to Grossi Point.</p> <p>4. All tile launching ramp is a safety issue.</p>	S	Grant consent

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		5. Ramp is needed to serve expanding boating community.		
143.	David Young	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Developing on contaminated land.</li> <li>2. Conflict between interest groups.</li> <li>3. Marine health &amp; safety issues, conflict of launching boats near swimmers.</li> <li>4. Traffic congestion and associated noise and parking issues.</li> <li>5. Need to protect coastal bird and marine life in estuary.</li> <li>6. TDC changing position</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent
144.	Nairn Webb	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Scale and operation of ramp doesn't represent needs of community &amp; will impact wider community.</li> <li>2. Risk of developing on contaminated site.</li> <li>3. Scale will hamper safety and village feel of current wharf environment.</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent
145.	Ngāti Rārua	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Area of significance for Ngāti Rārua, traditionally important for mahinga kai &amp; seasonal camps in the area.</li> <li>2. Adverse effects on cultural values should not be disregarded on the basis the TRMP permits the activity under 16.13.6.1(d)(i).</li> <li>3. May improve mahinga kai access &amp; benefit wellbeing of ramp users for increased recreational access.</li> <li>4. Careful management of earthworks, discharges, stormwater, restoration planning &amp; appropriate tikanga to avoid adverse effects.</li> </ol>	N	<p>Doesn't state but seeks following conditions if consent is granted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cultural safety induction (by mandated representative of Ngāti Rarua) prior to works commencing.</li> <li>• Ngāti Rarua iwi monitor onsite for all earthworks.</li> <li>• ADP in place and strictly adhered to.</li> <li>• Avoid discharge of contaminants including sediment to water.</li> <li>• Use of native, site suitable &amp; locally sourced plants for restoration – tangata whenua iwi should be consulted.</li> <li>• Low impact stormwater design.</li> <li>• Maintain free public access to boat ramp.</li> <li>• Maintain unimpeded public access to Waterfront park &amp; along coastline.</li> <li>• Ngāti Rarua must be represented in any form of cultural interpretation on the site.</li> </ul>
146.	Waimea Inlet Forum	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Disturbance of contaminated soil &amp; potential for hazardous chemicals to contaminate water in inlet &amp; its benthos life.</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Bird &amp; fish disturbance by activity on surface of water – no disturbance of coastal marine species which prevents them occupying usual habitat.</li> <li>3. West of Tahī Street should be left in grass as important resting &amp; feeding area for oystercatchers &amp; other waders.</li> </ol>		
147.	Annette Cren	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Substantial scale of development</li> <li>2. Safety issues with launching boats – no jetty, tides &amp; currents are ferocious at times.</li> <li>3. Lack of transparency for ongoing financial obligations by Council.</li> <li>4. Disturbance of toxic dump &amp; sea bed.</li> <li>5. Replicate Port Motueka.</li> <li>6. Attracting larger boats will diminish fish stock &amp; increase fuel costs.</li> <li>7. No mention of water or sea bed monitoring.</li> <li>8. Where do kayaks &amp; small sail boats launch if they can't use Grossi Point and will need to pay to launch.</li> <li>9. Alternative sites have not been fully investigated – Mapua Leisure Park could be an option.</li> </ol>	O	<p>Decline consent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applicant required to monitor ground water, estuary sediment, aquatic invertebrates for contaminants.</li> <li>• Smaller ramp suitable for smaller boats – a replacement ramp.</li> <li>• Independent review into alternative sites.</li> <li>• Reliable survey of community feedback.</li> </ul>
148.	Brian Thomas	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Vehicle congestion in public reserve.</li> <li>2. Traffic increase.</li> <li>3. Noise.</li> <li>4. Safety risks &amp; threats to other users including ferry.</li> <li>5. Disturbance to birds, fish &amp; overall ecology of area.</li> <li>6. Loss of recreational land from large scale parking.</li> <li>7. Risk of contamination to wharf area from fuel leakage, exhaust fumes &amp; rubbish.</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent
149.	Ian Reade	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Application is based on assumptions &amp; does not account for boats diverted from Nelson &amp; Motueka.</li> </ol>	O	<p>Decline consent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request hearing commissioners who are not members of the Local Authority.</li> </ul>



Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Issues with retrievals, launchings can start as early as 4am.</li> <li>3. Access issues along Aranui Road which has been narrowed.</li> <li>4. Analysis of boats using the ramp doesn't account for growth in wider area – congestion on roads.</li> <li>5. Conflict with Mapua CBD – congestion from traffic.</li> <li>6. Risk assessment is not independent &amp; contains incorrect information – risk of life to unfamiliar users.</li> </ol>		
150.	Barry Reade	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Application is based on assumptions &amp; does not account for boats diverted from Nelson &amp; Motueka.</li> <li>2. Issues with retrievals, launchings can start as early as 4am.</li> <li>3. Access issues along Aranui Road which has been narrowed.</li> <li>4. Analysis of boats using the ramp doesn't account for growth in wider area – congestion on roads.</li> <li>5. Conflict with Mapua CBD – congestion from traffic.</li> <li>6. Risk assessment is not independent &amp; contains incorrect information – risk of life to unfamiliar users.</li> </ol>	O	<p>Decline consent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request hearing commissioners who are not members of the Local Authority.</li> </ul>
151.	Neil Clifton	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Assessment provides an unrealistic account of traffic effects by using Gross Point data – people will be drawn from other boat ramps and traffic assessment doesn't take that into account.</li> <li>2. Car parks should be sealed and landscaped.</li> </ol>	S	<p>Grant consent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic congestion mitigation conditions – car park entry on Tahī Street but have an exit onto Aranui Road.</li> <li>• Alternatively discourage ramp use over periods of high visitor use by variable ramp fees or restrictions on time.</li> </ul>
152.	Barrie Moran	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety – high risk of injury or death to swimmers / wharf jumpers. Medium risk to pedestrians crossing ramp.</li> <li>2. Risk assessment lacks validity due to skills &amp; experiences from</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		<p>those who prepared assessment &amp; methods used.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Loss of public access along coast.</li> <li>4. Loss of public open space.</li> <li>5. Noise effects &amp; insufficient consideration of best practicable options. Contrary to section 16</li> <li>6. Loss of amenity due to Sea Scout building &amp; large car park area.</li> </ol>		
153.	Mitchell-Devereux & Cheva-Isarakul Family Group	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Scale of proposal greater than that consulted on by applicant.</li> <li>2. Contrary to Mapua Waterfront Area Masterplan (2017 decision).</li> <li>3. Traffic effects.</li> <li>4. Health &amp; Safety – risk to swimmers, wharf jumpers and pedestrians.</li> <li>5. Disturbance to wildlife or marine mammals &amp; amenity values.</li> <li>6. Loss of public access along CMA.</li> <li>7. Privatisation of reserve land.</li> <li>8. Contrary to Part 2 RMA, NZCPS, TRPS, TRMP.</li> <li>9. Adverse effects on historic heritage, landscape, seascape, natural character &amp; amenity values.</li> <li>10. Adverse effects on ecology &amp; indigenous biological diversity.</li> <li>11. Climate change.</li> <li>12. Other boat ramps are available.</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent
154.	David Martin	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lack of GHG emission audit.</li> <li>2. Scale of building and ramp – affect quiet solitude of coastal area.</li> <li>3. Risk to contaminated land soil cap.</li> <li>4. Fuel spillages &amp; discharges to estuary.</li> <li>5. Noise from boats &amp; cars.</li> <li>6. Effects on wildlife.</li> <li>7. Traffic effects.</li> <li>8. Safety – speed of current.</li> <li>9. Walking access along the inlet and conflict with boats reversing down ramps.</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		10. Loss of amenity for public open space from new building. 11. Motorised boat launching should be forbidden at Grossi Point – should be part of proposal. 12. Survey controversy. 13. Out of proportion with previous ramp.		
155.	Jane Renwick	1. Contrary to Part 2 RMA, NZCPS, TRPS, TRMP. 2. Traffic effects on narrow roads, effects on cyclists. 3. Adverse visual, amenity & natural character effects. 4. Safety – risk plan is unsuitable, conflict with swimmers, wharf jumpers & other users. No pontoon launching & retrieval issues. 5. Loss of Council reserve land 6. Risks from toxic soil. 7. Lack of genuine community consultation. 8. Climate change (s7(i)) RMA.	O	Decline consent
156.	Sarah & Seamus Van Lent	1. Irreversible damage on environment & loss of local character. 2. Grossi Point has less risks & more benefits for launching. 3. Contaminated soil risks. 4. Traffic effects – Aranui Road ‘streets for people’ amendments. 5. Health & Safety – safety measures insufficient, conflicts with other users. Only suitable for highly skilled skippers, tide flows. 6. Out of keeping with village scale.	O	Decline consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Boat club and contractors are required to take out clean up cover.</li> </ul>
157.	Roger Waddell & Adele Smith	1. Only support if no boats are launched from Grossi Point (only small non-powered crafts). 2. Conflict with swimmers & wharf jumpers. 3. Disturbance of contaminated soil.	O	Decline consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Boat club and contractors are required to take out clean up cover.</li> </ul>

