

**FINAL: Motion on the Mapua Wharf precinct development. It has three main points. The motion is:**

- 1) THAT the MDCA urges that the new Tasman District Council gives the highest priority to a review and report on issues arising from the performance of its current Mapua Wharf precinct development project including:**
  - a) The lack of an approved overall plan for the project;**
  - b) The substantial cost over-runs and how they will be financed;**
  - c) The actions that led to a costly court ruling against the TDC over Hamish's cafe and**
  - d) The omission from the current operational plan of measures to protect and support the vital Mapua community assets at and near Mapua wharf, including:**
    - i) The Mapua Boat Club and its vital assets, a launching ramp and a practical dinghy rack;**
    - ii) The Tamaha Sea Scout Group;**
    - iii) The Port Mapua Maritime Museum and**
    - iv) The Wharf Reserve and family area**
- 2) THAT the council delays further decisions and spending on the development project until**
  - a) The review is completed, reported on and a comprehensive future plan is properly defined, costed and made public.**
  - b) The present council policy focussing on only commercial returns from the Mapua Wharf precinct is modified to acknowledge, support and protection for the important Mapua Wharf assets created and managed by the Mapua community, the Mapua Boat Club and its assets, the Tamaha Sea Scout Group, the Port Mapua Marine Museum and the wharf itself.**
- 3) AND THAT there is proper public consultation over the future plan for the Mapua Wharf precinct.**

**The reasons for the motion are that:**

1. For both council and the community, the unauthorised over-spending on the Shed 4 project of approximately \$577,000 and the court award made against the council of \$20,000 and costs for breach of contract are serious matters of concern for both council and the community. They need review and measures to prevent further mistakes of this type.  
The current council wharf development project has been undertaken without an overall plan. While the council's initiative to kick-start commercial development after the loss of the aquarium by building shops on the site of the former Shed 4 has been a positive move, the council has gone on to do much more with its project. Other changes have included forcing out a popular shop, closing the boat ramp and dinghy rack, buying back the lease of Shed 5, expanding the licensed area of the tavern and locating a temporary toilet block on the wharf reserve area for the use of tavern patrons.  
As a result of these actions, important community groups based at the wharf, the Mapua Boat Club, our Sea Scout Group and the museum have either had big problems to deal with or are concerned about their future use of the wharf area. They fear that they will be forced out under the existing council policy demanding high commercial returns from the area. Families and iwi are also disappointed about changes to the Wharf Reserve and comments from the council's commercial manager that the area will be developed to give a commercial return.
2. A central problem is the adoption by the council in 2014 of a commercial policy that focuses on high financial returns from what the council's Commercial Committee regards as simply a financial asset. The Mapua Wharf area is being bracketed with commercial business ventures like the council's forestry operations and, through new policies adopted in 2014 for the council's Commercial Subcommittee, is being charged with yielding maximum financial returns. We are also concerned that the committee of five making decisions contains three unelected and unaccountable members and that most of the business conducted by this committee is done with the public excluded.

3. The committee's policy makes no allowance for special factors at Port Mapua that have helped make the Mapua Wharf so popular with visitors and the community. These include
  - a. The work of the boat club and its members in supervising and assisting visiting boats and overseeing launching and landing small boats and also simply keeping watch on the wharf.
  - b. The presence of an attractive, locally-focused museum with photos and artifacts displayed there.
  - c. Tables and places for visitors to sit on the wharf and in the Wharf Reserve area
  - d. An attractive and safe place for children to play in the reserve area, which is in close proximity to a safe small beach and includes a popular Ngaio tree.
4. The council is in the process of considering other decisions in the wharf area-including a new site for a replacement boat ramp, a new permanent toilet, a total change to the licensed area for the Golden Bear Tavern and the commercial manager is talking about new commercial development of the Wharf Reserve area.
5. We further believe that there should have been consultation with iwi over the siting of the temporary toilets and the location of the tavern's licensed area. It is now evident that much of the wharf area has been used in the past as an urupa (burial ground) and some of the burials are very historic. There are special Maori cultural values related to urupa and former food preparation sites that deserve respect.
6. The council has said that it stopped further spending on the wharf development project back in May 2016 and said then that it would undertake a review of the project. However, work on aspects of the project has continued. So far as we can understand it, the scope of the review has not been determined and no deadline has been set for its completion.
7. There seem to be too many issues for them to be considered on an individual basis. The issues are inter-related and all involve one of our most beautiful community and district assets, the Mapua Wharf area. A result has been public confusion about the council's objectives, strong opposition to some council decisions and community uncertainty about the benefits of the project.
8. Currently, it seems that each new council decision about the Wharf Precinct is given only the most basic consultation via the Mapua Waterfront Advisory Committee and the end result is that there is pressure on community representatives on the committee to make quick responses to new proposals. Examples of unresolved issues that are currently being considered are: a site for the dinghy rack, a site for a new boat ramp; the future of the wharf reserve area; the possibility of another new toilet block near the site of the temporary one and the fence planned for the rear of Alberta's café. The present limited consultation seems very inadequate for such a range of important and related issues.
9. In this project, as in any other one, inadequate planning is unlikely to lead to good outcomes. Both the community and the council need a plan for the vitally important Mapua Wharf precinct that acknowledges the project has to be a council-community partnership and it needs a well-considered, affordable and comprehensive plan that has the full support of the both council and the community.