

Draft Nelson Tasman Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2025



Submitter Details

Submission Date: 07/03/2025

First name: Karen Last name: [REDACTED]

Organisation: Nelson Tasman Climate Forum

Postal address: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Daytime Phone: * [REDACTED]

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?
If you wish to present your submission at the hearing in Te Reo Māori or New Zealand sign language please include this information in your submission.

Yes

Additional requirements for hearing:

Feedback

Do you agree with our vision being 'Waste free together'?

1 Please tick one.
Yes

Further Comments:
We agree with this vision, but the definition of this as a low waste, not zero waste society and one that has a resilient waste system does not meet the vision. Waste free means not generating waste; we should be aspiring to a resilient resource reuse, repair and recovery system. What level of waste per household is seen as low waste?
The plan to get to a low waste society is totally inadequate. See comments below, particularly in the Any other Feedback section.

Our vision is based on collectively reducing or avoiding waste.

2
Do you agree that we all have a role to play? Tick any of the following that applies to you.

I can personally do more to reduce the amount of waste I produce.
Further Comments:
Your form does not allow more than one option to be selected. We select 'I can personally do more to reduce the amount of waste I produce' and 'I am prepared to pay more to significantly reduce waste'.
To make a major difference to the generation of waste there needs system wide change at central and local government. Businesses and industries also have more scope for impactful change. It is important to bring the whole community along the journey so that they understand the issues and problems, and don't just believe that recycling is the answer. Perhaps then they would vote for change and support the change that is happening in their local region.

We are proposing 5 focus areas.

Focus Area 1: Strengthen partnerships and collaborative efforts.

Focus Area 2: Prioritise waste preventions, reuse, repair, and repurpose activities

Focus Area 3: Address the impacts of climate change and natural hazards

Focus Area 4: Enhance the efforts to recover and divert resources from being disposed to landfill.

Focus Area 5: Enable waste solutions that take care of people and the environment.

3

Do you support our focus areas, or have we missed something?

We generally support the focus areas but not necessarily how you are actioning each. More comments below.

Target #1 Avoid waste generation - Reduce waste generation by 10% per person by 2035 (using a baseline of 2024/25, as complete data are not yet available).

Target #2 Reduce waste disposal - Reduce waste disposed to landfill by 30% per person by 2035 (using a baseline of 2017/18).

Target #3 Minimise waste emissions - Reduce emissions of biogenic methane from landfill by >85% in 2035 relative to 2017 baseline; and utilise at least 75% of the captured landfill gas for beneficial use by 2035 (with a focus on displacing fossil fuel use).

4

Do you agree with these targets?

Yes

Further

We would like to see a clear signal of how Councils are aiming to become low waste by 2050, and what is low waste? This Plan is tinkering at the edges and relying on recycling to meet the targets. Recycling is not the solution to our wasteful society. If we are going to focus efforts to reduce waste at the top of the waste hierarchy, recycling should not be seen as a solution to meet the vision.

Diverting all green and food waste, along with other organic waste streams to recover the resources to go back into our local soils and avoid the generation of methane, would be one way to possibly meet these targets. This action is needed but to become low waste by 2035 we need to do much more and target the other resources that are wasted.

In our plan we have a focus on waste streams such as food/organic waste, more recycling, building waste and disaster waste.

5

Are there other types of waste you would like to see and focus on and if so, why?

The focus seems to be on how to process waste streams. To achieve a low waste society we need to stop producing it. The process of stopping production is not to create the waste, and then do something with it to divert it from landfill. It is to use less stuff, make it last longer through good design and the ability to repair when it does fail, and use materials that are reusable, refillable and will not harm our people or environment.

The waste streams you are focusing on are important, but if you are just focused on dealing with waste once it's generated, it's an ambulance at the bottom of the cliff type solution. Hazardous waste needs to be a focus too, including electronic waste. Another waste stream to deal with is beverage containers. Councils need to be advocating more strongly for a good container deposit return scheme. This should be through advocacy of central government and particularly the Minister for the Environment, but done in a public way so that ratepayers understand what is being asked for, why, and what are the many benefits to them as well as our environment. That encourages them to show their support.

One issue with hazardous waste is that there seems to be very little understanding in the community about what hazardous waste types can be diverted and where to take them, and even what is hazardous. Signage at the Nelson Waste Recovery Centre is woeful, including that beyond the ticket desk. The NCC website is also not very clear. We're not sure how good the systems are at the TDC Resource Recovery

Centres. It would at least be good if the same services were available at all Nelson and Tasman centres. An example is tyres. At Richmond RRC, tyres are covered under the Tyrewise PS scheme, and so it's free to drop off up to 5 tyres. At Nelson, there is still a charge per tyre and when you ask about Richmond being free they don't know why, and didn't know that information. The sources of all these waste types need to be addressed, and not just solutions to deal with the waste.