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Size and scale of ramp &amp; building.</li> <li>5. Out of keeping with village – bigger than Motueka.</li> </ul>		
158.	William Conway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of natural amenity.</li> <li>2. Increase in traffic – conflict with Council making streets safer.</li> <li>3. Heavy vehicle movements associated with construction.</li> <li>4. Adverse effects from noise, odour &amp; pollution.</li> <li>5. No provision for boats queuing on or off water.</li> <li>6. Reduction in parking spaces.</li> <li>7. Scale of ramp is not in keeping with village character (Mapua Masterplan).</li> </ul>	O	Decline consent
159.	Petra Dekker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Other boat ramps are locally available.</li> <li>2. Scale and size not an equal replacement to original ramp &amp; unjustified.</li> <li>3. Scale &amp; size of building – significant visual impact.</li> <li>4. Size of car / trailer parking.</li> <li>5. Traffic congestion &amp; compromise safety of other road users (pedestrians &amp; cyclists).</li> <li>6. Contaminated soil risks – land was gifted to NZ public.</li> <li>7. Future of wharf.</li> <li>8. Climate change &amp; biodiversity loss</li> </ul>	O	Decline consent
160.	Deanna Douglas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the ramp &amp; building for scouts &amp; community groups.</li> </ul>	S	Grant consent
161.	Angela Fon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Loss of public open space.</li> <li>3. Loss of parking.</li> <li>4. Conflict with boats &amp; swimmers &amp; wharf jumpers.</li> <li>5. Traffic generation.</li> <li>6. Contaminated land concerns – breach of cap and risk of contaminated sediment discharge.</li> </ul>	O	Decline consent
162.	Flenney Gamble	Not stated	S	Grant consent
163.	David Mundy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Adverse effects on Mapua</li> <li>2. Significant adverse visual, amenity &amp; natural character effects – scale &amp; size of ramp &amp;</li> </ul>	O	Decline consent

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>buildings &amp; loss of public open space.</li> <li>3. Noise effects</li> <li>4. Safety risks – conflicts with other users, no pontoon, risk mitigation measures inadequate.</li> <li>5. Additional car &amp; boat parking.</li> <li>6. Traffic effects.</li> <li>7. Unknown risks from changes to environment – levels used are likely incorrect – channel bathymetry.</li> <li>8. Community consultation was biased.</li> </ul>		
164.	Sylvia Wilson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of natural amenity.</li> <li>2. Increase in traffic – conflict with Council making streets safer.</li> <li>3. Heavy vehicle movements associated with construction.</li> <li>4. Adverse effects from noise, odour &amp; pollution.</li> <li>5. No provision for boats queuing on or off water.</li> <li>6. Reduction in parking spaces.</li> <li>7. Trailer parking – dust.</li> <li>8. Scale of ramp is not in keeping with village character (Mapua Masterplan).</li> </ul>	O	Decline consent
165.	Steven Gamble	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the ramp &amp; building for community.</li> </ul>	S	Grant consent
166.	Ari Fon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of amenity values.</li> <li>2. Loss of public land.</li> <li>3. Scale of development not in keeping with local community.</li> <li>4. Due to scale ramp is likely to become regional facility.</li> <li>5. Adverse traffic effects – conflict between through traffic on Tahi Street due to position of trailer parking.</li> <li>6. Disturbance of contaminated soils.</li> <li>7. Utilisation of TDC owned residential land for car parking – lost opportunity.</li> </ul>	O	Decline consent
167.	Maria Fillary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Contrary to RMA, NZCPS, TRPS, TRMP.</li> <li>2. Loss of wharf jumping and swimming from wharf due to conflict.</li> </ul>	O	Decline consent

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Loss of fishing from wharf.</li> <li>4. Loss of public reserve – disturbance to peace of reserve.</li> <li>5. Safety – contrary to Council advice about navigational safety issues.</li> <li>6. Traffic &amp; parking effects – comparison to issues in Kaiteriteri</li> <li>7. Scale of ramp.</li> <li>8. Risks from toxic soil.</li> </ol>		
168.	Bruce Gilkison	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Occupation of public land by small group of people – contrary to Govt. funding conditions.</li> <li>2. Climate change – GHG emissions from concrete &amp; fuel emissions.</li> <li>3. Impact on wildlife, flora &amp; ecosystems as well as tranquility of estuary.</li> <li>4. Risks from contaminated soils.</li> <li>5. Future governance and management of the ramp.</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent
169.	David Melville	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. On behalf of Nelson Tasman Region of Ornithological Society of NZ.</li> <li>2. TRMP Sch 25D identifies Waimea Inlet as being area with nationally and internationally important natural ecosystem values.</li> <li>3. Ecological assessment doesn't look at ebird records which show higher bird records than recorded in the assessment.</li> <li>4. Loss of land at Kite Park where variable oystercatchers roost &amp; forage.</li> <li>5. No consideration given to Waimea Inlet Management Strategy 2050 and Action Plan 2023-2026.</li> <li>6. How will people be forced to take home fish waste as claimed by the application.</li> </ol>	N	Not stated
170.	Abi Bennett	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Impact on local ecosystem – water quality, habitat disruption &amp; disturbance to wildlife.</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No community &amp; scout hall</li> <li>• Simple boat ramp with limited parking for locals only.</li> </ul>

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Traffic &amp; parking – road safety, narrow roads &amp; poor infrastructure.</li> <li>3. Noise effects on nearby residents.</li> <li>4. Visual impact – detract from natural beauty – green spaces should be protected.</li> <li>5. Cost &amp; maintenance</li> <li>6. Existing community hall – why is a new one needed.</li> <li>7. Other local ramps could be supported instead (Motueka).</li> </ol>		
171.	Friends of Nelson Haven & Tasman Bay Inc	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ramp will affect landscape quality.</li> <li>2. Risk of contaminant leakage which risk health of fish, bird &amp; plant species.</li> <li>3. Scouring due to fast tides ebbing &amp; flowing.</li> <li>4. Loss of Kite Park for Variable Oystercatchers and other waders.</li> <li>5. Grossi Point should be used only by smaller non-motorised craft – keep people off No Man Island which is a bird sanctuary.</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent
172.	Judith Holmes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Would like to be able to launch from Mapua – TDC promised a useable ramp and that should be honoured.</li> <li>2. Grossi Point is unsuitable.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate safety procedures are displayed as at any NZ boat ramp.</li> </ul>
173.	Helen Lane	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Declined under s5 &amp; 6 of RMA – does not allow for sustainable management of natural &amp; physical resources.</li> <li>2. Risk to other users – swimmers, wharf jumpers, unpowered crafts.</li> <li>3. Inhibit public access along CMA.</li> <li>4. Disturbance of contaminated soil.</li> <li>5. Uncertainties, risks &amp; likely increased cost for project.</li> <li>6. Will it be a public or private asset or both.</li> <li>7. Changes to the unique character of activities which currently take place at wharf.</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
174.	Belinda Ellis	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety concerns</li> <li>2. Traffic effects.</li> <li>3. Size is disproportionate to existing ramp.</li> <li>4. Grossi Point is fit for purpose and free.</li> <li>5. Building is too large for village aesthetic.</li> <li>6. Signed survey without any information.</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent
175.	Kim Bowie & Elspeth Collier	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Disturbance from boat &amp; jet skis on birds.</li> <li>2. Marine safety issue – strong tidal currents, debris build up – only suitable for ‘experienced’ boaties.</li> <li>3. Risk of toxic chemicals from contaminated land – leaching into estuary.</li> <li>4. Supportive of alternative option to upgrade Motueka boat ramp.</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent
176.	Gillian Pollock	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Chemical contamination of estuary from soil disturbance.</li> <li>2. Increased bird disturbance from boats &amp; jet skis.</li> <li>3. Loss of Kite Park – site for roosting &amp; feeding waders.</li> <li>4. Traffic increase – Aranui Rd &amp; Tahī Street – conflicts with cyclists.</li> <li>5. Safety of locals &amp; visitors.</li> <li>6. Safety of swimmers at wharf.</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent
177.	Colin Sutton	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Desperate need for boat ramp in Mapua due to loss of original ramp.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
178.	Helen Stevens	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Need a boat ramp to replace original ramp.</li> <li>2. Grossi Point is not suitable for launching long term.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
179.	William Terry	No reasons given	S	Grant consent
180.	Laurie Hope	No reasons given	S	Grant consent
181.	Timothy Robinson	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. New building will be improvement – Tasman Rowing group are interested.</li> <li>2. Need for boat ramp – will save fuel, time &amp; pollution from people having to go elsewhere to launch.</li> <li>3. Benefit to Mapua rescue team.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent



Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Noise will stop for Tahi St residents.</li> <li>5. Grossi Point will be returned to intended purpose – bbq &amp; picnics &amp; passive water activities.</li> </ol>		
182.	Anna Shortt	No reasons given	S	Grant consent
183.	Lesley Morris	No reasons given	S	Grant consent
184.	Kay & Bevan Paterson	No reasons given	S	Grant consent
185.	Brett Farrell	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Badly need a new boat ramp</li> <li>2. Sea scouts are crowded in current building &amp; membership is limited.</li> <li>3. Grossi Point has strong side currents &amp; limited parking.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
186.	Richard Morris	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ramp is seriously needed.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
187.	Peter Wood	No reasons given	S	Grant consent
188.	Hannah Shirer	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Would give future generations access to water</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
189.	Gayle Farrell	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Growing area, excellent for water activities.</li> <li>2. Need a decent boat ramp.</li> <li>3. Sea scouts desperately need better venue.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
190.	James Thompson	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Boat owner – launching at Grossi Point is challenging at times due to tides.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
191.	Janet Bond	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Member of boat club and have a boat – lives in Mapua</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• none</li> </ul>
192.	Ian Stonehouse	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Member of boat club and have a boat – lives in Mapua</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
193.	Billy Willis	No reasons given	S	Grant consent
194.	Shane Menzies	No reasons given	S	Grant consent
195.	Scott Robinson	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support ramp.</li> <li>2. Reduce busyness of Grossi Point.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
196.	Emma Downey	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ease congestion at Grossi Point which is high recreational use area.</li> <li>2. Support all tides access ramp.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
197.	Jill Robinson	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unsure boat ramp for future generations.</li> <li>2. Sea Scouts have a building suitable for launching boats.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prefer Kite Park to remain green – no concrete or gravel.</li> </ul>
198.	Mark Robinson	No reasons given	S	Grant consent