6

Please if you have other feedback enter it here.

This Plan is more of the same. It has good and bad bits. But it's not going to make any fundamental difference to how the region respects resources and minimises the use of them. We'll continue to see the health of our people and environment challenged by the resources we all use everyday.

We would like to see how the budget for managing waste is spent in relation to the waste hierarchy. We imagine most of it is in the disposal and recycling end of the hierarchy. If Councils want to make a real difference in preventing the generation of waste then that balance needs to be shifted. That would be another good measure of progress, to see how that picture changes, over time. Recycling is not the answer to achieving a low waste society, and yet the expansion of recycling is still seen as a solution in this Plan. Behaviour change and legislation combined are the only likely ways of achieving it. Invest in those solutions, not recycling. Invest in community-led solutions that work in and with the community to bring the whole community along on the journey.

This Plan should be aiming to move the budget (over time) away from the focus on recycling, to the top of the hierarchy. Councils were provided with many suggestions to consider when you wrote the Plan, including links to other Council Waste Management and Minimisation Plans (including Auckland Council and Wellington City Council). The report from Reuse Aotearoa commissioned by you and on the [NCC website](#), gives suggestions on what Councils can do to support a reuse economy. We can see no evidence of any influence from these other plans or the report or any other of the many suggestions given to Councils.

It is good that the need to advocate to central government for the Right to Repair legislation, and other legislation, is included. But if the plan is to encourage a society that repairs goods, for example, the model for supporting repair activities needs to be reviewed. This is one example of where financial support for creating system change is totally inadequate. One example is the NTCF's Nelson Repair Cafes funding has been reduced in 2025, by \$1,250 to \$5,000 because the council didn't want to fund the coordination of the Cafe's! Most of the labour for these events is voluntary. We can only run one event per month generally from February to November, because we don't have enough volunteers. The cafe's are successful, but to really make an impact we would need to hold repair cafes, or provide other options to repair goods in an affordable manner, every week throughout the region. We're not wanting to lead the delivery of Repair Cafes, we're just one organisation trying to support the kaupapa, throughout the region, not just in Nelson. To do that the events would best be held at local community centres/spaces. It won't happen unless the councils invest in supporting the development and ongoing costs of such services. We know this will be met by the call that councils can't fund solutions for ever, and yet that is what councils do for recycling. If the money (or at least a greater proportion) spent on recycling is diverted to activities supporting repair, setting up reuse systems etc. then we would see real change happening.

Councils too often use funding as a means to support important community-led initiatives. If a business isn't already providing that service, then it's not likely to be viable. The community gets involved because there are passionate people wanting to drive change, and there is no other solution. If the council supports that change then you need to be realistic about what is needed to do so, and not rely on an overstressed pool of volunteers. If the service is needed, then work with the community and contract them, through a tender process, to deliver it. Don't expect them to do so on a year by year basis using mostly volunteer labour. It will not be sustainable. Councils need to move away from minimal short term funding. It doesn't work to create long term system change.

If Councils want to seriously create a low waste society then you need to talk to your whole community and involve them in developing a plan. This Plan is not the answer.

Note: This is a submission from the Nelson Tasman Climate Forum. The Forum launched in February 2020 as a community-led climate action initiative open to everyone. The Forum aims to weave the community together around urgent, strategic action to achieve the following goals:

- Rapidly reduce the region's greenhouse gas emissions, increase carbon sequestration and undertake other climate stabilising initiatives, consistent with the urgency of the situation.
- Adapt to the likely adverse environmental effects of climate change and the resulting social and cultural effects, using inclusive and responsible decision-making to support these desirable outcomes.
- Respond to climate change in a way that recognises the rights of all living organisms, including people, and provides for a just, equitable, and resilient society.

The Forum is volunteer-led, apolitical, and registered as a non-profit partner under the Tasman Environmental Trust. In the four years the

Forum has been functioning, volunteers have carried out over 30 community projects. These projects range across many climate initiatives and include monthly Repair Cafés in Whakatū Nelson, Motueka and Tākaka, a yearly Climate Action Festival, a climate action campaign called Take the Jump, art events and photography exhibitions, a Climate Action Plan and Book for the region, climate conversations with varied groups across the community, several waste reduction projects, letter writing campaigns, government and council submissions, and the protection and restoration of native habitats.

This submission is a consensus document from the Nelson Tasman Climate Forum, having been reviewed by signatory members once for input, and a second time for approval.

Please note: whilst the Nelson City Council and Tasman District Council have both signed the Nelson Tasman Climate Forum Charter, this submission has been prepared completely independently of the Councils. This submission is in no way intended and nor should be construed to represent the views of either Council in any way.

We thank you for the opportunity to present this submission and for your consideration of our contribution.