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
199.	Michael White	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will support local business &amp; tourist trade.</li> <li>Far less drownings due to culture developed by those involved in project.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
200.	Ray Stevenson	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No increase in traffic as boats currently being launched from Grossi Point.</li> <li>Sea Scouts could move from congested wharf.</li> <li>Contamination risk can be managed.</li> <li>Grossi Point would be freed for picnickers &amp; swimmers.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
201.	Susan Newcombe	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For future generations &amp; locals to enjoy.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
202.	Bridget Dapples	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need a new ramp – benefit for kids.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
203.	Ian Smith	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for youth &amp; sea scouts.</li> <li>Good for community development</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No variations.</li> </ul>
204.	Yvone Smith	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Great for boating community &amp; sea scouts.</li> <li>Low impact on environment &amp; others in community.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No conditions</li> </ul>
205.	Chris Innes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Benefit to community</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
206.	Desiree Dunlop	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need a wharf &amp; boat ramp for community, along with marine centre.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nil</li> </ul>
207.	Leanna Hewitt	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No more subdivisions</li> <li>Great for youth</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nil changes to application</li> </ul>
208.	Elizabeth Hewitt	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Much needed by community &amp; young people need marine centre.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nil</li> </ul>
209.	Robert Pope	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I need a Mapua ramp</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nil</li> </ul>
210.	Jocelyn Rae	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Benefit to community</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
211.	Stephen Clark	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To upgrade existing facilities</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nil</li> </ul>
212.	Shane De Vries	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need a boat ramp</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
213.	Phil Boyd	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Facilities for younger generation</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nil</li> </ul>
214.	Gayle Hill	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the ramp and facilities.</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
215.	Isabella Bryant	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More community facilities.</li> <li>Access to sea with a new ramp</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nil restrictions on application</li> </ul>
216.	Charlie Johnson	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve access to sea</li> <li>Community use of building</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nil conditions imposed</li> </ul>
217.	Michael Gray	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for ramp &amp; scout facilities / groups</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
218.	Lesleigh McLachlan	1. Support the ramp and facilities for community.	S	Grant consent • nil
219.	Laura Kidd	1. Need for boat ramp & facility for families	S	Grant consent • nil
220.	Robert Ralfe	1. Mapua needs a boat ramp for community use. 2. Sea scouts need facilities & support marine centre.	S	Grant consent • Nil restrictions on application
221.	Marylou Ralfe	1. Need boat ramp for community use & marine centre for youth	S	Grant consent • Nil restrictions
222.	Bryan Jenkins	1. Need for boat ramp, community facilities, youth programmes including scouts	S	Grant consent • nil
223.	Wayne & Pamela King	1. Reestablish boat ramp for community. 2. Community facility for youth & groups.	S	Grant consent • nil
224.	Bill Martin	1. Replace old ramp. 2. Easier & safer access to water.	S	Grant consent • nil
225.	Mary Chisnall	1. Support ramp & facilities for community	S	Grant consent • nil
226.	Robin Frisbey	1. Need for boat ramp & community building.	S	Grant consent • nil
227.	Tyla Scott	1. Positive community asset 2. Great for youth	S	Grant consent • nil
228.	Toni Wilson-Adams	1. Better access for boaties, fisherman & kids activities. 2. Youth have better facilities for Sea Scouts.	S	Grant consent • Nil restrictions
229.	Heather Quinn	1. Focal hub for young people. 2. Wharf was constructed for boats. 3. New arrivals want to enjoy sea and have a boat to do so.	S	Grant consent • No
230.	Greg Davies	1. Ensuring safety of wharf. 2. Facility for community which aligns with historic use of Mapua.	S	Grant consent • nil
231.	William Stinton	1. Benefit of future youth, communities.	S	Grant consent • nil
232.	Wallace Duff	1. Benefit my family	S	Grant consent • Nil changes to application
233.	Carol Leonard	1. Benefit of local youth & new ramp.	S	Grant consent • Nil changes
234.	Amanda Los	1. For the new ramp & youth of area.	S	Grant consent • nil
235.	Peter Watson	1. Need for a new ramp.	S	Grant consent • nil
236.	Sandy Reid	1. We own a boat and it was meant to happen years ago.	S	Grant consent • Nil

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
237.	Scott Lapham	1. Inconvenience to people who want to picnic at Grossi Point with boat trailers everywhere	S	Grant consent • 0
238.	Jessica Maennicke	1. For a new boat ramp.	S	Grant consent • nil
239.	James Kane	<b>SUBMISSION WITHDRAWN</b>		
240.	Robbie Mitchell	1. Need for better ramp with suitable boat launching to meet needs of community & provide base for sea scouts.	S	Grant consent • nil
241.	Alice O'Donoghue	1. Adding to community	S	Grant consent • Nil changes
242.	Terry Milton	1. Benefit youth & replace old ramp.	S	Grant consent • Nil change to consent
243.	Lynda Cruickshank Brunt	1. Launch our boat safely	S	Grant consent • nil
244.	John Bird	1. Want a new boat ramp.	S	Grant consent • nil
245.	Glen Samways	To establish a new ramp	S	Grant consent nil
246.	Eleanor Leslie	Replacement boat ramp & benefit scouts.	S	Grant consent nil
247.	Ron Grossi	Build a new ramp.	S	Grant consent Nil changes
248.	Aimee McHardy	1. Sea Scouts need a new building. 1. Mapua needs a functioning easy access boat ramp	S	Grant consent • nil
249.	David Scales	1. Support new ramp and community facility	S	Grant consent • nil
250.	Marianne Hermsen-Van Wanrooy	1. Benefit our community & young sailors	S	Grant consent • nil
251.	Rhonda Luke	1. Support ramp & sea scouts	S	Grant consent • nil
252.	Clare Cozens	1. Need for new ramp & activities	S	Grant consent • nil
253.	Audrey Melrose	1. Need for ramp & help youth of area.	S	Grant consent • nil
254.	Maria Bengio	1. Easy access to sea & for local youth	S	Grant consent • nil
255.	Jan Batchelor	1. Makes sense	S	Grant consent • Nil change
256.	Lorraine Ryder	1. Need for ramp & new Sea Scout building.	S	Grant consent • nil
257.	Danny Bartlett	1. Need for new boat ramp.	S	Grant consent • nil

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
258.	Andrew Twiss	1. Boat access	S	Grant consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes</li> </ul>
259.	Su Smith	1. Needed to maintain culture rather than commercial – will support lifestyle.	S	Grant consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes</li> </ul>
260.	Dale Raymond	1. Mapua needs a replacement ramp & focal point for aquatic activities in Channel & estuary.	S	Grant consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No conditions required</li> </ul>
261.	Julianne Brabant	1. Negative effect on peace, tranquillity & scenery as well as bird life & specialness of estuary. 2. Safety of wharf jumping. 3. Building is visually unappealing. 4. Risk to marine & human health from contaminated soil disturbance.	O	Not specified
262.	Dennis Crawford	1. Need for decent launching ramp. 2. Community growth and people who love fishing.	S	Grant consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Speed restrictions in channel within mooring area.</li> </ul>
263.	Tim & Francesca Manning	1. Safety concerns 2. Loss of amenity and green space 3. Scale is out of proportion for Mapua and is too close to the village area 4. Sea scout building will have an overbearing presence 5. Maintenance costs for such a large building 6. The mass of information provided demonstrates the un-ideal nature of the proposal – too many non-compliances 7. Applicant expects TDC to be responsible for operations 8. There are errors and contradictions throughout the RC application and lacking in some details.	O	Decline consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Boat ramp should not be brought into use until the Sea Scout building is available for use</li> </ul>
264.	Daryl Urlwin	1. Boat ramp not required 2. Proposed location is dangerous 3. Impact on village feel and loss of green space 4. Increased vehicle traffic and congestion 5. Existing building facilities are adequate 6. Boat club survey is likely biased	O	Decline consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Boat pontoon adjacent to the wharf would be needed</li> <li>Boat washing facilities need to be included</li> <li>Responsibilities for maintenance is with the applicant</li> </ul>

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		7. Negative impacts on property values		
265.	Gaylene Urlwin	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of village feel and green space</li> <li>2. Damage to green space</li> <li>3. Grossi point adequately provides for the community</li> <li>4. Community survey was not adequate</li> <li>5. Health and safety for existing wharf activities and tides</li> <li>6. Boaters will have to be competent</li> <li>7. Traffic and congestion</li> <li>8. Cost to the community</li> </ol>	O	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guarantee that the bed is not disturbed and the community and estuary life continue to be protected</li> <li>• MBRCT are responsible for repairs and maintenance</li> <li>• The sea scouts building must be contingent on any consent</li> </ul>
266.	Cristian Manole	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Assets to the community</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
267.	Cheyenne Roche	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Great infrastructure progress for the community</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
268.	Nick Mitchell	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Would be a good facility</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
269.	Gordon Webb	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mapua boat ramp has always been an essential part of the community</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
270.	Lisa Macale	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Encourages youth into the outdoors</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
271.	Willis Scott	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mapua needs a new boat ramp and facilities</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
272.	Blake Woods	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Good community facilities</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
273.	Kathryn Young	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Good for the whole community</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
274.	Richard Knight	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reduces travel time</li> <li>2. Needed for the youth</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
275.	Michael Christie	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support boat ramp and facilities for the youth</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
276.	Peter Lawrence	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Additional sea scout facilities including new boat ramp</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
277.	Grant Rutledge	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Community sea scouts need a boat ramp and building</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
278.	Gerald King	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Great for kids</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
279.	Grace Turner	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mapua needs a new boat ramp</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
280.	Thomas Turner	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mapua needs a replacement boat ramp</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
281.	Sally Daniel	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mapua needs a replacement boat ramp</li> <li>2. Gives children and families more opportunity</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
282.	Janet Mitchell	1. Mapua needs a launching area away from tourists and restaurant activities 2. Sea scouts need an adequate facility 3. Would like the motor boats away from Grossi point	S	Grant consent
283.	Cameron Williams	1. Mapua needs a replacement boat ramp 2. Scouts need a facility	S	Grant consent
284.	Doreen Seagar	1. Mapua needs a new boat ramp	S	Grant consent
285.	Graeme Baas	1. Mapua needs a new boat ramp	S	Grant consent
286.	Candice Dougall	1. Ability to make boat launching safer	S	Grant consent
287.	Kieran Cosgrove	1. Maintain Mapua as a destination for all	S	Grant consent
288.	Shane Thomas	1. Need a boat ramp for the kids	S	Grant consent
289.	Lynn Thomas	1. Need a boat ramp to support the growing community	S	Grant consent
290.	Debbie Odering	1. Need a new boat ramp in the area and a focal point for youth	S	Grant consent
291.	Erin Kingan	1. Need a new ramp and centre for young youths	S	Grant consent
292.	John Richards	1. New boat ramp for the community	S	Grant consent
293.	Tristen Vorster	1. Need a new ramp for the youth	S	Grant consent
294.	Richard Win	1. Need for a safe boat ramp	S	Grant consent
295.	Gavin Levick	1. Land being used for trailer parking is too valuable 2. Existing Grossi Point ramp remains open	O	Decline consent
296.	Elizabeth Bibby	1. Construction effects 2. Contaminated soils risk 3. Sedimentation and pollution of the Coastal marine area 4. Loss of open space for the community 5. Out of proportion land for parking 6. Potential need for groynes – further disruptions 7. Loss of amenity – community poem will be lost 8. Increased traffic and congestion	O	Decline consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lease or buy land from Leisure Park</li> </ul>

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		9. Increased erosion to neighbouring properties from changes in tidal flow		
297.	Neville Bibby	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased traffic – should also consider effects from Wakefield, Richmond, Nelson</li> <li>2. Does not benefit wider community</li> <li>3. Soil disturbance mitigation</li> <li>4. Disturbance of land and coastal area during construction</li> <li>5. Building for sea scouts to be leased to boat club</li> <li>6. Out of proportion parking area</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent
298.	Gordon and Gaye Waide	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Access to the sea is important for safety, recreation, and education</li> <li>2. TDC owe the boat club a ramp</li> <li>3. Okiwi Bay boat ramp example – noise and congestion are minor and the park is used by the whole community</li> <li>4. Water activities are a big part of the community</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
299.	Frank Davidson	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Replaces ramp that was taken away</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent
300.	Dale Vercoe	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Additional traffic/size of towed boats down Aranui Rd</li> <li>2. Contaminated land</li> <li>3. Loss of amenity</li> <li>4. Cost to rate payers</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent
301.	Peter Walker	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The area is becoming too commercialised</li> <li>2. Health and safety – wharf jumping, bar channel is always changing, strong current would not be good for the sea scouts</li> <li>3. Loss of greenspace</li> <li>4. Noise</li> <li>5. Traffic</li> <li>6. Land contamination</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Propose a new boat ramp at McKee Domain or Mapua Leisure Park instead</li> </ul>
302.	Sheila Stephens	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased noise and activity from boat trailers and motors</li> <li>2. Loss of recreational greenspace</li> <li>3. Increased congestion will negatively impact attraction for visitors</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent
303.	Christine O'Connell	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety of children wharf jumping</li> <li>2. Restriction of space</li> </ol>	N	



Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		3. Management of contaminated soils during construction 4. Traffic and noise management will be needed to mitigate loss of amenity		
304.	Raymond O'Connell	No reasons given	S	Grant consent
305.	Jackie Paterson	1. Parking removal/privatisation 2. Environmental health – contaminated land 3. Safety concerns – tidal estuary 4. Loss of Grossi point – new ramp not possible to launch non powered boats.	O	Decline consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No more than 20 car and trailer parks</li> <li>• No building construction</li> <li>• Single lane ramp</li> <li>• Put a ramp in Leisure Park or at McKee Reserve</li> </ul>
306.	Peter Paterson	1. Community survey is fundamentally flawed 2. Scale is out of proportion 3. Complexity and no of non-compliances is alarming 4. Land disturbance and contamination 5. Loss of amenity, recreation and public space 6. The application minimises the risks to water safety, environmental health and traffic management 7. Proposed mitigation of risks are not reassuring 8. Existing Grossi point ramp is already utilised 9. Funding – effects on rate payers	O	Decline consent
307.	Fiona Smith	1. Negative impact on wider community 2. 'Consultation' was inadequate and bias and information given was incorrect 3. Recreational effects – swimming, kayaking, walking paths etc 4. Loss of amenity and open space 5. Grossi point already exists 6. Out of scale for the village character 7. Traffic – increased larger vehicles 8. Contamination – vague 9. Economic impacts	O	Decline consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduced width for ramp</li> <li>• Limited parking spaces</li> <li>• No buildings to be constructed</li> <li>• No 'boat trailer only' parking on the reserve</li> <li>• Restriction of access re area boats can use on the wharf</li> <li>• Limit no of ramp users per year</li> <li>• No private functions if building is constructed</li> </ul>

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		10. Safety - Tides		
308.	Susan Trew	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Non-compliant with TRMP</li> <li>2. Previous community consultation was incorrect</li> <li>3. Reduction of visitor/public parking</li> <li>4. Loss of open space/Mapua Coastal landscape</li> <li>5. Signage – loss of amenity</li> <li>6. Funding</li> <li>7. Potential loss of residential land for parking</li> <li>8. Noise</li> <li>9. Traffic – traffic data incorrect</li> <li>10. Safety of non-boat activities</li> <li>11. Existing Mapua Hall</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent
309.	Derek Trew	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Existing recreational users</li> <li>2. Safety – a regional boat ramp will attract inexperienced users</li> <li>3. Breaches too many rules under TRMP</li> <li>4. Contaminated land – no excavation management plan included</li> <li>5. Sea scout building scale out of proportion</li> <li>6. Existing Mapua Community Hall</li> <li>7. Replacement ramp at an increased scale</li> <li>8. Traffic report incorrect</li> <li>9. 78 boat trailer spaces is not acceptable for a small minority of the community</li> <li>10. AEE does not consider noise</li> <li>11. Payment /charging method not considered</li> <li>12. The community survey is flawed</li> <li>13. Decision should not be made until Master Plan finalised</li> </ol>	O	Decline consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce boat parking spaces to 20 and increase car parking to 100</li> </ul>
310.	Lesley McIntyre	Duplicate of Submission 327.		
311.	Trevor Marshall	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fulfilment of TDC promises</li> <li>2. Local boating needs</li> <li>3. Ideal location – has been identified in studies</li> <li>4. Allocating parking space preserves of green space</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Improves safety compared to Grossi point</li> <li>6. Contamination can be effectively managed</li> <li>7. Community partnership</li> <li>8. Supports anticipated future growth</li> <li>9. Increased traffic can be mitigated</li> <li>10. New ramp unlikely to cause recreation restrictions</li> <li>11. profits will be reinvested into the community</li> </ul>		
312.	Richard Marshall	No reasons given	S	Grant consent
313.	Geoffrey McCullough	No reasons given	S	Grant consent
314.	Susan Scott	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Community facility</li> <li>2. supports sea activities</li> </ul>	S	Grant consent
315.	John Green	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Need for youth facilities</li> <li>2. Need for new boat ramp</li> </ul>	S	Grant consent
316.	William Fowler	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Community benefits</li> </ul>	S	Grant consent
317.	Wendy Gelling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reduced travel for Mapua residents to launch a boat</li> </ul>	S	Grant consent
318.	Robyn Packer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fabulous for the region</li> </ul>	S	Grant consent
319.	Kennett Packer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Great for the area</li> </ul>	S	Grant consent
320.	William Thaugland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Good for the community</li> </ul>	S	Grant consent
321.	Sarah Pumphrey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports local children's sporting activities</li> <li>2. Safe boat ramp instead of Grossi point</li> </ul>	S	Grant consent
322.	Alan Pumphrey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safe space for youth to learn</li> <li>2. Safe boat launching facility is needed</li> <li>3. Profits return to the community</li> </ul>	S	Grant consent
323.	Jennifer Joy Marchbanks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Replacing the previous ramp that was removed</li> <li>2. Community benefits</li> <li>3. Kite park essential for parking – already needed and used</li> </ul>	S	Grant consent
324.	John Leslie	No reasons given	S	Grant consent
325.	Captain Erik Walter Inkster	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Positive community outcome</li> <li>2. Safer outcomes for the sea scouts</li> <li>3. Emergency access – benefits for coastguard, police, rescue</li> </ul>	S	Grant consent

Sub no.	Submitter	Key Issues	Support, Oppose or Neutral	Conditions / relief sought
		4. Fair for TDC replace the facilities they have taken away		
326.	Te Atiawa o Te Waka a Mui Trust	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Historical and cultural significance of the area</li> <li>2. Will encourage further land disturbance</li> <li>3. Increased traffic over a culturally significant site</li> <li>4. Frustrates the policies and objectives of the RMA and Te Atiawa Iwi Environmental Management Plan</li> <li>5. Environmental loss – sedimentation, contamination</li> <li>6. Effects on cultural activities</li> </ol>	O	Decline
327.	Lesley Anne Sheed McIntyre	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Out of proportion for the community</li> <li>2. Loss of amenity – views, noise, pollution</li> <li>3. Increased traffic</li> <li>4. Environmental and ecological – mitigation not 100% proven – too many questions</li> <li>5. Grossi point exists</li> <li>6. safety measures inadequate</li> <li>7. Building is an aesthetic nightmare</li> <li>8. Loss of open space</li> </ol>	O	Decline
328.	Bec Deacon	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Serves a minority of the community</li> <li>2. Grossi Point and Motueka boat ramps already exist</li> <li>3. TDC funds better spent on other community improvements</li> <li>4. Use of Kite Park implies a subsidy from TDC to the Boat Ramp Trust</li> <li>5. Sea scouts already have facilities</li> <li>6. Safety issues – tide, other users, pollution hazards</li> <li>7. Traffic and increased use of petrol station – loss of amenity</li> <li>8. Cost and effect on rates</li> <li>9. Loss of park space - community better served by shelter facilities</li> </ol>	O	Decline
329.	Clare Elizabeth Kininmonth	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Benefits for the community</li> <li>2. Loss of community open space - sealing Kite Park unnecessary</li> </ol>	S	Grant consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leave Kite Park grassed</li> </ul>